

T.C.
MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
SİYASET BİLİMİ VE ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER ANABİLİM DALI
ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER BİLİM DALI

**PERCEPTION OF MODERNIZATION DURING THE REPUBLICAN
ERA: RAILWAY CASE**

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

DERYA AYTEN

İstanbul, 2014

To my new-born baby, Nil

T.C.
MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
SİYASET BİLİMİ VE ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER ANABİLİM DALI
ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER BİLİM DALI

**PERCEPTION OF MODERNIZATION DURING THE REPUBLICAN
ERA: RAILWAY CASE**

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

DERYA AYTEN

Danışman: PROF. DR. AHMET DEMİREL

İstanbul, 2014



T.C.
MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

TEZ ONAY BELGESİ

SİYASET BİLİMİ VE ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER Anabilim Dalı
ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER (İNGİLİZCE) Bilim Dalı TEZLİ YÜKSEK LİSANS öğrencisi
DERYA AYTEN'nın PERCEPTION OF MODERNIZATION DURING THE
REPUBLICAN ERA : RAILWAY CASE adlı tez çalışması, Enstitümüz Yönetim Kurulunun
18.12.2013 tarih ve 2013-46/11 sayılı kararıyla oluşturulan jüri tarafından oy birliği / oy çokluğu
ile Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Tez Savunma Tarihi 8. 1. 2014

Öğretim Üyesi Adı Soyadı

İmzası

Öğretim Üyesi Adı Soyadı	İmzası
1. Tez Danışmanı Prof. Dr. AHMET DEMİREL	
2. Jüri Üyesi Doç. Dr. NURAY BOZBORA HEKİMOĞLU	
3. Jüri Üyesi Yrd. Doç. Dr. ÖZLEM YÜCEL	

ABSTRACT

PERCEPTION OF MODERNIZATION DURING THE REPUBLICAN ERA: RAILWAY CASE

Ayten, Derya

M.A., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ahmet Demirel

January 2014

Modernity might be said to have developed concurrently with the railways in the nineteenth century within the Western context. The impact of this technology to the non-Western world produced a similar realization as railway development and modernization process went hand in hand in those areas that fall outside the borders of the continent. The Ottoman Empire was among those in which the construction of railroads conformed to the pursuit of modernization. Encoded in railways, quest for modernization was bequeathed to the Turkish Republic. Railway technology had a considerable impact on the development of Turkish state's perception of modernization, from when the newly founded republic had initiated a new transportation policy and accelerated the building of railway network throughout Anatolia, to the 1940s until when the early republican period came to an end together with the change in the state's preference from railroad to highway.

Within the context of the revolutionary laws under the aegis of Atatürkism/Kemalism, the idea of modernization as crystallized reaching to contemporary civilization came to the fore as one of the most important ideals which had social, political and economic dimensions. As part of this ideal, between the years 1923 and 1940, representing the early republican period, the state adopted a railway policy known as *Şimendifer Siyaseti* through which not only new railway lines were started to be constructed, but also already-existing ones inherited from the Ottoman Empire were nationalized as these lines had been under the ownership of the foreign railroad companies.

Analyzing the relationship of this railway policy with the revolutionary laws, this thesis addresses the impact of railroad development on the formation of the state's perception of modernization. Within this framework, the aim of this thesis is not to explore the socio-economic and politico-cultural changes the state went through due to the outcomes of this railway policy, but to focus on the position of this policy in the modernization paradigm of the Turkish state and to explore the contribution of the railroad development to the state's discourse of reaching to contemporary civilization.

Keywords: Modernization, Railway, Ottoman Modernization, Railway Development in the Ottoman Empire, Turkish Modernization Policies, Development of Railways during the Republican Period

ÖZET

CUMHURİYET DÖNEMİ MODERNLEŞME ALGISI: DEMİRYOLU ÖRNEĞİ

Ayten, Derya

Master, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Ahmet Demirel

Ocak 2014

Modernleşmenin, 19. yüzyılda Batı dünyasında demiryolları ile eşzamanlı olarak geliştiği söylenebilir. Demiryolu gelişimi ve modernleşme sürecinin Avrupa kıtası dışında da birlikte gerçekleşmesiyle, bu teknoloji Batılı olmayan dünyada da kıtadakinine benzer etkiler doğurmuştur. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu da, demiryolu yapımının modernleşme yolunda önemli olduğuna inanan ülkeler arasında yer almaktadır. Demiryollarında kodlanmış bu modernleşme arayışı Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'ne miras kalmıştır. Demiryolu teknolojisinin Türk devletinin modernleşme algısı üzerinde önemli etkisi olmuştur. Bu etki yeni kurulan cumhuriyetin başlattığı yeni ulaştırma politikaları ve Anadolu'da hızlandırılan demiryolu ağı inşaatlarının olduğu dönemden başlayıp, devletin ulaştırma politikasının demiryolu yerine karayolu olarak değiştiği 1940'lı yıllara kadar sürmüştür.

Sosyal, siyasal ve ekonomik alanlarda önemli etkileri olan modernleşme ideali, Atatürkçülüğün/Kemalizmin devrim yasaları çerçevesinde, muasır medeniyet seviyesine ulaşma olarak tanımlanmıştır. Bu idealin bir parçası olarak cumhuriyetin ilk dönemi olan 1923 ve 1940 yılları arasında, devlet “*Şimendifer Siyaseti*” olarak bilinen demiryolu politikasını benimsemiştir. Bu politika ile devlet yeni demiryolları yapımına başlamanın yanı sıra, Osmanlı'dan miras kalan ve yabancı demiryolu şirketlerinin elinde bulunan mevcut demiryollarını da millileştirmiştir. Devrim kanunları ile devletin demiryolu politikası arasındaki ilişkiyi analiz eden bu tezde, demiryolu gelişiminin devletin modernleşme algısının oluşumuna olan etkisi incelemektedir. Bu çerçevede, tezin esas konusunu, devletin takip ettiği demiryolu

politikasına baęlı olarak ortaya ıkan sosyal, ekonomik, kltrel ve/veya siyasi deęişiklikler oluřturmamaktadır. Tezde, cumhuriyet dneminde devletin modernleřme paradigması ierisinde demiryolu politikasının nemine odaklanılmıřtır. Tezin amacı, izlenen demiryolu politikasının, devletin muasır medeniyet seviyesine ulařma sylemine olan katkısını incelemektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Modernleřme, Demiryolu, Osmanlı Modernleřmesi, Osmanlı İmparatorluęu'nda Demiryolu Geliřimi, Trkiye'nin Modernleřme Politikaları, Cumhuriyet Dneminde Demiryolu Geliřimi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express sincere gratitude to my thesis advisor, Professor Ahmet Demirel, for his invaluable assistance, guidance and critical advice. Even though it has been a very busy year for him, Ahmet Demirel devoted a great amount of time and patience to this thesis. For a lifetime, I will carry the honor of having had the opportunity to be acquainted with him by his acceptance of being advisor of this study. I am also greatly indebted to my jury members, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nuray Bozboru and Assist. Prof. Dr. Özlem Yücel for their valuable comments and encouragements.

During 2010 – 2012, I benefited from the graduate scholarship of “National Scholarship Programme for MSc Students” granted by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK). I would like to express my gratitude for their financial support throughout my graduate studies.

I am especially grateful to my family, especially to my sisters who have always encouraged me during hard times. My husband deserves special thanks. Due to the health problems and the successive operations I had to undergo, although the whole year has been very rough for both of us and we have almost lived nothing good to remember except the birth of our baby, he has kept his indulgence and tried hard for being a decent father. Without the existence and support of my mother, I would not have been able to complete this thesis. During the whole process I have experienced as a mother, she has always been with me. She cared of us, looked after my daughter and never lost faith in me. Most importantly, I would like to dedicate this study to my new-born baby, Nil who has been my everything since the first time I knew about her existence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ÖZET	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
1. CHAPTER I: MODERNITY ENCODED IN RAILWAYS	7
1.1. A Brief Discussion about Modernity.....	7
1.2. Industrial Revolution and The Development of Railway Technology.....	11
1.2.1. Development of Railways.....	14
1.3. Railway as an Epitome of Modernity.....	16
2. CHAPTER II: RAILWAYS IN THE MODERNIZATION PROCESS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE	30
2.1. A Brief Introduction to The Ottoman Modernization.....	31
2.1.1. The Modernization Process.....	34
2.2. A General History of The Ottoman Railway Development.....	46
2.2.1. The Period between 1830 and 1856.....	48
2.2.2. The Period between 1856 and 1876.....	54
2.2.3. The Period between 1876 and 1908.....	58
2.2.4. The Period between 1908 and 1914-18.....	67
2.3. Impact of The Railways on The Ottoman Modernization Process.....	69
3. CHAPTER III : ROLE OF RAILWAYS IN THE MODERNIZATION PROCESS OF THE TURKISH REPUBLIC	82
3.1. A General History of Modernization Under the Republican Rule.....	82
3.1.1. Pillars of the Turkish Modernization Process.....	89
3.1.2. Kemalist Reforms-Modernization Policies.....	99
3.1.3. Modernization as Westernization.....	107
3.1.4. A Corollary to Kemalist Modernization: Scientism.....	117
3.2. Railway Development during the Republican Period.....	124
3.2.1. A Brief History of Railway Development.....	128

3.2.2. Railroads under the Republican Rule.....	135
3.2.3. Railways Constructed by the State	137
3.2.4. Nationalization of the Existing Rail Lines	141
3.3. Impact of Railways on the Modernization Process under the Republican Rule.....	143
3.3.1. Railways as a Site for Legitimation of the State Power through the Modernization Discourse	143
3.3.2. Modernization Encoded in Railways	147
3.3.3. Tracking the Perception of Modernization in the Railways.....	149
CONCLUSION	153
BIBLIOGRAPHY	165

INTRODUCTION

Even before the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923, the year 1919, when the national liberation movement started in Anatolia, marked the turning point for the transition from the Ottoman Empire to a new evolution giving the first signals of the change. This change as was to be called later as the Revolution Movement (*İnkilap Hareketi*) under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal in projecting a nation-state that would replace the Ottoman Empire, gained its momentum with the start of the War of Independence in 19 May 1919. As independence and national sovereignty are two interrelated processes for the new state to be built, the start of the national independence movement is seen as the first step of the revolutionary policies Mustafa Kemal envisaged for the new state that would replace the Ottoman Empire. After the regime change was declared and the republic was founded, with the power taken from the national assembly that was formed in 1920, founding fathers of the new state initiated revolutionary laws in order to strengthen the building blocks of the new state as well as to change the total picture of the society. For this aim to be realized, policies ranging from economic to socio-cultural were put into practice especially after 1925 when the politicians of the time had radical choices that sometimes leaning towards authoritarianism.

Yet, still, the remnants of this tendency about the change of the social structure could be traced back to the Ottoman Empire which the Turkish Republic inherited Western-oriented political legacy. The republic was built upon the institutional structure of its predecessor with its cadres, who would take the important positions in political realm in the coming years of the new state. As it is impossible to draw clear-cut boundaries between the Ottoman and republican structures, it is significant to explore the Ottoman legacy in order to understand the issue at hand deeply. For this, it should be acknowledged what lied behind the policies of the republican regime when the elites of the new state turned their faces to the West; and to explain hows and whys of the process. The answers could be found as long as the developments during the Ottoman period are analyzed and put into the great picture.

The opening of the doors of the Ottoman Empire to the West unconditionally came into reality with two concurrent events: Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Convention of 1838 (*Balta Limanı*) and Tanzimat Edict of 1839. While with the former, the empire faced a sudden integration with the premature Western capitalism, the Tanzimat Edict meant for the Empire to

put into effect changes in legal and thus in political realms. Although reforms were put forward within the imperial structure during the reign of Selim III when the Ottomans started to take their first defeats against the West, the year 1839 constituted the turning point in the Ottoman reform history as the Tanzimat Edict signified more than a series of regulations and reforms that were already in practice, but of the beginning of the full-fledged modernization process which would have influence in marking the direction and content of the change for the succeeding periods including the republican era.

The awareness of there was no going back to the earlier glorious periods of the empire and more importantly, of the fact that if the appropriate measures were not taken urgently, the empire would not be able to survive was what made the Ottoman rulers to initiate a program covering those reforms which went beyond the earlier military and administrative ones. This situation necessitated the opening of the empire with its all institutional setting including the legal and economic schemas. To be able to sustain the continuance, the Ottoman Empire had to encounter the growing influence of the Western powers, especially of England which was the leading power in imperial race as a state which launched the Industrial Revolution. Within the context of centralization efforts of the House of Osman in order to keep the boundaries of the empire intact which went hand in hand with the western penetration into the different realms of the Ottoman structure, the modernization process of the Ottoman Empire started in the last quarter of the nineteenth century with a focus on the meaning of the reforms in relation with the development of railways.

These successive reforms were followed by a revolutionary movement when the Ottoman Empire was replaced by a nation-state founded on a new regime. Even though the intent for the initiation of revolutionary laws of the new Turkish state was similar to the former reforms, that of modernization; the way to proceed to the idea of modernization was different. While the Ottoman reformers were looking for modernization to be able to protect the existing system intact, the republican elite saw modernization as a building block in order to found a new state-society structure. Modernization was viewed as a prerequisite to the formation of the new system that what was perceived to be in the category of the modern was conceptualized as imperative to historical progress of the new regime which was identified with the motto of reaching to the level of contemporary civilization.

In Turkey modernization was explained and understood not as an abstract phenomenon but as a measurable and concrete process of development. For the modernizing elite also, progress oriented to concrete innovations as opposed to philosophical concerns was of greater importance. Attached to the narrative of reaching to the level of civilized nations, railways were seen inescapable part of the modernization project. In other words, railways were imagined by the republican elite as the vehicle that would allow Turkey to journey into modernization. Perception of modernization was interwoven with the development of technology of the time, i.e. railways as historical progress was equated to transformations developed in the West which was taken as civilized and modern.

As the modernization project of the republican regime was ideologically premised on the presumption of “civilization” and “modernization” being categories that were inherently substitutable in accordance with the master narrative of the Turkish Republic about modernization as historical progress achieved by the Western world, an analysis of state discourse over railways would help to draw the fault-lines along which the process of modernization was coded within railways and perceived by the state. This understanding thus comprises the backdrop that the thesis takes as its point of departure. A study of the impact of railway development on the state’s perception about modernization, this thesis explores, historically how the railway development was identified with the modernization process during the early republican period as the historical meaning of the railway development was re-signified as the precursor of modernity.

In the introduction part, a brief analysis about the concept of modernity would be given in reference to the discussions of the forefathers of the discipline of sociology. My goal in this chapter is not to give a deep explanation about modernity, but to frame a general understanding to be able to position my argument in a historical context for a more meaningful analysis. In parallel, basic assumptions about modernity as a concept and as a process and the analysis put forward by those scholars whose theoretical assessments are widely accepted in their fields would be examined in the chapter. It is aimed to give an insight about the subject matter in order to clarify the main argument of this thesis in reference to the historical contextualization. In this frame, modernity connotes to the change in socio-economic and political composition of the Western social structure within the interrelated breakthroughs in these respective realms, while

modernization refers to the implementation of that socio-political change at institutional base from where it has been exported across ever-expanding regions of the non-West. Thus, the thesis does comprise neither the discussions about the different interpretations of modernity, modernization, and modernism; nor the reflections on the modernization theory, post-modernism, nor multiple modernities. The second part of this chapter concerns the relation between the Industrial Revolution and the development of railway technology. The chapter is concluded with the last part which explains the dimensions of how railways symbolized the modern age.

After forming the background for the significance of railways in the modern context, the second chapter examines the relation between the railroad development and the modernization process in the Ottoman Empire. This analysis is important as it would give clues for understanding the roots of the both the railroad development and the quest for modernization in the early Republican era. In the first part of this chapter, a brief history to the Ottoman modernization process is presented, while the second part would deal with the history of railroad development in the Ottoman Empire. These two parts would be inclusive of an introductory phase in each topic about which multitudinous studies have been conducted. The last part would be the backbone of this chapter as it examines the relation between the modernization process and the railway development in the Ottoman Empire. This examination would offer an insight into the theme of the thesis since the analysis of the Ottoman Empire as a case at hand would strengthen the argument asserted in the first chapter.

In such a field which requires expert-level knowledge and academic background on the Ottoman history, the analysis in this chapter could be regarded as a simple and trial for quantifying the impact of railroad development on the modernization process of the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, it does not mean to claim to measure or evaluate the overall effect of the railroad development-as it is a multi-dimensional subject- on the modernization process of the era under examination, but to show the relationship between the two. As worthy as it is, this analysis would provide a comprehension about the subject matters as contrary to the official discourse of the Republican era, the Ottoman Empire was eager in pursuing the developments that took place in the Western world, reinforcing the fact that more than half of the railway

network in the republic was inherited from the Ottoman Empire as well as the roots of the republican modernization were grounded in the process started almost a century earlier.

The following chapter addresses in its first part the modernization scheme of the Turkish Republic through examining the Kemalist reforms and the motives behind the enactment of the revolutionary laws. The formation of the railway policy and the establishment of a railway network in the early republican period are discussed in the second part of this chapter. Like the second chapter, this chapter, too, does not give extensive information about the subjects in these two parts as each would be a topic for an in-depth study which would not be realized within the scope and the aim of this thesis. In the last part of this chapter, the pivotal point for the thesis is discussed. This part analyzes the impact of railway development on the perception of the modernization during the early republican period. Exploring this impact of railways in republican Turkey where the master narrative of modernization was equated to that of reaching to the level of contemporary civilization would allow insights how the republican elite had thoughts about railways both as a technology and a signal sign of modernity.

As the foundation of the Turkish modernization movement was built upon Kemalist principles and revolutionary reforms, together with the statesmen who actively involved in party politics, the speeches of Atatürk constitutes the main part of the analysis from which the idea about the perception of modernization during the republican era would be read through the railway case. Giving due attention to the speeches of Atatürk, speeches delivered by some of the prominent statesmen of the time would be analyzed in the last part of the third chapter to be able to gain insights about their perception of modernization and the place of railways in this understanding. Within the conceptions of the culture and the problems of the period, this part tries to analyze the perception of the republican elite dominantly making use of their speeches delivered about the modernization and railways. Although the focus would be primarily on Atatürk's speeches, the speeches of selected other important figures of his contemporaries would also be referred.

Though this study is about the examination of speeches, the thesis is not based on the discourse analysis. It means that the aim is not to reveal socio-psychological characteristics of the respective orators, whose speeches are used in the thesis, but to affirm the argument of the thesis through exemplifying the speeches which are displaying overtly the perception of the state

elite in their interpretation of railways as the symbols of modernization. Notwithstanding, the thesis touches the fringes of the impact of railroad development on socio-economic and cultural life during the era under consideration, this subject necessitates an in-depth analysis covering a whole range of issues related to the state-society relations together with their imprints on today's Turkey.

Associating the dream of reaching to the level of contemporary civilization with that of railway development has been an intrinsic component of the Turkish politics since the early republican era with varying overtones. Sometimes this emerged as a matter of party politics to denote the affinity to the Western world, and more often to infer to the commitment to the founding principles of the republican state. For the further studies on the railroad subject, how this relation between the modernization process and the railway development has gained ground in the Turkish political agenda for decades up until the recent days might be an unexplored field for the discovery of the deep-seated aspiration for attainment to the level of the contemporary civilization through the iron nets covering the motherland from end to end.

1. CHAPTER I: MODERNITY ENCODED IN RAILWAYS

1.1. A Brief Discussion about Modernity

In order to understand what modernization is in general, and to be able to contextualize it within the Turkish case in particular, the first thing to do is to explain the concept of modernity. Even though these two are generally used interchangeably in characterising social changes, indeed they are quite different notions; while one corresponds to a reflection, and the other to a process. Has been described not only as ‘modernization’, but also as ‘Europeanization’ or ‘Westernisation’, the concept of modernization refers to the process by which non-European societies acquired those characteristics which the Western Europe had underwent in political, economic, social and technological realms.¹ Referring to the time sequence and those of historical dynamics that gave birth to the origins of the modern epoch, modernity as a process antecedes that of modernization. In this context, as modernity refers to the development of individuals and social classes, modernization refers to the implementation of that socio-political change at institutional base.² While, in many uses, the modern is just a synonym for the West (or in more recent writings, the North), modernization continues to be commonly understood as a process begun and finished in Europe, from where it has been exported across ever-expanding regions of the non-West.³ The phenomenon of modernization can be described in terms of contacts with nearby or distant societies and the repercussions of these encounters on European societies.

Modernity, on the other hand, is equated a break in time, separation from earlier periods in history as it refers to a series of practices, ideas and experiences that came forward in Britain and Europe in the period when the industrial revolution altered everything from how people dressed to what they read. Emerged out of revolutions which were based on the belief in human agency in interpreting the surrounding environment, modernity is conventionally attributed to the progressive core, while change and distancing from the past constitute the fundamental

¹ Ayla Göl, “The Requirements of European International Society: Modernity and Nationalism in the Ottoman Empire,” *Working Paper Series: Australian National University. Dept. of International Relations* (2003/4), p. 22.

² Selahaddin Bakan and Fikret Bırdışlı, “The Analysis of Nationalism, Statism, State Nationalism and State Economy in Turkey’s Modernisation Process: Comparing The Nation State of Europe to the State Nationalism in Turkey,” *Süleyman Demirel University The Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, vol. 15, no.1 (2010), p. 358.

³ Timothy Mitchell, “The Stage of Modernity,” in *Questions of Modernity*, ed. Timothy Mitchell (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), p. 1.

characteristics of it. Associating modernity with a time period and with an initial geographical location, Giddens conceptualizes “modernity” referring to modes of social life or organization which emerged in Europe from about the seventeenth century onwards and which subsequently became more or less worldwide in their influence.⁴ Modernity mainly connotes to the change in socio-economic and political composition of the Western social structure within the interrelated breakthroughs in these respective realms. Hereby, depending on the power it yielded due to the intensity of the idea of enlightenment and the industrial revolution that followed it, the West determined the very definition of modernity.

It is generally agreed that the project of modernity as a social, cultural, and economic sphere has been a Western undertaking.⁵ Taking its roots from previous developments, indicating those which were prompted by the periods of Renaissance, Reform and Enlightenment, modernity signifies a process developed from historical dynamics within the specificity of the Western context. From a historical perspective, it is the process by which Europe was defined by reference to the concept and to the processes entailed from the age of the discoveries to the age of the revolutions. Enthralled with the idea of progress and development, modernity had its roots in the Age of Enlightenment based on the idea of continuous progress of people who could develop and change their society. The term modernity is therefore the broader context, which denotes the historical epoch that began in Western Europe with a series of profound socio-political transformations in the seventeenth century and reached its maturity with the age of Enlightenment and the rise of the industrial revolution.⁶

The birth of modernity involved a number of interrelated processes, such as the spread of determinist world view, rationalisation and laicisation of the thoughts, increased bureaucracy and the development of new forms of government, industrialization, change in the mode of production, significant changes in population growth and urbanization. Transition to modernity is accepted to be eventuated with four major revolutions: Scientific, Political, Cultural and

⁴ Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (California: Stanford University Press, 1990), p. 1.

⁵ B. Wittrock, “Modernity: One, None, or Many? European Origins and Modernity as a Global Condition,” *Daedalus, Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, vol.129, no.1 (2000), p. 42.

⁶ Göll, p. 22.

Industrial-Technical.⁷ Modernity has come up from the basic belief that reason of man can grasp the operation (mechanism) of nature and social order, and that the man can provide the happiness of people with the laws and rules developed by reason.⁸ While promoting the ideal of scientific inquiry, it prioritizes progress as the principle that the reason could attain. Trust in reason developed to conquer, to control and to master both the nature and human society with the explosion of machinery and the mastery of science. Based on new instruments of knowledge which gradually took shape between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries, the control of nature, did bring about a scientific model that was an essential element in European modernity. As a concept describing the common technological, political and socio-economic characteristics of an historical epoch within the Western context, modernity represents a break from tradition and is associated with progress, science and embetterment of human conditions. As Wagner puts into words, “modernity was associated with the open horizon of the future, with unending progress towards a better human condition brought about by a radically novel and unique institutional arrangement.”⁹

Modernity is understood here as a process that leads to the emergence of social and political characteristics that are described as “modern” in contrast to a past conceptualized as pre-modern from the point of view of “the ways, norms, and standards of the dominant and expanding civilization”.¹⁰ Central aspects associated with modernity are secular forms of political power exercised in a depersonalized, formalized, and rational way through the institution of the modern bureaucratic state, a monetarized exchange economy with its complex division of labor and the “discovery” of the rational individual and its freeing from traditional religious and cultural constraints that allows for increased social mobility and cultural fluidity.¹¹

For the classic founders of the discipline of sociology, Marx, Weber, and Durkheim who are all theorists of modernity, “the social changes investigated were so rapid and far-reaching

⁷ Ali Budak and Hüsamettin İnaç, “Ottoman Modernization and Literature: A New Approach towards the Transformation Process from Empire to the Nation-state,” *Ozean Journal of Applied Sciences*, vol.1, no.1 (2008), pp. 89 - 90.

⁸ Ibid., p. 89.

⁹ Peter Wagner, *Modernity as Experience and Interpretation: A New Sociology of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008), p. 1.

¹⁰ Bernard Lewis, *What Went Wrong? The Clash between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East* (New York: Harper Collins, 2002), p. 150.

¹¹ Stuart Hall, *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies* (London: Blackwell, 1996), p. 57.

that they were convinced they were witnessing the birth of a different kind of society”¹². Basically, what holds the key for these theorists in defining modernity was capitalism, rationality and the change in the functional role of solidarity, respectively. In an attempt to understand the overriding dynamic of transformation in interpreting the nature of modernity by glimpsing their underpinnings, for Marx, the emergence of modern society is tied to the change in the mode of production through the transition from feudalism to capitalism. For him, change in the relations of economy thereafter brought changes in other realms of society transforming it into a modern one.

Interested in the increasing rationalization by rules and regulations of the rising importance of bureaucratic class to implement such regulations, Weber evaluated the history of modernity as rationalisation expressed as control of human activities by capitalist bureaucratic organisations through rationalised control of information as expressed in technology. According to him, the hallmark of modernity is the advent of scientific-technical rationality that differentiates various “cultural spheres” like the market, religion, science, art etc. with the state and its bureaucracy being the rationalizing agent. Concerned with the change in the functional role of solidarity, Durkheim saw modernity as moral order largely defined by a change in patterns of social solidarity following the emergence of capitalism and hence of change in productivity and the division of labour.

All three of these classic theorists had a very critical view of capitalism and society, that the importance of economic factors in the transformation of the West was stressed in their analysis about modernity. Industrialism primarily had a significant stance in their evaluation about the nature of modern society, albeit from different perspectives in each one of them. Industrial revolution with its economic, political and social implications was among those historical breakthroughs through which the transformation into modernity was realized. Taking modernity as an umbrella term used to describe the social patterns set in motion by the Industrial Revolution that began in Western Europe in the mid-eighteenth century, the relation between the Industrial Revolution and modernity would be examined through the symbol of the development of railways in that epoch in the following part.

¹² Tony Bilton, *et al.*, *Introductory Sociology* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), p. 25.

1.2. Industrial Revolution and The Development of Railway Technology

Associated with rise of capitalism and development of the nation-state system, modern epoch was epitomized with the Industrial Revolution that inherently linked to the development of science and technology. By a tide of unprecedented technological inventions in the cotton industry, including steam power, coupled with a change in the basis of socio-economic and political conditions, the Industrial Revolution- which began in Western Europe in the mid-eighteenth century- was accompanied with the transformation from traditional to modern systems. With profound impacts on social and natural world, the origins of the Industrial Revolution traced back to the last quarter of the eighteenth century in England.

“In the last decades of the eighteenth century, the British economy was affected by the new industrialization which was associated with the increasing use of power-driven machinery.”¹³ Transformation in the coal, iron and textile industries with the development of steam power had a dramatic impact on the economy in general that “not only did industry itself begin to undergo radical change, but more and more it replaced agriculture as the most important sector of the economy, until by the mid-nineteenth century Britain had become the first industrial nation.”¹⁴ Having initiated large-scale production and thus industrial growth, technical advance namely the mechanization in manufacturing inevitably led to the growth of trade, the development of auxiliary services and the improvement in transport facilities. “The first stage of industrialization was symbolized by the combination of steam and iron, and was a process inextricable from the railways, which opened the doors to new markets over a vast area for the industrializing countries.”¹⁵ “Without the reach, speed, and capacity of the railroad, industrial enterprise would have been substantially reduced in scale and limited to local materials for production and local markets for consumption.”¹⁶ In other words, England could hardly have

¹³ Eric Hopkins, *The Rise of the Manufacturing Town: Birmingham and the Industrial Revolution* (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publications, 1998), p. 25.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Zafer Toprak, “Railways, The State and Modernity,” in *Iron Track: Age of the Train*, ed. Selahattin Özpabalıyıklar (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2003), p. 10.

¹⁶ Geoffrey L. Herrera, *Technology and International Transformation: The Railroads, the Atom Bomb, and the Politics of International Change* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006), p. 112.

reached its peak without the ready access to raw materials via the rail lines to the west and ready access to markets via these same routes.¹⁷

“Industry, trade and services all developed in mutual interdependence, the growth of any one sector both initiating and at the same time responding to growth in the other sectors in a complex system of economic relationships.”¹⁸ Thus, for example, it was no coincidence that the beginning of professional banking originated in England as was the birth of the steam locomotive. “The accumulation of capital found significant expressions in the railways, the first of which were built as private ventures.”¹⁹ Constituting an important modern development, the global banking network took shape around the railroads²⁰ as “international capital was carried to the four corners of the world by rail”²¹. The railroad was the earliest form of modern business organization; that, prior to the turn of the century, the great aggregations of capital and management were not industrial concerns for the most part, but railroads.²² While the rail industry contributed in establishing management models for other businesses, with the modern structures it developed, railroads had a profound influence on the broader community as well. Thus, rail industry served as the foundation of modern systems that were essential to the developments in socio-economic realms.

The emergence of the modern railroad must be understood within the context of English industrialization as industrialization provided both the impetus for cheaper and bigger transportation systems and the capital and expertise to build them.²³ Brought together steam engine technology, iron rail manufacture, surveying, bridge building, and machine parts and tools, the railroads were a rich combination of engineering innovations and embodied the accumulated knowledge of the Industrial Revolution.²⁴ In other words, as large and centralized concentrations of power, railroads were the symbols of the modern, large-scale organizations produced by industrialization. As “traditional accounts of the Industrial Revolution emphasize

¹⁷ Maurice P. Moffatt and Stephen G. Rich, “The Railroads in a Changing Society,” *Journal of Educational Sociology*, vol.27, no.7 (March 1954), p. 316.

¹⁸ Hopkins, pp. 26 – 27.

¹⁹ Toprak, p. 10.

²⁰ William G. Thomas, *The Iron Way: Railroads, the Civil War, and the Making of Modern America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), p. 8.

²¹ Toprak, p. 10.

²² Moffatt and Rich, p. 315.

²³ Herrera, p. 51.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

technological advance in the textile and iron industries, together with the development of steam power and railways”²⁵, if one of the symbols of the industrial revolution was to be the factory, the other was the train in reference to the importance of the improvement in transport facilities for economic growth. The reason why railway became the pioneer symbol of Industrial Revolution was due to its impact on the whole processes of traditional industry and trade sectors. In order words, “certainly it is hard to think of the Industrial Revolution without attributing great importance to the role of new machinery in the textile industry, to the new processes in the production of wrought iron, and to the widespread use of the new Boulton & Watt steam engine.”²⁶

“At once effect and cause, railway development coincided with a development of metallurgy and mining quite without precedent.”²⁷ Iron combined with steam set its mark to the first half of the nineteenth century and increasingly the production of iron and steel became the symbol of development.²⁸ Iron manufacturing and the railway each constituted a cornerstone of western technological progress. Power of steam engines made it possible not only to carry raw materials, goods, manpower to production centres with high speed, but also it eased the distribution of industrial products to the markets. Problems concerning the developing industry were solved with railway not only by providing a faster way to reach the sources, but also by establishing a feasible network.²⁹ Hence, railways in Europe had developed as industrial railways on the basis of economic development after the Industrial Revolution.

Railway technology was of great importance because its spread led eventually to the establishment of machine manufacture. The seeds for industrial development dated back to the establishment of the railway's machine manufacturing division. Machine manufacturing technology was transmitted through the individual manufacturing divisions that developed in the railway industry, and many local plants became the site for the accumulation of technology. At the same time, the railway paved the way for foundation of steel industry. The production of cheap and high quality steel gave rise to new industries such as building and ship construction,

²⁵ Hopkins, p. 173.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 25.

²⁷ John H. Clapham, *An Economic History of Modern Britain* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1959), p. 425.

²⁸ Toprak, p. 10.

²⁹ Murat Özyüksel, *Osmanlı-Alman İlişkilerinin Gelişim Sürecinde Anadolu ve Bağdat Demiryolları* (İstanbul: Arba, 1988), p. 2.

and chemical industries.³⁰ It was the needs of the rail lines that led to many of the striking steps in development of modern engineering practice.³¹

1.2.1. Development of Railways

“The nineteenth century was the century of the railway.”³² When emerged as an alternative, modern vehicle of transportation in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the birth of the steam locomotive in England initiated a new era, i.e. the railway age. “Railroads – steamships on land – revolutionized land transport in a profound way.”³³ As the industrial revolution was a transnational and competitive process, the British monopoly did not last long when a home market saturated with railroads and an overabundance of skilled engineers drove large numbers of them out of Britain in the 1820s and 1830s.³⁴ This radical change in land transport born in England, would later lead to significant transformations not only in the rest of Western Europe, but also throughout the world.

“In the first stage of capitalism, waterways took precedence, while railways belonged to the period of industrialization.”³⁵ “Until the development of the steam engine in the later eighteenth century, transport by water was the only realistic form of shipping goods in bulk.”³⁶ In those regions which had relied on existing rivers and natural features for transportation and communication before, with the advent of the rail network, railroads became the essential means to break geographic barriers. That, “preference for canals over railroads faded by 1830; largely as a result of British demonstrations of the practicality of the steam locomotive.”³⁷ Hence, some of the earliest railways were built expressly to break down a canal or “navigation” monopoly as was the aim of the Liverpool and Manchester, along whose route the waterway companies maintained a strict and illiberal alliance.³⁸

³⁰ Murat Özyüksel, *Hicaz Demiryolu* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000), p. 4.

³¹ Moffatt and Rich, p. 319.

³² İlber Ortaylı, “Haydarpaşa to Baghdad,” in *Iron Track: Age of the Train*, ed. Selahattin Özpalabıyıklar (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2003), p. 24.

³³ Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 122.

³⁴ Herrera, p. 9.

³⁵ Toprak, p. 10.

³⁶ Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, p. 119.

³⁷ Robert G. Angevine, *The Railroad and The State: War, Politics, and Technology in Nineteenth-Century America* (California: Stanford University Press, 2004), pp. 81, 83.

³⁸ Clapham, p. 396.

Use of steam power in transportation had begun first with the opening of the Stockton and Darlington Railway in 1825 which was followed by the operations on the Liverpool and Manchester Railway in 1830. “The promotions of 1836-7 had added something over a thousand miles to the potential railways of Britain.”³⁹ In the second half of the 1830s, a revolution in transport began, but the full effect of this advance on trade and industry was not to be seen until the next decade and the coming of the railway mania of 1845-6.⁴⁰ From the 1840s, the growth of the railway system quickened its pace, and by the 1850s the extent and influence of it was such that the development of the railway was seen as marking the beginning of a distinctive, modern, epoch.⁴¹ That, “by the end of 1848 a round 5000 miles of line were working in the United Kingdom, of which less than 400 were in Ireland.”⁴²

The three decades from 1830 to 1860 were a time of experimentation and rapid growth in Britain, Western Europe and the United States. Although England had a pioneer role in the development of the railway, other European countries- Germany, France, Italy- as well as the United States followed England in a short period of time in the railway competition. In 1835 the first railway line of continent of Europe was opened in Germany. France and Italy followed Germany. In 1850, the railway network lengths were 11.000 km in England, 6.000 km in Germany, 3.000 km in France, 2.000 km in Austria-Hungary and 176 km in Italy. Denmark, Sweden and Spain began to establish their railways at the end of the 1840’s.⁴³ Together with the political, financial and engineering techniques that had developed along with it, the rail network spread throughout the world from 1860s to 1914.⁴⁴ The effect was so profound, so pervasive, that those places without railroads in the nineteenth century measured time and distance by how close they were to the growing network.⁴⁵

³⁹ Clapham, p. 389.

⁴⁰ Hopkins, p. 78.

⁴¹ Ralph Harrington, “Construction and Cataclysm: The Railway in Nineteenth-century London”, p. 1. Available online at: <http://docutren.com/archivos/aranjuez/pdf/06.pdf> (17 March 2013).

⁴² Clapham, p. 391.

⁴³ Nedim A. Atilla, *İzmir Demiryolları* (İzmir: Stil Matbaacılık, 2002), p. 23.

⁴⁴ Charles Holcombe, *A History of East Asia: From the Origins of Civilization to the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge: The University Press, 2011), p. 190.

⁴⁵ Thomas, p. 3.

“Only in the 1830s did steam power begin to be used on any significant scale, and only then were larger work units becoming more common and more prominent.”⁴⁶ As an indispensable component of the industrial age, railway development went hand in hand with the leap in capitalist mode of production coupled with the relentless search for profitable investments and new markets. “The technological revolution in transportation in turn facilitated still greater upward movements in the volume of commerce.”⁴⁷ To the extent that, the main lines of the free trade programme for increasing the wealth of the kingdom by stimulating its overseas trade were laid down in the year the Liverpool and Manchester railway was opened.⁴⁸ “The opening of the railway age had coincided with a sharp rise in the outward flow, not only of goods but of men, from the United Kingdom.”⁴⁹

As an infrastructure investment by itself and a means of transportation, railway had an intricate relationship with industrialization. Involving enormous social and economic changes, industrial revolution became the benchmark for defining the level of development in societies while the railway system was already being articulated as a forerunner of modern industry. It was not until the coming of the railways in the 1830s that a speedy and punctual service became available for products; that until then, the benefits of the canal system were limited to the cheaper transport of raw materials, especially coal, rather than the transport of goods and passengers.⁵⁰ Since concentration of production and wide-scale distribution were made possible by the advent of railroads, the web of steel made closer integration of the economy as large-scale imports and exports could be moved cheaply and quickly by rail.

1.3. Railway as an Epitome of Modernity

“The railroad became one of the most obvious, and the most prevalent, forms of symbolic technology in nineteenth-century society.”⁵¹ The advent of the railway had a greater and more immediate impact than any other technological or industrial innovation before or since. The building of lines across the western landscape left in its wake economic development, population growth, modernized machinery and lifestyles, and new cultural sophistication. Railways, Max

⁴⁶ Hopkins, p. xvi.

⁴⁷ Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, p. 120.

⁴⁸ Clapham, p. 495.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 489.

⁵⁰ Hopkins, p. 30.

⁵¹ Thomas, p. 10.

Weber noted in the early twentieth century, “have been the most revolutionary instrument that history records as regards the economy, and not merely transport.”

One of the most significant developments in transportation history, railway had a crucial stance in transforming socio-economic and political landscapes wherever it reached. In the wake of the fast growth of the railways from the 1840s onwards, there came the development of modern capitalism, and the formation of modern societies and nations.⁵² Beyond the economic growth it helped to stimulate, as a technology, railways as part of the industrial age led to transformations in social order as well. Few technological developments of the period had such a great impact on the majority of the population as the railways. The railways transformed, redefined and expanded the limits of the civilized world.

Rail transport carried civilisation to places far from water, and brought dynamism to places where water transport was impossible, so consolidating countries economically.⁵³ In its first decades of development, the expanding rail system connected major urban centers and the sites of natural resources required by industrialization. Reducing transport times, lowering transport costs, consuming raw materials and stimulating investment, the age of the railway had begun with incredible impacts on economics. As the concentration of production and wide-scale distribution became possible with the advent of railways, they stimulated the closer integration of the economy. “Crops that would have rotted in the fields were carried more cheaply by rail over long distances to cities with growing populations, and industrial goods could be transported to places thousands of kilometres away.”⁵⁴ Railways made possible cheap and quick transport of large-scale imports and exports.

In the context of the great national changes in economy and society which were associated with the technological advancement, with the removal of obstacles to marketing, trade and flow of people, the process of urbanization developed together with industry, trade and technical inventions. In the modernization process of the western world in the second half of the nineteenth century, railways were celebrated as a symbol of industrial progress in the railway-building countries of Europe. Railroads redirected the natural flow of goods and capital by

⁵² T.G. Otte and Keith Neilson, *Railways and International Politics: Paths of Empire, 1848-1945* (USA: Routledge Press, 2006), p. 1.

⁵³ Toprak, p. 10.

⁵⁴ Ortaylı, “Haydarpaşa to Baghdad,” p. 24.

“forcing the commerce” through a shorter route. The railroad also encouraged the development of modern agriculture, particularly the founding of farm organizations, the spread of scientific farming, the expansion of agricultural colleges and experiment stations, and the general shift from frontier crops such as cereals and livestock to higher-value fruit and specialty crops.⁵⁵ Railways opened new markets for farmers as they were capable of transporting more goods with less jolting or cost than a horse and cart and faster so produce would not spoil.⁵⁶

They made resource extraction easier as logs and minerals could be shipped in large quantities with less difficulty. While they revolutionized the grain trade, the railroads increased land values, spurred farm acreage improvement, and concentrated urban growth.⁵⁷ With the rise of agriculture and economy along the rail lines, railroads had great contributions to transform and realign the regions. Through the transportation infrastructure of the railroad, agrarian landscapes of large, irrigated commercial farms became spatially linked to other sites of agricultural production, as well as to markets. As the population gained mobility they began to obtain some of their needs not from local markets but from the city which concluded in the simultaneous advancement of the railway and monetarism.⁵⁸ “Monetary circulation increased in volume and extent together with the railway.”⁵⁹ Similarly, railroads connected hinterlands to urban markets more efficiently while the railway corridor reoriented the spatial organization of production.

Increased urbanisation followed the construction of the railroads. The mail, newspapers and books written that the railroads delivered between cities, and the messages secreted by railroad engineers between stations, facilitated the growth and influence of a large public sphere whose members were literate in the precepts and culture of modernity. Providing new opportunities and orientations, this new mode of transportation shaped urban and rural life in a dramatic way. The geographical and the temporal extent of the inter-relationship between railways and rural development was important as expansion of rail service into rural areas, by stimulating new commerce and employment, served to hold people in revitalized rural regions.

⁵⁵ Richard J. Orsi, *Sunset Limited: The Southern Pacific Railroad and the Development of the American West, 1850-1930* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), p. xiv.

⁵⁶ Heather A. Longworth, “Tracks, Tunnels and Trestles: An Environmental History of the Construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway”, Unpublished Master Thesis, (Acadia University, Department of History, 2007), p. 44.

⁵⁷ Thomas, p. 45.

⁵⁸ Toprak, p. 13.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

At the same time, the traditional structure of both urban centres and rural land has changed due to new cultural and commercial life of the society. Much of settlement pattern was shaped by part and parcel of railroad planning. As the revolution in transportation served to link existing market towns rather than generate totally new settlement, the decision regarding the route of the railroad would therefore have significant negative implications for those towns ultimately bypassed, that the changes in commercial structure affected the forms of the cities and in almost every city to which the railway reached, the city centre moved towards station area.⁶⁰

Since “industrialisation fuelled the growth of urban centres as large numbers of people migrated from the countryside to the city in search of work”⁶¹, the easy and cheap transportation, which was provided by the railway, also enabled population movements. As a factor that strengthened the domestic market and symbolised the nation state, railways also generated employment on a large scale, both to construct and run.⁶² The industrialised cities began to expand with the workers who came from provincial areas.⁶³ Grew rapidly in most areas, railroad building provided a work site for nonfarm occupation. Railway workers were the single largest occupational group in the period and among the first workers to be employed by large-scale, corporately owned and bureaucratically managed organizations. Being one of the fastest growing industrial sectors in the second half of the 19th century, railroad work became a site for an emergence of a modern, systematized, large-scale labour force. “Trade apprentices and day labourers became workers with the arrival of the railway, and the idea of collective work developed.”⁶⁴

This situation resulted in various changes in societies; first of all, the social structure was re-organized due to new economic conditions. New working areas provided employment in masses while the labour stratification was formed. Railroads had to devise new methods for mobilizing, controlling, and apportioning capital, for operating a widely dispersed plant, and for supervising thousands of specialized workers. With the rapid expansion of the railroads, they

⁶⁰Christine A. Berkowitz, “Railroad Crossings: The Transnational World of North America, 1850-1910”, Unpublished Phd Thesis, (University of Toronto, Department of History, 2009), p. 37.

⁶¹ Bilton, *et al.*, p. 37.

⁶² Toprak, p. 11.

⁶³ For instance, the population of Manchester grew from 75.000 to 600.000 between 1801 and 1901. London reached to a size five times larger in the same period; from 1 million to 6½ million while Paris grew up to 3 million at the end of the nineteenth century.

⁶⁴ Toprak, p. 15.

began to act as catalysts for employment that a new class of workers emerged. The railroad system led to the emergence of a body of workers and managers who formed a privileged working class whose social and cultural influence spread far beyond the railroad yards, stations, and depots. The union movement began with railway workers and railways strikes were the most effective of any as they could drag the economy to a standstill in an overnight.⁶⁵

The railroad facilitated the movement of workers both directly and indirectly. It indirectly facilitated the movement of immigrants and internal migrants in search of new opportunities presented across an ever expanding industrial landscape. As an employer the railroad directed the recruitment of labour for construction and expansion into areas lacking a local source of cheap labour. In other words, the expansion of the rail network linked formerly isolated regions with larger domestic and international markets; drew immigrants and internal migrants from land poor regions toward the promise of greater opportunities; and put into motion the largest workforce in a single industry in history.⁶⁶ This was the first time that the workers were working together under the same conditions, thus the labour class movements began.⁶⁷ Widespread ideas about labour, land settlement, immigration, abolition, commercial supremacy, and the natural flows of commercial expansion became interwoven with railroad development.⁶⁸

With the new technology, architecture also witnessed changes as physical landscape was to be modified as a result of the new medium providing faster interaction between cities. New building patterns led to the changes that never experienced before in the structure of cities. The increasing use of iron was the most important contribution of the railway to architecture as it was shaking up traditional construction methods. Wood became outmoded, and iron, followed soon by steel, took over every area of production including that of modern urbanisation.⁶⁹ This new construction material made the construction of wide span spaces required by industrial production possible.⁷⁰ Industrial complexes like factories, farmeries, and docks with attendant warehouses, the architectural components of the major transportation systems – everything from tollhouses, docks and railroad stations to various kinds of bridges, viaducts, and engine houses

⁶⁵ Toprak, p. 15.

⁶⁶ Berkowitz, p. 21.

⁶⁷ Özyüksel, *Hicaz Demiryolu*, p. 3.

⁶⁸ Thomas, p. 39.

⁶⁹ Toprak, p. 10.

⁷⁰ Frampton Kenneth, *Modern Architecture: A Critical History* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), p. 32.

and that of urban scores of building types like banks, government offices, and the fashionable shopping arcades were all made possible by the wrought iron which radicalized architecture as it was integrated into the building structure of urban centres. The railway had an important role in these achievements in architecture. The solutions for many structural problems to construct the brave designs, such as bridges or viaducts were developed with the railway construction. Moreover, the concept of modern architecture arrived with railway stations which were the further evidence that the railway was the symbol of modernity.⁷¹

It also altered the relationship of time and space. “In the nineteenth century, steam and rail shortened both distance and time.”⁷² In the modern era, changing perceptions of space and place and external intrusions into local space and culture led to the weakening ties between people and the places they lived in.⁷³ Improvements in transportation and communication enabled this process. The railroad shaped a revolution in spatial and temporal relationships, ones which challenged traditional fabric of societies. Travelling from city to city became faster as had never been experienced before. Expanded people’s horizons, railway made possible to reach countries that had only been dreamed of before.⁷⁴ Accessibility of communities got easier and more comfortable. This new vehicle in transportation made distances closer in a faster and easier way than its predecessors, thus led to temporal shrinkage and altered the perception of time. In the cause of the transformation from a static to a mobile society the railway provided the perfect material backdrop as trains meant movement, a momentary image that in flashing past like a film strip were captured and engraved on the memory.⁷⁵ As a result the railroad’s time and space extensions could be found in a host of hybridizations—maps that performed a particular set of connections, tables that altered economic relations, and station platforms that provided the stages for not-so-chance encounters.⁷⁶ “In time the vicinity of railway stations became areas of public amusement with coffeehouses and teahouses from which people could watch the trains and station restaurants that were prestigious venues for people of social standing.”⁷⁷

⁷¹ Toprak, p. 13.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁷³ Carrie M. Buchanan, “A Changing Sense of Place in Canadian Daily Newspapers: 1894-2005”, Unpublished Phd Thesis, (M.J. Carleton University, School of Journalism and Communication, 2009), p. 2.

⁷⁴ Ortaylı, “Haydarpaşa to Baghdad,” p. 24.

⁷⁵ Toprak, p. 13.

⁷⁶ Thomas, p. 57

⁷⁷ Toprak, pp. 13 – 14.

Railroads in the nineteenth century constituted a major step in the building of the modern state as innovations in transportation contributed to the process of time-space convergence. As a channel to go beyond a particular and limited locality, the construction of railroads brought an increase in individual mobility and communication networks. In mid-nineteenth century, the hallmark of modernity was personal mobility which railroad offered for anyone who rode in its cars. Railways defied conventional restraints of power and speed, and, above all, they reconfigured the way people thought about their own mobility.⁷⁸ “For individuals, as for commodities, formerly narrow confines of movement were broadened, providing new scope.”⁷⁹ Mobility brought social mixing and enhanced the possibilities for equality and opportunity. Facilitation of travel through establishment of railways contributed to the popularization of travel. Few technological developments of the period had such a great impact on the majority of the population as the railways. Competed with shipping, rail transport speeded up the movement of goods and services around the world to an unprecedented level, and brought a new degree of equality to their availability.⁸⁰

As a technology deeply embedded in international and domestic political practices, railroads functioned as a transformative element of the international political system as they had effects on force, security, geography, diplomacy, and state-society relations, and the transnational process that constructed them. The economic stimulus railways carried not only had an impact on the alteration of economic organization, but also had increased the technological capability as well as transformed the structure of society, culture and politics. In countries without sufficient accumulation of capital, the state undertook railway construction that in a sense, the concept of statism or the interventionist state originated with the railways.⁸¹ As railroads vastly expanded the range, speed, and size of armies, states became much more intensively involved in their economies, and military planning extended deeper into peacetime.⁸² Railway enabled states to reach to previously unreachable distances.

Rail, together with the steamship and the telegraph, shrunk the world. “The geographic expansion of the states system in the nineteenth century is attributed to steamships, railroads, and

⁷⁸ Thomas, p. 3.

⁷⁹ Toprak, p. 10.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Herrera, p. 9.

telegraphs.”⁸³ “By linking isolated areas, railroads induced political change wherever they were laid.”⁸⁴ Railroads reconfigured the nation’s borders, geography, and commerce as they connected places, linked sub-regions, and crossed natural barriers. As Hobsbawm put into words; “Government and subject or citizen were inevitably linked by daily bonds, as never before.....revolutions in transport and communications typified the railway and the telegraph tightened and routinized the links between central authority and its remotest”.⁸⁵ Iron manufacturing, and railway industries, developed together in response to the needs for a nation-state building in several parts of the world. The development of the railways which made communication and intercourse between the people of different parts of the country possible marked an important stage in the evolution and development of national consciousness.⁸⁶

It contributed to the nation-building process as it enabled centres to control populations, binding people together via the sense of belonging to a nationalist cause and the material power of national market. The construction of railways was considered synonymous with nation building that providing the chance for cheap and quick transport, railways promoted national cohesion within a context of emerging national economies that were integrating into the capitalist world market as well as of growing military might which now had a technology enabling it to have control over the vast territories. In case of war, railroads lend increased military effectiveness to the national resources. Railroads also made possible to transport troops and munitions cheaply.

For instance, the railroad had established itself as an important form of transportation in the United States; that completed trunk lines helped to transform it from a continental to a transcontinental nation.⁸⁷ When compared to the continent, railways had greater impact in the United States as the vastly large steppes which belonged to the Indians were opened to the white people, originated from England, Ireland or Italy by means of the railway.⁸⁸ Americans in the 1840s and 1850s saw how railroads transformed business opportunities, social relationships, and

⁸³ Herrera, p. 3.

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 107.

⁸⁵ E. J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 81.

⁸⁶ Ian J. Kerr, *Engines of Change: The Railroads That Made India* (USA: Praeger Publishers, 2007), p. 122.

⁸⁷ Angevine, pp. 110, 113.

⁸⁸ Atilla, p. 24.

the physical landscape around them.⁸⁹ Performed the same function as the Central and Ocean Pacific Railroads did in the United States, the Trans-Canadian Railway, finished in 1885, and the Trans-Siberian, completed in 1903 united separate regions and made a nation possible.⁹⁰

“As a consequence of the state becoming heavily involved with railroad financing, line planning and construction, and civil–military coordination, the railroad also altered state–society relations.”⁹¹ “Railroads remained the principal feature in the social landscape of the reunited nation—the means of personal mobility, the carriers of progress and modernity, and the most prominent instruments for wealth, power, and geographic dominance.”⁹² Its potency as a military technology and its centrality in economic development were what made railway development a moment of rupture in transportation as well as in world history. That the frontiers of railway development were not ended within Europe as the continent followed the example set by England and had already started to build up railway networks starting from the 1830s. “In France, Belgium, Prussia the state in one way or another reserved its ultimate rights over the railways.”⁹³ The new vehicle was also exported to the other parts of the world within the quest for new markets via the race of imperialism. With its qualified advantages, railway became a useful instrument of imperialism as it was the physical image of the exploitation of colonies by imperial powers.⁹⁴ The role of railway in the process of imperialism was put into words as “*imperial penetration had always begun from ports, but until the coming of the railway the influence of the European powers rarely extended far inland. The railway permitted comparatively easy access to the hinterland; imperialists used railways to integrate and annex territory, and to exploit the resources of the regions surrounding the ports they controlled.*”⁹⁵

To the extent, the last quarter of the nineteenth century was the period during when the building of railways reached its peak, as often referred to as the “Golden Age” of railroad construction. More tracks were laid in this period in North America than in any other period, for instance. Tied peripheral markets to the metropole with fast and reliable transport, railroads were

⁸⁹ Thomas, p. 2.

⁹⁰ Herrera, p. 107.

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 9.

⁹² Thomas, p. 197.

⁹³ Clapham, p. 423.

⁹⁴ Köşgeroğlu, Fahrettin E., “An Approach for Conservation of Railway Heritage: Assessing and Experiencing The Izmir-Aydın Railway Line”, Unpublished Master Thesis, (Middle East Technical University, Department of Architecture in Restoration, 2005), p. 10.

⁹⁵ Anthony Coulls, *Railways as World Heritage Sites* (Paris: ICOMOS, 1999), p. 3.

a dramatic physical assertion of colonial dominion and allowed imperial powers ready and effective means of defending their colonies from internal and external threats which made them the most important tool of colonial expansion in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁹⁶ Railways were a necessary part of late nineteenth-century colonial expansion as they performed a unique and vital political function; to the extent that rail lines followed political boundaries or developed new ones, and everywhere bound colonial territories with their European patrons.⁹⁷ European powers built an extensive network of railways for the economic exploitation and strategic defence of the valuable colonies. That, the competition, which extended into World War I, was fought largely with railway lines.

With the growing economic interests, railway became the symbol of political and economic expansion. “Continent-sized states like the United States and Russia were likewise made more feasible by rail transport, as were industrial-era colonial empires that combined political control of large territories with intensive economic exploitation (such as British India).”⁹⁸ Continental network of rail lines facilitated an increased flow of people, goods and services across international borders that in turn produced an influence at a national, regional and local level; so that, the very nature of railroad operation—standardization or railroad logic—was the constant in each scenario and as a result produced a continental convergence of thought and action in the areas examined.⁹⁹

The railway constituted a prerequisite for colonization, that, the railway was an important tool in maintaining authority in colonies. Construction of the railways increased economic and politic influence and pressures on minor countries and weakened empires. Slavery, too, proceeded to expand in concert with the railroads.¹⁰⁰ As slavery was adapted into the service of this new technology, railroads became to be participated in exploitation. The modern development of slavery with railroads and the extension of railroad technologies proceeded together and in relation to one another.¹⁰¹ While new lands opened to cultivation, a new market made possible by the railroads and of slavery its logical consequence. Thus, the growth of

⁹⁶ Herrera, p. 106.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 111.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 9.

⁹⁹ Berkowitz, p. 226.

¹⁰⁰ Thomas, p. 4.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., p. 34.

railways had a dramatic impact on different parts of the world. As Herrera puts into word: *“The railroad’s effects were not confined to the European continent. They were an important factor in economic integration throughout the developing world. They played an important role in the extension of European colonialism. Railroads opened up the interiors of India, China, and Africa to economic exploitation. By providing rapid and relatively safe access to the interior, they offered an effective tool for military subjugation.”*¹⁰²

The growth of the Western powers beyond the continent with imperialist ambitions, together with the transfer of railway technology to the rest of the world contributed to the development of parallel social, economic and political conditions as people, goods and ideas now flew in a relatively faster way. If the non-Western people resisted the spread of railways, as often happened, the railway promoters knew how to apply force, just as they knew how to overcome natural obstacles with bridges and tunnels. The social implications of the railway had a profound impact on people in the periphery as the railroad system permitted a dramatic increase in local travel, local market economies, and the exchange of ideas in those places. Time savings reduced distance and effectively brought the rest of the world closer together and gave previously remote places economic and strategic significance to Europe. In terms of interaction capacity, rail lines shrank distance, extended the reach of European states, and literally expanded the size of the international system.

“The railroads and the war, more than any other forces, provided the opportunities to reimagine one’s personal mobility and the context in which to take action on that imagined extension of the body—to move through space and time.”¹⁰³ The increasing connectedness facilitated by the transfer of railway technology brought to different parts of the world imperial control of the West together with the consequences it laid down in social, economic and cultural realms. Like the telegraph, while the railroad did serve as technological agent of Western civilization, it also exposed sheltered communities to the economic realities of the outside world. As the engine of progress and prosperity, railway technology was powerful to transcend political and cultural divisions. Beyond its short-term impact on economic, political, and military purposes, the most obvious long-term effect of railroads was the extension of the European

¹⁰² Herrera, p. 51.

¹⁰³ Thomas, p. 9.

influence and the nation-state form to the periphery.¹⁰⁴ Railroads in the periphery helped emerge a new national political unit: the underdeveloped modern nation-state. As the majority embraced railroads as a progressive innovation, many sought to use railroads for the nationalist cause and to further national goals.¹⁰⁵

More often, railroads were used to absorb small states into larger European empires and bring existing colonial possessions closer to the metropole as they could knit together spheres of influence, forge subordinate alliances, and keep other European rivals out of the area where railway loans and concessions were a frequent tool of great power politics.¹⁰⁶ Rival concessions could protect desirable territory from another's grasp. Identified with industrial development, confrontation of the imperial West with the native people they colonized evolved around the question of economic and social progress. Railway as a technology connecting the East to the West had a crucial position in the discourse imperial power used to legitimize itself. Locomotives and the railway network seemed to the Western powers to furnish irrefutable proof of their material superiority and their commitment to 'civilising' and 'improving' the periphery. Accounts about railway as the vehicle of modernity were among those that the imperial project had often used within the linear understanding of historical change towards progress.

In this developmental schema, material and 'ideal' factors were inextricably linked: disparities of material or economic progress were matched with asymmetries of culture, language, and human worth. Steam not only signified to the Westerners the dynamism of their own civilisation; it also expressed the vast cultural and technological distance they saw between themselves and indigenous populations they perceived as backward and ridden by superstition. Within the correlation between industrialization and progress, contributing to the presumed hierarchy among civilizations, railway functioned as a symbol in the modernization project of the imperial rule. It was assumed railroads would encourage enterprise, multiply production, facilitate the discovery of latent resources, increase national wealth, and encourage "progress in social improvement" similar to that which occurred in Europe and the United States of America.¹⁰⁷ The British, Dutch and French had long used railroads as bearers of modernity and

¹⁰⁴ Herrera, p. 106.

¹⁰⁵ Kerr, p. 122.

¹⁰⁶ Herrera, p. 107.

¹⁰⁷ Kerr, p. 18.

economic development in their colonies as they believed that railroads not only brought civilization to the colonies, but ended their poverty and isolation as well.

As a vehicle transforming not only the physical landscape but also the social, economic and political landscapes as well, railway held a significant place in historiography of both the West and the East in terms of industrialization, modernity and nation-building. The railroads emerged as not only the leading industry of the period but also the most visible indicator of modernity.¹⁰⁸ Through the colonial railways, the economic processes, ideas and institutions of the Europe spread all over the world. This meant new production techniques, new legal arrangements and orders, new property ownership rights, new investment areas and new safety codes, the development and civilization. One of the first transformative technologies in world history, the railroad had many and diverse interfaces to its system, slowly altering how people saw themselves, their futures, and their opportunities.¹⁰⁹ Those who saw themselves as modern manipulated these new interfaces. Indeed, the control of them, and of knowledge about them, was an important and highly contested arena of modernity. As the agency that for the century past has done more than any other single one of man's inventions to transform human life, the railway transportation was seen to be burdened with civilization in the way of pushing backward people forward and lifting submerged classes.¹¹⁰ While railway was symbolizing the historical difference between the old and the new in the West, it gained new meanings in the East as part of the imperial project under the banner of modernization. In all of the rhetoric of modernization and railroad growth, there was an intense competition for resources, commercial supremacy, and expansion.

Due to its allying concordance with industrial modernity, the railway was a unique product as a materialistic enterprise that paralleled the rise of infrastructure and the accumulation of capital in an increasingly industrial world.¹¹¹ "In the countries which achieved industrialization at an early stage, railways were the symbol of economic development."¹¹² In others, however, the railway as a transforming power was associated with participation in a

¹⁰⁸ Thomas, p. 2.

¹⁰⁹ Köşgeroğlu, p. 11.

¹¹⁰ Mark Jefferson, "The Civilizing Rails," *Economic Geography*, vol.4, no.3 (July 1928), p. 217.

¹¹¹ Wayne Huang, "The Death Railway: Semblances of Modernity," p. 2. Available online at: http://www.arts.cornell.edu/knight_institute/publicationsprizes/discoveries/discoveriesspring2005/02waynehuang.pdf (27 February 2013).

¹¹² Toprak, p. 10.

“higher standard of civilization” as articulated in the imperial discourse. Economic superiority and technological advancement of the West led to conclusions about civilization as referent to the Western values which gave birth to this new vehicle that was spread to the other parts of the world through the hands of European powers as a tool to have control over those areas. Development of science and technology reinforced the power of the European states and paved the way for an ideology of progress that promoted further changes. Assuring the pre-eminence of Europe in the age of imperialisms and by setting European parameters as the dominant frames of reference, this ideology imposed its own terms upon the dialogue with non-European cultures and knowledge systems, which were thus compelled to enter with it into an asymmetric (albeit reciprocal) relationship, and their own independent development became deflected.

Within the context of the imperial race, intrusion of these powers led to the confrontation of different values as well as emergence of awareness that there was a European and it was powerful. This process not only provided the enmity but also envy to these outside powers. Developments in the Western world were viewed as part of modern progress, and this perception had important consequences for the ways they thought about their region and its growth. Within the process of “European-centred modern standardisation”, first the European-centred modern paradigm was formed within the continent itself, and then it started to spread out with the term of “civilization” which foresaw “to be like Europe” as the criteria of success and development that was to be accomplished through importing the political, social, cultural, technological and military institutions among which the railway stood as the most convenient tool of existence.¹¹³

Railed steam locomotion was embraced as a measure of a superior civilization as railroads set in motion many interconnected and progressive economical and social changes. In terms of cause and effect, railways represented an effect for most of the industrialized countries, whereas they might be perceived as a cause for the developing countries; and as such were a factor both representing and lending momentum to development and transformation.¹¹⁴ In other words, superiority in power and taking this from material sources made to think about the European civilization in a nutshell in which the technology of the time, i.e. the railway was among those which became a signifier in differentiating what belonged to European civilization

¹¹³ Bilmez B. Can, *Demiryolundan Petrole Chester Projesi, (1908-1923)* (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 2000), pp. 8, 24.

¹¹⁴ Toprak, p. 11.

and what not. The railroad's land grant, its engineering, its marketing, and its settlement plan were the clearest indicators of the emergence of modern Europe organized around geographic mobility, technological expansion, and the conquest of nature. In other words, rail technology had limitless potential in conquering distance and nature's constraints.

It was the popular vision that the railway was equated to destruction along the track to the human capacity to conquer nature with a band of steel. Indeed, nature needed to be conquered and mastered with bridges, tunnels and lines and railroad building demonstrated the mastery of geography. Locomotive enabled people to clamber over mountains and penetrate the most remote corners of the land. A symbol of man conquering nature, most saw the rail work as progress as confirming victory of man over nature. Few enterprises symbolized the mobility of the nation, and its mastery over nature, more eloquently.¹¹⁵

The terms related to "the development" were united with the technology and the railway became the most important symbol of the technology; therefore, most of the countries were willing to have railways which would bring prosperity and successful national development.¹¹⁶ Railroads were embraced as vehicles of modernity and progress referring to "the civilizing influence of steam" which would change for the better the "political, social, moral and religious condition of the millions." Considering machinery to be the "bane of civilization" led to the articulation of the isomorphic relationship between railways and civilization within the historical teleology of modernization binding railway development to progress and modernity. Taking stance from this understanding, the experience of first the Ottoman Empire and later the Turkish Republic in their evaluation of railroad development within the quest for modernization would be examined in the following chapters.

2. CHAPTER II: RAILWAYS IN THE MODERNIZATION PROCESS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

In this chapter, after a brief analysis about the Ottoman modernization history, introduction of the technology of the nineteenth century, i.e. railway into the Ottoman Empire

¹¹⁵ Thomas, p. 7.

¹¹⁶ Köşgeroğlu, p. 11.

and its development in the Ottoman lands would be examined. This would be followed by the last part in which the impact of the railways on the Ottoman modernization process would be analysed. The background about the modernization process and the railway development given in the first two parts would give an examination for the Ottoman example about the impact of the railways within the process of transformation from a pre-modern to a modern structure. Considering its role in multiple realms, railway had a significant role in this transformation. As engines of change, development of railways in the Ottoman Empire was influential to the extent that it symbolized what belonged to the Western world and thus the process of modernization.

An attempt to analyze the impact of railway development on modernization process does not mean to claim a direct causation between the two. It would definitely be wrong to assert that railways were the prerequisite for the Ottoman transformation. In other words, it is not possible to explain the Ottoman modernization process only through attributing the influence of the railway development. Rather, what is requested for in this chapter would be to analyze the role of railway development in the modernization process of the Ottoman Empire. Within the complex interaction of multiple factors influencing that process, this thesis would seek to exemplify the case at hand through examining the modernizing impact of the railway development on political, strategic and socio-economic realms bound to the consequences this development resulted into in each and every one of them.

2.1. A Brief Introduction to The Ottoman Modernization

“The Ottoman Empire was one of the most important non-Western states to survive from medieval to modern times, and played a vital role in European and global history.”¹¹⁷ Being one of those empires which achieved to exist until the nineteenth century with their traditional state of affairs and which were struggling to survive at the time when the world was changing rapidly, the House of Osman was trying to find solutions for its socio-economic and political problems. “These problems became more acute as the Ottoman Empire was progressively enveloped by the constantly expanding world economy with its centre in Western Europe.”¹¹⁸ “The loss of territory and the ultimate demise of the Ottoman Empire was not the result of

¹¹⁷ Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, p. i.

¹¹⁸ Feroz Ahmad, *The Making of Modern Turkey* (New York: Routledge, 1994), pp. 21 – 22.

external pressure alone, however, but of the interplay of that pressure with separatist nationalism developed by the non-Muslim communities of the empire.”¹¹⁹

As the political system evolved in response to both environmental change and forces deriving from within the system itself, its component units or subsystems also changed. Within the interchange of external developments and internal dynamics of the empire, while the Western world was growing in power economically at the expense of the Ottoman Empire in the international arena, they also had influence on it in terms of the new ideology, i.e. nationalism. These two challenges, nationalism and the attacks of the great powers which came from the West, ultimately were to destroy the empire of the Ottomans.¹²⁰

It was the time that developments occurred in the international arena which the Ottoman Empire could not have control over and moreover was forced to be part of them. One of these developments was the capitalist economy coupled with imperialism. “Since 1500 if not before, European economic strength had mounted to equal and then surpass that of any other region of the globe, including the Ottoman Empire.”¹²¹ During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with the increasing consolidation of military power, material wealth, and scientific progress among the European states, the Ottomans started to lose their military superiority over the West.¹²² “The Ottoman Empire built the alliance with the European states until the sixteenth century and in the turning point of the eighteenth century it noticed its backwardness in economical, political and cultural parameters and Westernization¹²³ process was initiated for sake of modernization orientations.”¹²⁴

Notwithstanding, with the developments in technology intertwined with the Industrial Revolution, the nineteenth century was a crucial turning point in the growth of European economic power. “The European industrial revolution adversely affected the Ottoman Empire in

¹¹⁹ Erik J. Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey* (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2010), p. 67.

¹²⁰ Roderic H. Davison, *Turkey: A Short History* (Huntingdon, England: Eothen Press, 1981), p. 73.

¹²¹ Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, p. 67.

¹²² Fatma M. Göçek, *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), pp. 3 – 4.

¹²³ Throughout the chapter, Westernization and modernization would be used interchangeably.

¹²⁴ İnaç, Hüsamettin, “Identity Problems of Turkey during the European Union Integration Process,” *Journal of Economic and Social Research*, vol.6, no.2 (2004), p. 39.

the nineteenth century and was instrumental in its final collapse.”¹²⁵ While the Western world gained a huge economic power, fell back of the process, the Ottoman Empire lost its economic and political power day by day. Its authority and power were declining at the very time that burgeoning technological innovation could contribute materially to modernising and reforming the Empire, and was to put additional pressures on it; that the Empire’s progress was thus effectively in the hands of the European Great Powers, and the financial advantage largely returned to them.¹²⁶

Another development which had a great effect on the Empire was the emergence of nationalism in the continent. This ideology through which the Ottoman *millets* started to quest for their independence one after another was among the prior political problem the empire would have to engage until its demise. As a result of the French Revolution, nationalism made inroads into the Ottoman lands which were an amalgam of peoples, religions, and customs with centuries of conquest and acquisition. That, “straddling three continents and encompassing an extraordinary diversity of ethnic and religious groups, the Ottoman Empire at the turn of the century was perhaps the most cosmopolitan state in the world.”¹²⁷ “The Ottoman Empire, like the other multi-national, multi-religious empires, had become an anachronism in a Europe dominated by nation states.”¹²⁸ To be sure, this was a problem shared by all contemporary poly-ethnic empires, but it was graver in the Ottoman context because of the weakness of central control, the severity of socio-economic problems, and the structural reality of an empire dominated by Muslims but well-nigh encircled by Christian powers.”¹²⁹ That, “the political potency and popularity of nationalism among the subjects of the sultan were encouraged and intensified by the direct and open support it received from powerful European states.”¹³⁰ The spread of the revolutionary ideas of nationalism to the outskirts of the Ottoman Empire put

¹²⁵ Edward C. Clark, “The Ottoman Industrial Revolution,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol.5, no.1 (January 1974), p. 65.

¹²⁶ Marian Kent, “Introduction,” in *The Great powers and the End of the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Marian Kent (London: Frank Cass, 1996), p. 1.

¹²⁷ Şükrü Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), p. 24.

¹²⁸ Feroz Ahmad, “The Late Ottoman Empire,” in *The Great Powers and the End of the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Marian Kent (London: Frank Cass, 1996), pp. 5.

¹²⁹ Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, p. 51.

¹³⁰ Mehrdad Kia, *The Ottoman Empire* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2008), p. 106.

pressure on it to take action in order to lessen and if possible to avoid the influence of this new ideology for the sake of its existence.

During the nineteenth century, “the forces triggering the territorial losses became increasingly complex, now involving domestic rebellions as well as the familiar imperial wars.”¹³¹ The internal threat posed by separatism paralleled an increase in the threat of partition from without, that Bonaparte’s invasion of Egypt in 1798 had demonstrated that a European power could conquer a major Ottoman territory—and one overwhelmingly inhabited by Muslims—with impunity.¹³² The invasion of Egypt proved once again western superiority showing that the Ottoman Empire was just as vulnerable in the south as in the north.¹³³ In order to cope with these problems, the Ottoman rulers took some steps which found meaning as engaging into the capitalist world market and initiating changes in legal and administrative issues, encapsulated in the term of reform. In order to meet the challenges of industrial capitalism and a rapidly growing nationalism, the Ottoman state and society were exposed to reform. Therefore, “between the eighteenth century and the end of the First World War, the history of the Ottoman Empire was shaped by the policies of modernization in accordance with the main purpose of preserving the Empire’s integrity.”¹³⁴

2.1.1. The Modernization Process

“When the geographical expansion of the Ottoman Empire came to an end in the seventeenth century; political and military establishment considered to introduce a set of reforms in order to prevent the further decay.”¹³⁵ Since the Ottomans were in the position of vulnerability to any attack by its neighbors as its military superiority *vis-à-vis* its European counterparts had already come to an end at the outset of this century, with its first and foremost aim of sustaining the unity of the empire, the primary importance was given to the military reforms to be able to face the threats directed to the Ottoman lands. “From the perspective of its rulers, the decreasing ability of the empire to compete militarily and economically with its continental rivals was cause

¹³¹ Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-192*, p. 54.

¹³² Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, p. 69.

¹³³ Davison, p. 72.

¹³⁴ Göl, p. 10.

¹³⁵ Ayhan Kaya and Ayşe Tecmen, “The State of the Art: Various Paths to Modernity,” *IME, Identities and Modernities in Europe, Work Package 4* (December 2009), p. 6.

for considerable alarm.”¹³⁶ That, Western military advance that resulted into a shift in the balance of power between the Ottoman Empire and the West alerted the Ottoman statesmen to observe Western military technology to be able to preserve the Ottoman geographical boundaries in the West. Derived from the features of the international power balance at the time, it explained the reason why the reforms were started in the military and the army to be the principal architect of this movement.¹³⁷

Together with the economic and administrative challenges, military weakness of the empire obliged its rulers to set reforms in order to reverse the process of decline. Accordingly, a number of reforms started to be introduced under the reign of Selim III (r. 1789–1808) who would make the most significant effort to reorganize the Ottoman military establishment. “The repeated defeats suffered by the Ottomans in the eighteenth century had convinced him of the urgent need to introduce reforms that would restore the power of the central government while preserving the territorial integrity of the empire against internal and external threats.”¹³⁸ The Sultan sought to improve the position of the army in order to recover the Ottoman power. As Europe grew in power and the international balance shifted from the Ottoman lands to the continent, the Ottoman rulers had to face the reality of the time with an intention to recover the Ottoman power by the means which had made Europe as it was at that century. In order to prevent the further territory losses, it was obvious to the Ottoman rulers that they ought to reform the army and they should do it through investigating ways of the example set by Europe.

How this came into existence was put into words by Deringil as “the nineteenth century was the epoch which saw the last efforts of dynastic *ancien régime* empires to shore up their political systems with methods often borrowed from their adversaries, the nationalist liberals.”¹³⁹ “The empire really had no choice but westernizing reform if it was to continue to exist in the modern world.”¹⁴⁰ That, neither the context the Empire was trying to stand on its own allowed the use of the old tools for the solution of the problems; nor the Ottoman Empire could manage to change its system altogether due to the lack of time and personnel. Moreover, “drastic westernization was impossible because it would have shattered society, and that therefore the

¹³⁶ Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, p. 6.

¹³⁷ Taner Timur, “Osmanlı ve Batılılaşma,” in *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 142.

¹³⁸ Kia, p. 100.

¹³⁹ Selim Deringil, “The Invention of Tradition as Public Image in the Late Ottoman Empire, 1808 to 1908,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol.35, no.1 (January 1993), p. 3.

¹⁴⁰ Davison, p. 79.

process had to be cautious and piecemeal”¹⁴¹ Thus, what the Ottoman Empire sought **was** a try to adapt its gigantic body to the changes of the time through combining the two, the old and the new. Taking the new tools for implementing them into the old system led the cultural duality wherein institutions based on western models began to emerge alongside long-established Islamic institutions. In Hanioglu’s words: “*Initial Ottoman responses to the challenges of a new era produced duality in every field: a modern, European-style army alongside a stubbornly conservative corps of Janissaries; an increasingly monetary economy together with the medieval timar system; glimmerings of fiscal responsibility yet multiple budgets; modern academies boasting libraries stuffed with French books along with Ottoman medreses whose curricula had not changed for centuries.*”¹⁴²

In earlier periods of the reforms, the will of the Ottoman rulers was to cure the ill and thus to reach the golden ages again, that “Ottoman reformers had considered principally the internal weaknesses of the empire, as the institutions of the golden age decayed, and their proposals therefore looked back toward restoration of the pristine state of those institutions”¹⁴³ With the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, what was quested for shifted to the self-preservation as the superiority of the West was accepted by the Ottoman rulers who became aware that there was no going back, but what was necessary to do was to keep the empire as possible as it was at all costs. While conservative instincts of the rulers of the empire produced only superficial changes at first, once cosmetic alteration had failed to yield substantial results, a more radical response became inescapable.¹⁴⁴ In other words, as traditional measures of reform were no longer sufficient, the empire’s leaders were better prepared to adjust to the socio-cultural milieu and to the demands of the free market economy as part of its modernization programme.

The Ottomans became aware that the reinvigoration of the Empire depended on modernization of state institutions for increasing state revenues and for bolstering the domestic and international legitimacy of Ottoman rule.¹⁴⁵ Hence, the westernization movement emerged in the Ottoman Empire when some major achievements were registered in establishing a new

¹⁴¹ Davison, p. 79.

¹⁴² Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, p. 53.

¹⁴³ Davison, p. 68.

¹⁴⁴ Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, p. 42.

¹⁴⁵ Turan Kayaoğlu, *Legal Imperialism: Sovereignty and Extraterritoriality in Japan, the Ottoman Empire, and China* (USA: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 118.

Ottoman army along European lines and in laying down the rudiments of a centralized modern administration. Selim III was prepared to accept European practices (and European advisers) to achieve his goals, his reign opened up channels of communication between Europe and the Ottoman ruling elite.¹⁴⁶ Yet, still the major westernization of Selim's reign was accordingly in the military field, that there was no consideration of such fundamentals as education, industry, or agriculture.¹⁴⁷ However, the immediate problems of the empire were to require more than an overhaul of the Ottoman armed forces to reassert military prowess in the face of foreign challenges, but of the expansion of the school system to harness science and technology, and of the establishment of some Western institutional patterns that would effect a redefinition of the Ottoman subject's place *vis-à-vis* the state and other citizens.

It was obvious that military reforms were not bound to that realm only, but to have effects on administration and legal structure of the empire¹⁴⁸; as reforms in this area later proved to be insufficient when the existing state mechanism became not to meet the needs of the century. Hence, adopted as a state policy within the limits solely to the military and technical areas, westernization inevitably moved out of these realms over the time.¹⁴⁹ “Although the original motive for the reforms was undoubtedly the desire to build an efficient European-style army, the modernisation process soon spread well beyond purely military affairs.”¹⁵⁰ In other words, “though the initial impetuses for reform were military modernization and the establishment of a state monopoly on the use of violence, the achievement of these goals required the reformers to cast the net of modernization ever more widely.”¹⁵¹ “The rebuilding of the army brought with it a need for an effective centralised monopoly of power, for the development of new skills, for more efficient extraction of surplus resources, for population censuses and land registration.”¹⁵²

¹⁴⁶ Erik J. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), p. 22.

¹⁴⁷ Davison, p. 70.

¹⁴⁸ İlber Ortaylı, “Batılılaşma Sorunu,” in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 137.

¹⁴⁹ Şerif Mardin, “Baticılık,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 247.

¹⁵⁰ Touraj Atabaki and Erik J. Zürcher, “Introduction,” in *Men of Order: Authoritarian Modernization under Atatürk and Reza Shah*, eds. Touraj Atabaki and Erik J. Zürcher (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), p. 3.

¹⁵¹ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, pp. 60 – 61.

¹⁵² Atabaki and Zürcher, p. 3.

The spread of the idea to reform which first started in the military to the other realms of the state structure found its meaning first with the institutionalization of westernization under Mahmud II who not only initiated a bureaucratic reform within the centralization efforts, but also achieved to eradicate a centuries-old formation-the Janissaries-which was lying as the main obstacle on the way of reform movement. The defeat of the janissaries eased the adoption of Western methods and institutions in his effort to form a modern and secular Ottoman state. “A staunch believer in the westernization of Ottoman political thought, culture, and institutions, he had engineered a series of reforms that culminated in the famous Tanzimat reorganization, a program that would make the empire look more like a Western nation-state.”¹⁵³ “He reorganized the state into units that emulated the French administrative model, with various ministries and departments, a new separation of executive and legislative branches of government, and a reformulation of the payment structure for members of the state.”¹⁵⁴

In the succeeding decades, increasing attention was being paid to the legal and political structures of the European states, that after Mahmud II, military reform was no longer the one overriding concern as westernization in law, administration, diplomacy, and education seemed as important. That with the declaration of the Tanzimat Edict on November 3, 1839 under the reign of Sultan Abdulmecid, reforms would be enlarged to encompass such areas of administrative, political and cultural issues. The reformers pledged to guarantee the life, honor, and property of all subjects of the sultan, as well as their equality under the law, and to establish a military system of conscription, while also reformed antiquated tax farming system by switching to a state-controlled, direct system of taxation.

“Ottoman recentralization during the first half of the nineteenth century coincided with the beginnings of administrative modernization.”¹⁵⁵ The political centralisation and social modernisation undertaken by the Ottoman administration under the Tanzimat reforms made the provincial centres of the Empire to experience modernisation in the second half of the nineteenth century. The Ottoman bureaucratic elite introduced drastic political measures that they hoped

¹⁵³ Karen Barkey, *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 3.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 268.

¹⁵⁵ Çağlar Keyder, “The Ottoman Empire,” in *After Empire: Multiethnic Societies and Nation-Building: The Soviet Union and the Russian, Ottoman, and Habsburg Empires*, eds. Karen Barkey and Mark von Hagen (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1997), p. 32.

would centralize and streamline the administration, unite disparate elements of the multi-religious, multi-ethnic society, and thus preserve the empire through the Tanzimat reform program.¹⁵⁶ The nineteenth-century state strove to bring all Ottoman subjects directly under its authority; that in a series of three enactments between 1829 and 1856, seeking to radically transform the relationship between itself and its subjects and within and among the subject classes, the central state aimed to strip away the differences among Ottoman subjects which was nothing less than a program to radically reconstitute the nature of the state-society relation. Through the clothing law of 1829 followed by the imperial decrees of 1839 and 1856, “modern” notions of equality of subject and citizen were introduced into the Ottoman state as the state’s duty to provide equality of all subjects were reiterated.¹⁵⁷ “In this regard, the Tanzimat epoch exemplified a general inclination toward a more secular conception of the state.”¹⁵⁸ Despite the partial success of these attempts at standardization and rationalization in the mode of imperial relations, reforms set out during the Tanzimat era still led to the state-society reorganization.

The spread of reforms from the military realm was not limited to politico-administrative, that the economic modernization of the Ottoman Empire started in the same period. Ottoman economic modernisation and European expansion were intertwined developments within the framework of socio-economic changes. “The nineteenth century saw European involvement in developing virtually every aspect of the economy—communications, transport, services, factories and mines, and trade—while by the early twentieth century the Empire’s three main creditor European Powers, France, Germany and Britain, supplied advisers to the Ottoman government over a very wide range of its activities.”¹⁵⁹ Abrupt changes in the economic sphere came with the introduction of free-trade regime into the Ottoman lands via some successive agreements which made the Ottoman economy an open market for the Western industry and thus provided the integration of the Ottoman Empire into the world economy. “This process was facilitated by the construction of ports and railroads and by the establishment of modern banking institutions, mostly by European capital.”¹⁶⁰ “Nineteenth century state actions in favor of free

¹⁵⁶ Renée Worringer, “Sick Man of Europe” or “Japan of the Near East”?: Constructing Ottoman Modernity in the Hamidian and Young Turk Eras,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 36, no. 2 (2004), p. 209.

¹⁵⁷ Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, p. 66.

¹⁵⁸ Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, p. 74.

¹⁵⁹ Kent, p. 2.

¹⁶⁰ Şevket Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 205.

trade include the 1826 destruction of the Janissary protectors of monopoly and restriction, the 1838 Anglo-Turkish Convention, and the two imperial reform decrees of 1839 and 1856.”¹⁶¹ Following the two simultaneous development in the Ottoman Empire, that of Balta Limani Treaty (1838) and the Tanzimat Edict (1839), the empire became an open market for the Western world where the capitalist mode of production had already gained a momentum as agriculture became commercialized. “Indeed, by the end of the nineteenth century, Western economic dominance in the Ottoman empire had branched into the spheres of commerce, finance, production, and infrastructural construction.”¹⁶² With these developments, the empire faced a sudden integration with the premature Western capitalism.

“Perhaps even more indicative of the empire’s tumble than the Western inspired political and social reorganization upon which the Ottoman government embarked especially after 1839, was the Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Convention of 1838.”¹⁶³ “When the Ottoman Empire signed the treaty of Balta Limani with England in 1838, Mahmud II and his elites had taken a number of measures strengthening state structures that once again made the empire resemble its Western counterparts to a much greater extent than both sides would have liked to believe.”¹⁶⁴ With the intention to destroy existing social and economic structures in order to make way for new ones, The Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Convention of August 1838 was perhaps the first conscious step taken by the reformers who believed that the destruction of outmoded structures would accelerate westernisation and force Ottomans to innovate.¹⁶⁵ Making considerable changes in the commercial practice within the Ottoman Empire, this convention played a key role in the socio-economic structure on the one hand, while it also led to developments in the area of legal reforms as increasing number of transactions necessitated adjustments to the European commercial codes. That, for instance, “a new commercial code, copied from France,

¹⁶¹ Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, p. 127.

¹⁶² Fatma M. Göçek, *Rise of the Bourgeoisie, Demise of Empire: Ottoman Westernization and Social Change* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 112.

¹⁶³ Daniel Goffman, *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 234.

¹⁶⁴ Christoph K. Neumann, “Political and Diplomatic Development,” in *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 61.

¹⁶⁵ Ahmad, *The Making of Modern Turkey*, p. 27.

was introduced in 1850, followed in 1863 by a maritime trade code and in 1867 by a law enabling foreigners to own land in the empire for the first time.”¹⁶⁶

The Ottoman Empire tried to fill the gap in the legal field which appeared as a result of integration to the world economy by importing Western codes on the one hand while endeavouring to revise the traditional legal norms on the other. Legal reforms undertaken from the mid-1800s indeed constituted the basis of the Ottoman modernization process as “the nineteenth-century reformist bureaucrats recognized extensive legal reforms as essential components of modernization.”¹⁶⁷ These reforms announced by the bureaucratic elite of the time constituted a revolutionary change in the legal system. Started with the Tanzimat Edict, and continued with many codification projects and that of 1856 Imperial Edict, the effect of attempts in the legal realm remained influential in the overall modernization history of the Ottoman Empire. Since 1856 when the Empire was included in the Concert of Europe and the European state system, it pursued an implementation of strong and coherent policies towards a permanent, insisting and ultimate aim of being European. In line with this aim, the most famous monument of the Ottoman legal modernization process, the Majalla (Mecelle) was issued between 1869 and 1876. As a complementary in legal and political aspects, a fundamental step was taken with the promulgation of the constitution in 1876. Though suspended after a short period of time, the constitution was the basis for far the most important steps initiated in the Ottoman politics by the Ottoman elites in the way to a constitutional monarchy.

To be modern in the nineteenth century was a way of thinking and acting in the world. Notwithstanding, the nineteenth century was not the epoch when only economic, legal and political reforms were undertaken in the Ottoman Empire. “The Ottoman reform movement, which drew upon French legal codes and fiscal regulations, opened the Ottoman market to European materials and techniques of production, and welcomed European advances in the sciences.”¹⁶⁸ In addition to the developments in those areas, there were drastic changes in the social and cultural life as well. Changes in economic, legal and political fields inevitably had reflections in the Ottoman socio-cultural structure. Within the functioning of the social fabric, a change in one area was reciprocally affecting the other fields. While opening of the Ottoman

¹⁶⁶ Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, p. 61.

¹⁶⁷ Kayaoğlu, pp. 118 – 119.

¹⁶⁸ Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, p. 34.

economy to the West brought the necessity for adoption of new codes, legal reforms led to changes in the function of the Ottoman administration. The more the Empire got integrated to the norms and values of the continent, the more it needed to take further steps to deepen this relationship. That for instance, while, on the one hand, nationalist outcries of the *millet*s led to the shift in orientation from religious to secular understanding of state administration, on the other hand, technology transfer necessitated the change in the education system according to the Western science.

“Western influences, at first scientific and linguistic, came with the new technical schools which Mahmud founded.”¹⁶⁹ During his reign, state educational activities were extended to the civilian population and a ‘translation office’ (*terceme odası*) was founded in 1822 which served as one of the main channels through which political knowledge was appropriated by a new group of French-speaking Muslim bureaucrats.¹⁷⁰ This group who had received their education and training at the translation bureau, followed by service at Ottoman embassies in European capitals would dominate the Tanzimat era. “Reform progressed at an accelerated pace in the period of the Tanzimat (1839-1876), when a Ministry of Education was established (1857), and a system of non-military schools began to emerge”¹⁷¹, while “the exposure to European ideas, values, and customs intensified with the establishment of permanent Ottoman legations to European capitals.”¹⁷² With the growing interaction with the West, intellectuals not only influenced the system through importing western type of thinking and style into the empire, but also had been affected by modernization as it eventually became inevitable in determining relations between state and society as well as between different groups among the society. More than the military and fiscal reforms, this change in thought signified the growing Ottoman engagement with modernity.¹⁷³

Under Abdulhamid II (1876-1909), the West continued to be a model and the empire became further integrated into the world political and economic system. Indeed, the period in which the western ideas were began to thoroughly understood was the period of Sultan

¹⁶⁹ Davison, p. 75.

¹⁷⁰ Neumann, p. 61.

¹⁷¹ Michael Winter, “The Modernization of Education in Kemalist Turkey,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), p. 183.

¹⁷² Kia, p. 101.

¹⁷³ Carter V. Findley, “Political Culture and the Great Households,” in *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, ed. Suraiya N. Faruqi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 79 – 80.

Abdulhamid II, not only because of the increase in the number of individuals who took education in the newly established schools and knew foreign languages, but also of the attitude of the Sultan himself who took the west as a model in his course of conduct to a certain extent.¹⁷⁴ In general, this period under Sultan Abdulhamid II was accepted as the one when the Ottoman Empire understood the importance of modernization in depth and accordingly took realistic steps especially in the fields of education, science and techniques. “He openly advocated the adoption of science and technology; in fact, he speeded up educational reform.”¹⁷⁵ Thus, it was no coincidence that new schools in various branches were opened during this period. The sultan sponsored the opening of many schools through which higher training and technical education was emphasized as Darulfünun, the first modern university in the Muslim world, was opened in Istanbul in 1900.¹⁷⁶ While many students were sent to European countries, the Western curriculum was put into application in the education system where military and technical schools took precedence. Through this way, during the reign of Abdulhamid II, importance was given to those fields which formed the basis of modernization such as education in order to head policy of a gradual change in the society. Educational reforms undertaken during this period had a considerable impact on the social infrastructure.

These reforms initiated in the field of education influenced the dynamics of modernization in the period following the reign of Sultan Abdulhamid II. Notwithstanding the religious-Islamic garb clothing them, Abdulhamid's schools led to the emergence of a new brand of rational, pragmatic, and individualistic elite, whose mental attitude and world philosophy began to resemble that of Europe.¹⁷⁷ He introduced a number of important educational and cultural reforms which transformed the Ottoman Empire and laid the foundation for a group of government officials to push a far more ambitious program of reforms in the following years.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁴ Mardin, “Baticılık,” pp. 247 – 248.

¹⁷⁵ Kemal H. Karpat, *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays* (Boston: Brill, 2002), p. 512.

¹⁷⁶ Winter, p. 184.

¹⁷⁷ Karpat, *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 513.

¹⁷⁸ It is now generally recognized that the long reign of Abdulhamid II (1876–1909) in many ways laid the foundations of what became modern Turkey. This is true in the fields of education, administration (with the expansion of the state bureaucracy and the extension of state control), and communications (telegraph and railways). It can be argued that it is also true where the management of religion is concerned. For more information, see Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 274.

Indeed, it was during the reign of Abdulhamid that a new and Western-educated officer corps emerged, who would play an important role in deposing the sultan in April 1909, ironically.¹⁷⁹

As a result of the developments in science and techniques, a movement led by intellectuals who took education both inside and outside of the Empire in a wide range of fields from literature to politics brought together the second constitutional era to the Ottoman politics. That, after a pause of 30 years, in 1908 parliament was formed under the constitutional monarchical regime. After the dethronement of Abdulhamid II in 1909, the growing intellectual impact on the Ottoman politics appeared as the Young Turks with their party the Union and Progress. “The Young Turk Revolution was to provide another twist to reform and centralization, a result of pressure from increasing internal and international conflict.”¹⁸⁰ The reforms introduced in this era had the underlying commitment of the CUP to abandon the old institutions and replace them with new structures that were borrowed from various European countries. Recognition of the West identical with that of being strong continued in the conception of the Union and Progress Party which had the dominance in the political organization during the Second Constitutional era.¹⁸¹ Young Turks, all of whom were preoccupied with finding a way to save the Ottoman state, came to believe that Westernization was the only way to achieve material progress and political strength.¹⁸²

Although the public program of the CUP had called for equal rights for all the many religious, ethnic, and linguistic groups that resided within the empire, once in power the CUP showed the dark side of its nationalism by asserting instead the hegemony of Turkish-speaking Moslems over all others.¹⁸³ Even though the party could not get the strings into its own hands until the end of the Balkan Wars in 1913, they were still influential in Ottoman politics not only for the remaining years of the Ottoman Empire but also for the dynamics of the new regime which would be built as a successor state on the Anatolian land. Following its acquisition of power, with the aim to modernize, westernize, and secularize Ottoman society, the party pressed ahead with a reform program which required the strengthening provincial governments, reducing

¹⁷⁹ Kia, p. 125.

¹⁸⁰ Barkey, pp. 267 – 268.

¹⁸¹ Mardin, “Baticılık,” p. 249.

¹⁸² Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 147.

¹⁸³ David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All Peace: Creating the Modern Middle East, 1914-1922* (New York: H. Holt, 1989), pp. 47 – 48.

the rights of minorities, reforming the tax system, improving education and the legal system, and requiring all citizens to speak Ottoman Turkish.¹⁸⁴

Among the series of reforms the Young Turks launched, education had a considerable stance as had been during the previous period. Curricula were improved in the schools from where a generation of educated individuals- who not only put the West on a par with its positive science, but also embraced the Western civilization as a source of strength-were brought up.¹⁸⁵ They believed that behind the power of Europe, laid the engine of science, and it could be transferred to the Ottoman Empire to revive the Ottoman strength. In addition to attempting to extend Istanbul's control over the provinces (which included draconian measures against the press, trade unions, tribes, and 'vagrants'), the imperial bureaucracy renewed its commitment to education as a means to 'enlighten' and mould the population.¹⁸⁶ The reforms founded their own need for modern educational establishments and a market for their graduates, so that, the Ottomans established professional colleges to turn out engineers and architects, (military) doctors and veterinaries, accountants and administrators.¹⁸⁷

"The Young Turks intended to transform the empire into a politically and economically independent, modern country by removing foreign control and cultivating a citizenry that would be loyal to the state."¹⁸⁸ Ideas of parliamentary government and of secular rationalism contributed to the nineteenth- century discourse on how to become "modern" in the empire. Reforms of the Union and Progress government which would even continue during the years of the First World War would form the basis of the radical change that would find its meaning with the foundation of a new regime rose from the ashes of the Ottoman Empire in 1923. The process began with the influence of the French Revolution on the intellectuals of the Ottoman Empire

¹⁸⁴ Jonathan S. McMurray, *Distant Ties: Germany, the Ottoman Empire, and the Construction of the Baghdad Railway* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2001), p. 96.

¹⁸⁵ Mardin, "Baticılık," p. 248.

¹⁸⁶ Ryan Gingeras, *Sorrowful Shores: Violence, Ethnicity, and the End of the Ottoman Empire, 1912-1923* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 15.

¹⁸⁷ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 61.

¹⁸⁸ Mustafa Aksakal, *The Ottoman Road to War in 1914: The Ottoman Empire and the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 14.

and that of Young Turk movement prepared the ground for the Turkish Republic founded with a revolution.¹⁸⁹

Becoming the dominant ideology of the Turkish Republic after 1923, together with the ideas of secularism and reformism, Turkish nationalism acquired its modern content during the Young Turk period.¹⁹⁰ Although steps taken within the reform program in order to save the Ottoman Empire from dissolution and dismemberment in the First World War proved futile, they would continue to shape the region as it entered the era of nation-states in the twentieth century and beyond. Though the Ottoman Turks tried till the very end to reform and struggle for survival, ultimately they were forced to accept the inevitable; to abandon the idea of empire and settle for a national republic.¹⁹¹ Despite their best efforts to focus on reforms, serious challenges from both internal rebellions and foreign aggression ultimately resulted in the disintegration of the empire.

2.2. A General History of The Ottoman Railway Development

As the vehicle of the nineteenth century, railway symbolized the modern not only for the continent that gave birth to it, but also for those areas where it reached mainly via imperial ambitions. The Ottoman Empire's experience with railroads reflected that state's less developed but nevertheless politically independent status, placing it somewhere between industrial West and exploited European imperial possessions.¹⁹² The Ottoman Empire was one those areas which found itself to face the situation of the time grudgingly. The empire was in shambles in military and economic terms from the beginning of the eighteenth century when its weakness was proven with successive defeats it had taken in various frontiers. Its former stance among the powers of the continent was demolishing as Russia, England and France were gaining power at the expense of it.

¹⁸⁹ If we want to understand the Kemalists and their policies, we must take a step back and look at their shared past, in other words at the final years of the Ottoman Empire. That period shaped the future leaders of the republic as well as the country they tried to reshape. Both the material circumstances and the ideological toolkit available to the Kemalists were products of the constitutional period after 1908 and the decade of war between 1912 and 1922. For more information, see Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 136.

¹⁹⁰ Karpas, *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 830.

¹⁹¹ Ahmad, "The Late Ottoman Empire," p. 5.

¹⁹² Donald Quataert, "Limited Revolution: The Impact of the Anatolian Railway on Turkish Transportation and the Provisioning of Istanbul, 1890-1908," *The Business History Review*, vol. 51, no.2 (Summer 1997), p. 142.

The signals of deterioration within the empire was first felt in the structure of the army which now started to take defeats against those powers that once were beaten. As an *ancien régime* empire whose maintenance was built on the incessant growth through the conquest of new lands, the functioning of the Ottoman Empire as a structure began to show weaknesses when the conquests halted and the empire started to take its first defeats. As the ability of war-making was shattered, the first field in the state structure to initiate reforms was that of military while the way the Ottoman rulers turned their face to be the West whose superiority in power at least in military realm, if not the all, was now accepted and taken as an example to follow in order to gain a respectful status among the powers of the time again and most importantly, through this way, to preserve the empire intact.

The political relations had been transformed by the railways built by the Western powers not only in colonies but also in countries and weakened empires like China and the Ottoman Empire. Began with the introduction of the postal system (1834), telegraph (1855-64), and railways (1866), chiefly as the result of the government's efforts to communicate with its field representatives and rapidly transport its troops, communication came to play a crucial part in the process of transformation.¹⁹³ Among those means, railways had a crucial stance in transformation of both the Ottoman state and society. In a world that was rapidly taking shape around aggressive nation- states whose borders were becoming ever more sharply defined, Ottoman statesmen saw themselves modernizing their society with railroads. Started in 1856 with a concession given to a British company, railway construction in the Ottoman lands reached 5883 kilometre until 1908, and 6309 till 1914.¹⁹⁴

Ottoman Empire had to give special rights to the countries who constructed the railways in the Ottoman land and this became a determinant factor both in economic and political relations between the imperial powers. Within the rivalry of the European powers for their struggle in carving out the Ottoman land into regions of penetration, each power had been effective in certain areas they chose in line with their interests. Britain, France and Germany all battled for influence. For each, railroads were an important means of penetration. This led to an

¹⁹³ Karpat, *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 50.

¹⁹⁴ For information about the Ottoman railway history that was arranged in chronological order, see Ali Satan, "Osmanlı Devri Demiryolu Kronolojisi," in *Osmanlı'da Ulaşım: Kara, Deniz, Demiryolu*, eds. Vahdettin Engin *et al.* (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2012), pp. 309 - 340.

underdeveloped railway network in the Ottoman Empire, but not without pattern as it mapped onto the spheres of influence of the foreign powers. As a result, with the development of the rail lines, the Ottoman territory through which railroads crossed over was exposed to the separation as zones of influence among Britain, France and Germany.¹⁹⁵

The first lines connected major commercial points. In almost all cases the financing was of foreign origin and control remained in foreign hands. The dominance of foreign finance and ownership made Ottoman attempts to forge something like a national network impossible. Instead, the patchwork of lines tended to reinforce the positions of influence enjoyed by foreigners while it integrated the Ottoman Empire into the global economic system. The partition of the Ottoman Empire by railroad rights had security implications as well. The Ottoman experience replicated on a smaller and more fragmented scale the pattern of railway development and European expansion in the periphery. While England was mainly dominant in western Anatolia and Germany in central Anatolia and the Adana region, France was active in western Greece, in some parts of the western Anatolia and in Syria.¹⁹⁶ Mostly built by the foreign capital due to the financial difficulties and limited technical capacity, the construction of the Ottoman railways were realized heavily by the British capital in the beginning, while in the later periods, French and German capital outweighed it.

2.2.1. The Period between 1830 and 1856

It was during this time, that of reform movement in the Empire was spreading to realms beyond the army and thus of intensity of the relations with the West was increasing, when the Ottoman state first met with the technology of the nineteenth century, i.e. the railway. As the relations between the Ottoman Empire and the West were gaining momentum increasingly especially after the establishment of permanent embassies in various Western countries which was backed by sending students abroad, the empire had the chance to follow the developments in the Western world closely. Railway as the technology of the time became to be known among the Ottoman rulers almost at the same time with that of the Western powers of the continent. “The first railway project was probably considered as early as 1836, at about the same time that

¹⁹⁵ Niyazi Berkes, *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma* (İstanbul: Doğu-Batı Yayınları, 1978), p. 357.

¹⁹⁶ Muhteşem Kaynak, “Osmanlı Ekonomisinin Dünya Ekonomisine Eklemlenme Sürecinde Osmanlı Demiryollarına Bir Bakış,” *Yapıt, Toplumsal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, no.5 (1984), p. 72.

railway development was beginning in the United States.”¹⁹⁷ The Porte was aware of the technology in question and willing to adopt it. Impressed by the economic future promised by the railroads, the Ottoman statesmen underlined the importance of railways as agents which would connect the agrarian areas to the sea by cutting across the most fertile provinces and thus develop the sources of wealth.¹⁹⁸ At the time, for instance, held various pictures of Liverpool-Manchester train in his room, Abdülmecid always mentioned his willingness for such trains operating in his country.¹⁹⁹

Although accelerated with the quest of England for new markets, the process that the Ottoman Empire met with the railway technology was lagged until the mid-nineteenth century even though it was well known for more than a decade. Due to the outbreak of the Crimean War, construction of railways on the Ottoman lands could not be realized in time when it had been planned. Britain, as a state which to be the first that accomplished industrialization, leaned towards the continent in search for raw materials for its factories and for markets to sell its products. Yet, the demands of Britain were not met in the continent which closed its frontiers for international trade with high tariff barriers in order to protect the development of their own industries. On the other hand, during the nineteenth century, when the West was undergoing its Industrial Revolution, the Ottoman Empire had followed a relatively open-door, free-trade policy which had finally brought about the foreign takeover of the economy, leading the country to economic ruin and bankruptcy.²⁰⁰ Consequently, Britain had to turn its face to the Ottoman lands as the Ottoman Empire as itself and as a corridor on the way to Basra and India, had a precious position in the British imperial ambitions as by June 1830, Britain was searching for alternative routes that would shorten the way to India.

“Britain did not fully awaken to the importance of the Ottoman Empire’s geographical, political and economic position in Europe until 1838 when Russia threatened England’s position in the Near East by signing with Turkey the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi.”²⁰¹ It was only five years

¹⁹⁷ Yaqub N. Karkar, *Railway Development in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-1914* (New York: Vantage Press, 1972), p. 12.

¹⁹⁸ Donald Quataert, “Transportation,” in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1600-1914*, eds. Halil Inalcık and Donald Quataert (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 805.

¹⁹⁹ Vahdettin Engin, *Rumeli Demiryolları* (İstanbul: Eren, 1993), pp. 37 – 38.

²⁰⁰ Mehmet Özey, “Turkey in Crisis: Some Contradictions in the Kemalist Development Strategy,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol.15, no.1 (February 1983), p. 54.

²⁰¹ Karkar, p. 26.

later after the Russo-Ottoman agreement that Britain achieved to sign a favourable treaty with the Ottoman Empire. 1838 Balta Limanı Treaty (convention) was not only balancing the Russian power on the Ottoman lands and thus strengthening the position of Britain in Ottoman politics, but also guaranteeing the British interests in economic realm as it gained a number of concessions which would invigorate the British imperial vision. “On each occasion, Mahmud II and his successor, Abdulmecid (r. 1839–61), conceded more of Ottoman sovereignty to international claims, most notably in the treaty of Balta Limanı, when the British acquired free trading rights in all Ottoman territories.”²⁰² Under the circumstances of its military weakness, the Ottoman Empire had to sign this treaty with Britain in order to guarantee its military support against the ongoing Egyptian threat.

Among the principal causes for the collapse of the Ottoman economy in the nineteenth century, the treaty which confirmed British capitulatory privileges and opened the Ottoman markets to British investment and trade was signed by the sultan who was determined to secure the support of Great Britain in a campaign to destroy Mehmed Ali and by the British prime minister, Palmerston who used this opportunity to expand British economic and commercial interests in the region.²⁰³ As was the case from the British side, for the Ottomans, too, the conjuncture of the time propelled the empire to act in favour of the British state. In order to realize its ambitions, Britain which felt threatened against the growing Russian power on the Ottoman state when the two came to an agreement after the Russian support to the Ottomans against the Mehmed Ali Pasha of Egypt, did not wait long to take an action.

As the Empire had neither the resources nor the ability to develop its own economic potential, participation in development concessions was among the main sources of European economic penetration in the Ottoman Empire. In the midst of the Egyptian dispute, in order to ensure the territorial integrity of the empire, the Ottoman rulers gave concessions to Britain in commercial affairs that with the treaty Ottoman lands became open to increased British imports. Although the Egyptian problem was solved through this way, these economic concessions resulted into unfavourable consequences for the Ottoman Empire in regard with the fact that

²⁰²Virginia Aksan, “War and Peace,” in *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 113.

²⁰³ Kia, p. 112.

within the same year, after Britain, France and between 1839 and 1846 other European states had the right to enjoy these concessions.²⁰⁴

“The eastward flow of European goods grew rapidly in the years following the end of the Napoleonic era in 1815, and Ottoman lands soon became important markets for many European manufacturers.”²⁰⁵ Detrimental to Ottoman producers, who could not be able to compete with the growing mechanization in the industrial sector of the Western world, the economy of the empire became integrated into the capitalist system as its main items in export had become raw materials and agricultural food products and in import those of manufactured and consumer goods. Trade, especially exports of agricultural products, had already grown faster since the early 1820s as the industrial revolution in England led to a fall in the prices of industrial goods and thus to more favourable terms of trade for exporters of agricultural goods to industrializing nations.²⁰⁶ Notwithstanding, 1838 convention, with lowered tariffs and the abolition of restrictions on trade, the Ottoman market completely opened up to British trade, progressing the incorporation of the Ottoman economy into the capitalist system faster than before. “The Ottoman authorities hoped that the benefits of increased trade and production would compensate for the losses stemming from the abolition of the monopolies and the lower tariffs.”²⁰⁷

In the age of Tanzimat, as the Ottoman central government adopted the European model and the role and responsibilities of the state expanded significantly, for the first time, the government had declared itself responsible for building a modern economic infrastructure and providing basic social and economic services ranging from the building of new schools to constructing roads and railways, which would connect various urban and rural communities of the empire, stimulate cross regional commerce, and develop a more integrated economic system.²⁰⁸ Beyond this auxiliary effect on the judicial reform process of the Ottoman Empire both as a commercial code and in a more comprehensive form as the declaration of the Tanzimat Edict, accelerating the integration of the Ottoman economy into the capitalist system, the 1838 Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Convention had a considerable impact on the transformation of the socio-economic fabric of the Ottoman Empire.

²⁰⁴ Engin, pp. 32 – 33.

²⁰⁵ Clark, p. 65.

²⁰⁶ Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, p. 47.

²⁰⁷ Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, p. 70.

²⁰⁸ Kia, p. 116.

“Meanwhile, new railways and steamships opened the interior to trade and extraction, as parts of the empire started to industrialize.”²⁰⁹ As the bearer of the industrial development and thus the increase in transnational trade, railway technology made a way into the Ottoman lands during this process of economic incorporation into the capitalist system via the 1838 convention and other similar free-trade treaties signed with several Western states. As noted, the Ottoman rulers were following closely the developments including technological advancements the Western world was undergoing at the time. That the plan to construct railways was neither the outcome of a simple and impulsive decision, nor even a development of that year alone; rather it had been developing in the minds of those concerned for many years.²¹⁰

Ottoman integration to the Western economies through various commercial treaties quickened the pace for the introduction of railways to the Ottoman lands as Western states found favourable conditions for furthering their commercial activities through gaining concessions for railway construction. Railways would connect the countryside where raw agricultural products were grown to the Ottoman ports from where these goods were shipped to the Western industry. Adversely, manufactured goods imported from the continent would be easily and quickly delivered to the interior from the ports again via the railroads. “After all, before the advent of steamships and railroads it was not a realistic proposition to import consumer goods for ordinary people.”²¹¹ Therefore, transportation facilities, railway construction in the nineteenth century, were an inalienable component of a system built on the search for cheap raw materials and accessible markets to sell its products. That, “the construction of railways provided the first stepping stone in a series of designs for a larger economic penetration.”²¹²

Taking into consideration the situation of the Ottoman transportation at the time, which was mostly dependent upon the beasts of burden, the need for a cheap and a faster way to transport was an urgent problem lying in front of the foreign traders who wished to gain more. Referring to its significance, the interest in constructing railways in the Ottoman Empire dates back to the 1830’s, when British Captain Chesney explored the possibility of building a line of

²⁰⁹ Sam White, *The Climate of Rebellion in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 296 – 297.

²¹⁰ Karkar, p. 12.

²¹¹ Suraiya N. Faroqhi, “Introduction,” in *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 6.

²¹² Karkar, p. 90.

communication joining the Syrian coast with the Euphrates and finally ending on the Persian Gulf.²¹³ With the opening of the Suez Canal, British abandoned the idea to construct this railroad.²¹⁴ Failed though, this attempt shows how the Ottoman lands were envisaged as part of those areas potential into the future plans of the British state. That, within the reciprocity of interests as much as the Ottoman rulers were following the up-to-date developments of the Western world, the continent had involved into the Ottoman politics through various means which could be a technology transfer as in the introduction of railways into the Ottoman lands.

This situation clarified the reason why the first state which took concessions for railway construction happened to be Britain. Excluding Chesney's failed project in the 1830s, despite the special attention given by the Ottoman reformers, the first railway construction would wait until 1851. Driven by incentives for colonization, a concession for a line that would connect Alexandria to Cairo was given to Britain. The construction began in 1851 and after three years, the line started to operate.²¹⁵ This line was the first rail line that was constructed within the borders of the Ottoman Empire was the line between Alexandria and Cairo, which had a strategic and economic importance during the years it was built until 1869 when it would lose its stance with the opening of the Suez Canal.²¹⁶

In the year 1856, another initiative for railway construction in the Ottoman lands would be taken by a British company which gained concession for the first railway line that would be constructed in Anatolia between İzmir and Aydın. With the purpose of establishing economic and political sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire similar to what they did in India, the first railway in Anatolia, Izmir-Aydın line, had an importance as it reflected the railway policy of British imperialism.²¹⁷ Under the privilege granted to this company, the construction of the 130 km line was completed in 1866. As the traditional protector of the Porte against Napoleonic and then Russian encroachment, Great Britain had first made the running in Ottoman rail construction, building the lines from Smyrna (Izmir) on the Aegean Sea inland to Kasaba in the

²¹³ Karkar, p. 64.

²¹⁴ Aron D. Novichev, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Yarı-Sömürgeleşmesi* (Ankara: Onur Yayınları, 1979), pp. 14 - 15.

²¹⁵ Kaynak, p. 68.

²¹⁶ Engin, p. 37.

²¹⁷ Jacques Thobie, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Yabancı Sermaye", in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 3 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 731.

1860s, and from Mersin to Adana along the Mediterranean.²¹⁸ It was no coincidence why 1856 was the year for successive initiatives for railway construction in Egypt and Anatolia that in 1856 “the treaty of Paris officially terminated the Crimean War, begun in 1853, between Great Britain, France and Turkey on one side, and Russia on the other; and the Ottoman Empire was brought into the European system of states.”²¹⁹

2.2.2. The Period between 1856 and 1876

From 1856 onwards, applications from the Western states to the Ottoman Empire in order to gain concessions for railway construction would increase rapidly within the alliance against Russia.²²⁰ 1856 was also significant in the way of transformation of both the Ottoman state and society from another aspect. Reiterated the state’s duty to provide equality and stressed guarantees of equality of all subjects, including equal access to state schools and to state employment, another imperial decree, the Reform Edict was issued in 1856 just before the conclusion of the Paris Treaty (1856).²²¹ Beyond the time sequence, though related, content of the decree also showed the endeavour of the Ottoman reformers for synchronising the domestic progress with that of the developments in its foreign policy.

“The Ottoman reforms of 1839 and 1856, both involving imperial decrees guaranteeing equal rights to all subjects, were executed at the encouragement of the Western powers.”²²² At the conclusion of the Crimean War, the need for reconciliation of international recognition with domestic reform became even more evident. “For European governments and especially the British who were concerned about Russian expansionism to the south, the success of Ottoman reforms was considered essential for the territorial integrity of the Empire.”²²³ As further reforms were carried out in the Ottoman politics, the Western powers began to show interest in the Turkish reform movement dealing with the rights of those Christian subjects living under the Ottoman sovereignty as well as with those issues related to the economic field. European governments believed that rapid expansion of commercial ties with Europe based on the

²¹⁸ Sean McMeekin, *The Berlin-Baghdad Express: The Ottoman Empire and Germany's Bid for World Power* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), pp. 34 – 35.

²¹⁹ Karkar, p. 11.

²²⁰ Ufuk Gülsoy, *Hicaz Demiyolu* (İstanbul: Eren, 1994), p. 19.

²²¹ Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, p. 66.

²²² Göçek, *Rise of the Bourgeoisie, Demise of Empire: Ottoman Westernization and Social Change*, p. 112.

²²³ Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*, p. 206.

principle of comparative advantage and European direct investment were essential for the development of the Ottoman economy.²²⁴ Beyond the rights granted to the non-Muslim subjects, the Reform Edict of 1856 reflected the concerns of the Western powers about the progress in the Ottoman system of infrastructure to be able to take advantage as possible as they could from the rights they gained from 1830s for domestic trade in the Ottoman lands. As its result, in the Reform Edict, it was stated that with the aim of providing the development of domestic trade, the Ottoman state would allocate money to reform land and water transport and would benefit from Western technique and capital for that end.²²⁵ The lack of an adequate internal means of transportation was lying as the major obstacle on the way undermining the potential of Ottoman ports in commerce as long as they were not connected with the agricultural hinterland.

Therefore, it was not surprising that the first railways built in the Ottoman Empire were consisted of short stretches connecting the agricultural hinterland with the main ports in the Aegean and Balkan lands in accordance with the concerns of British and French investors. As much as it was, it was no coincidence that the infrastructure to be reformed in the 1856 Edict in order to ease the transportation was thus mainly referring to that of railways which would guarantee the privileges of the Western powers in trading within the Ottoman territory. Since railway construction was an infrastructure that necessitated large amounts of capital, trained labour and technical know-how, and because the Ottoman Empire had none of these at the time, the empire had to give concessions to foreign companies to be able to own the technology of the time in its lands. In other words, “unable to find money to put into public works, so vital for a desperately needed economic infrastructure, the Porte was forced to grant concessions to foreign entrepreneurs for, among other things, roads and railways.”²²⁶

Within the major barriers, lack of capital, lack of technically trained labour, and lack of stable investment situation, the empire offered extensive economic advantages known as kilometeric guarantees- given to meet the costs of construction and operation- to European railroad companies which made them eager to build railways in the Ottoman land. This meant duplicating the advantage taken for the Western powers which were able not only to engage a profitable enterprise through taking railway concessions, but also to guarantee cheap

²²⁴ Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*, p. 206.

²²⁵ Engin, p. 26.

²²⁶ Ahmad, “The Late Ottoman Empire,” p. 22.

transportation for easy and effective commerce on the Ottoman lands within low custom tariffs. Under these circumstances as the extent and the volume of economic relations with the Western world increased, following the 1860s, the Porte initiated several institutional reforms in order to gain credibility in the European markets. As the importance Ottoman statesmen gave to the railway development extended, in 1865, the Ministry of Public Works was founded.

Concerns of both the Western powers and the Ottoman Empire over the railway construction on the Ottoman lands were not bound only to Anatolia. That, during the 1850s, railway lines started to be built on the Balkan provinces of the empire. Indeed, with the intention to appeal technical assistance from its allies at the time, the Porte had railway construction plans particularly in the Balkans. The first railroad constructed on the Ottoman lands in the Balkans was the line between Köstence and Çernavoda (Boğazköy) whose concessions were given to Britain in 1857. 66 kilometres long, this line was completed and opened to traffic in 1860.

In 1863, British capital obtained another privilege to build a line between İzmir and Kasaba whose construction started in 1864 and was completed in 1866. In 1893, a French company purchased this railway line from the British.²²⁷ Granted privilege, 98 km. of the Manisa-Bandırma line whose remaining part was built in the subsequent years, was also constructed by Britain and out in service in 1865. With the aim to connect agricultural lands to harbours, another concession was given to the British investors to build the Varna-Ruşuk line which was finished in 1866 and 224 km. long.²²⁸ Thus, mostly initiated by British interests with the intention to sustain the cheap transportation for the flow of agricultural export, railway lines built in the Ottoman lands until 1866 reached to 514 kilometre, with 66 km. Köstence-Tuna, 98 km. İzmir-Kasaba, 220 km. Varna-Ruşuk, and 130 km. İzmir-Aydın.

The Ottoman rulers who believed in the necessity of furthering the integration of the Ottoman Empire with the Western world, did not wait long to initiate a railway project which would connect the Ottoman Empire to the continent. For them, being accepted into the European system of states with the Paris Treaty, the empire ought to seek to better its relations with those partners of the system. In addition to that, considering the uprisings in the Balkans at the time,

²²⁷ Vedat Eldem, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun İktisadi Şartları Hakkında Bir Tetkik* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1994), p. 97.

²²⁸ After the 1877-1878 war with Russia, these two lines were left outside the Ottoman territory.

constructing railroads that would enable the Ottoman capital to take necessary action in the area made the issue of easy access to those provinces a necessity, if not a total preference. Building new roads and railways was viewed as one of the most important priorities of the central government, that armies sent to quell internal rebellions and confront foreign invaders could reach their destination much faster using a modern road or riding on a train.²²⁹ Providing the communication with the developed Western states, the need to mobilize troops and dispatch them to the front rapidly against a possible uprisings or a war that would erupt in the Balkans, and benefiting from the rich resources in the Balkans in order to increase the income of the state, all gave birth to the idea that a rail line ought to be built in the Balkan peninsula.²³⁰ This was the Rumelia railroads which the Ottoman state wanted to build with these aims.

Despite all the willingness of the Ottoman statesmen, the construction of the Balkan railways had to wait until 1870s. After several tries with British entrepreneurs, construction privileges of the 2,000 km. Orient Railways was lastly granted to an Austrian banker, Baron Maurice de Hirsch with an agreement signed in 1869. After he obtained the concession, Baron de Hirsch, founded two companies for both construction and operation, namely Société Impériale des Chemins de Fer de la Turquie d'Europe on 5 January 1870 and Compagnie Générale pour l'Exploitation des Chemins de Fer de la Turquie d'Europe on 7 January 1870.²³¹ With kilometric guarantee and 99 years of management privilege, the construction was started in 1871. Including the line which connected Istanbul to Europe, 319 km. Sirkeci-Edirne line, Baron Hirsch built 1279 km. line with this project; that of 243 km. Edirne-Sarımbey, 149 km. Dedeağaç-Edirne, 361 km. Selanik-Mitroviçe, 102 km. Banaluka-Novi, and 105 km. Tırnova-Yanbolu. Though the total project was foreseen as 2000 km. of railroads, Baron Hirsch transferred his privileges with much less than the other 700 km. not completed. An incomplete line which would not serve the ultimate aim of connecting the Ottoman capital to the European inland by rail, Rumelia railroad project led to extensive losses as it could not be finished until 1875. As the Balkan *millet*s were

²²⁹ Kia, p. 116.

²³⁰ Engin, p. 43.

²³¹ Peter Hertner, "The Balkan Railways, International Capital and Banking from the End of the 19th Century until the Outbreak of the First World War," *EABH Annual Conference 'Finance and Modernisation'* (May 2005), p. 7. Available online at: http://www.bnb.bg/bnbweb/groups/public/documents/bnb_publication/discussion_2006_53_en.pdf (21 June 2013).

separated one after another, the railway lines constructed in the region was lost that in 1914, 480 of the 2,000 km of the Oriental Railway were left in the hands of the Ottoman Empire.²³²

Railway construction in the Balkans was not the only attempt, that another project related to the Anatolian lands appeared on the political agenda of the empire during these years that covered the lines between Haydarpaşa and Ankara. Discontented with the problems experienced with Baron de Hirsch, the Porte decided to undertake the project as a state initiative. Under the Anatolian Railroad project, with its own means, the state built the 91 km. part from Haydarpaşa to İzmit whose construction was commenced in 1871 following an imperial rescript and ceded its management when it finished its building in 1873. Difficulties in implementation of the project led the empire to come to an agreement with an Austrian engineer Wilhelm von Pressel in 1872 in order to carry out the construction as the Director General of Asian Ottoman Railroads. According to the application project prepared by Pressel, a railroad of 4670 km. would be started from İstanbul and following İzmit – Ankara – Sivas – Diyarbakır – Musul – Baghdad route, would reach Basra.²³³ Although the line connecting İzmit to Ankara built up to 3 kilometres, problems in management including the financial difficulties did not allow the completion of the project.

2.2.3. The Period between 1876 and 1908

The year 1876 marked the beginning of a new era in the Ottoman history. It was the end of the Tanzimat period which began with the declaration of the Tanzimat Edict, continued with successive reform initiatives in various realms and even furthered with the issue of the Reform Edict in 1856. In 1876, a new period started with a dramatic change in the state structure. It was also the year a new Sultan, Abdulhamid II, would get the reign for more than two decades. With the goal to sustain the integrity and the power of the empire, Abdulhamid gave due attention to the development of railways which would strengthen the centralization efforts of the Ottoman state which had started during the reign of Mahmud II. “He encouraged the development of a transportation improvement program including the railways, supported fiscal reorganization, and stabilized the foreign debt.”²³⁴ This gave the result that beyond all the developments in the

²³² Quataert, “Transportation,” pp. 807 – 808.

²³³ Özyüksel, *Osmanlı-Alman İlişkilerinin Gelişim Sürecinde Anadolu ve Bağdat Demiryolları*, p. 15.

²³⁴ Karpas, *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 512.

railway construction in the previous decades, railroad building in the Ottoman Empire was realized extensively during the reign of Abdulhamid II with the foundation of the *Düyun-u Umumiye*.

Changes were not limited to the domestic politics yet. During this period, the relation between the Ottoman Empire and the continent would witness considerable adjustments as the former ally, Britain quitted its previous policy to sustain the status quo and thus the integrity of the Ottoman territory, while a new actor appeared in the political scene having a dramatic impact for the rest of the Ottoman politics as well as the politics of the world. In line with this shift in foreign affairs, policies followed in regard with the railway construction were to change. In addition to the change in the state policies, there were also other reasons lying in front of the European companies not to invest in the Ottoman railroad projects in 1880s. With the 1877-1878 Ottoman-Russian war following the Ottoman-Serbian war in 1876 and the 1875 rebellion in the Balkans, the Ottoman state had to spend a considerable amount for military expenses which put the Ottoman treasury in extreme difficulty. Beyond the economic risks, with the uprisings in the Balkans, there was also a political instability in the Ottoman Empire where building railroads would not be a profitable investment. Therefore, during the years between 1877 and 1887, railway construction halted in the empire. Under these conditions, applications from foreign companies for railway concessions almost came to an end. It was when the war resulted and the Public Debt Management was established in 1881, foreign companies sought to gain concessions from the Ottoman Empire for railway construction again. As the institution would guarantee the payments, railway construction in the Ottoman lands became a profitable investment for the foreign entrepreneurs.

Unable to repay new loans, this was the time when most of the Ottoman public revenues were taken under foreign control with the establishment of the *Düyun-u Umumiye*. Founded in 1881, the Ottoman Public Debt Administration acted as the intermediary between the Ottoman government and the foreign investors on railroads. Taken their interests under guarantee with the establishment of the administration, foreign capital encouraged railroad construction in the Ottoman lands again. During this period, the existence of the OPDA encouraged foreign direct investment in the empire at an unprecedented rate that a considerable amount of the foreign direct investment in this period went to the railway schemes, which not only facilitated domestic

economic activities but also enabled the penetration of western goods into the interior parts of the country.²³⁵ The establishment of new railroads, facilitated by its co-operation, opened vast territories to trade which formerly were almost without communication with the rest of the world.²³⁶

In this period, the state adopted the kilometric guarantee system as a technique through which the state aimed to attract the investors for railroad construction by assuring them certain minimum revenue per kilometre of track in operation.²³⁷ Under the guarantee of the administration the railway projects in the empire had always been a profitable source of business for European capitalists. Railroad development accelerated in this period as the commitment of the state to the railway companies with this financial technique was taken under guarantee by the Public Administration.²³⁸ The OPDA played a crucial role in the railway investments as European capitalists who sought profits amidst the disorder that prevailed in the country often asked for the protection or the cooperation of the OPDA.²³⁹

At the dawn of the era of capitalism, the Ottoman Empire stood at the crossroads of intercontinental trade. With the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, imperial competition among the Western powers gained a new momentum that now the access to India would not have to be over the Ottoman Empire, but found a shortest way. This resulted in the shift of the British policy about the Ottoman Empire that while in the previous period, Britain was defending the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire, would act in favour of its share in this period. Not only Britain, but also France and Austria were among those states which the Ottoman statesmen distrusted as they had demands over the Ottoman lands or had already occupied some parts of it. Therefore, even though the kilometric guarantees the institution was to pay decreased the economic risks and resulted in an increase in the demands of railroad privileges, British and French entrepreneurs lost their share in the Ottoman railway projects with the rise of the German

²³⁵ Murat Birdal, *The Political Economy of Ottoman Public Debt: Insolvency and European Financial Control in the Late Nineteenth Century* (London: Tauris, 2010), p. 14.

²³⁶ Charles Morawitz, "The Public Debt of Turkey," *The North American Review*, vol.175, no. 549 (August 1902), p. 282.

²³⁷ Quataert, "Transportation," pp. 806 - 07.

²³⁸ M. Hecker, "Promoted Private Activity," in *The Economic History of the Middle East, 1800-1914: A Book of Readings*, ed. Charles Issawi (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. 249.

²³⁹ Birdal, p. 97.

power in the continent which entered into competition with these two in getting influence over the Ottoman lands.

On the other hand, the 1877-1878 war with Russia showed that the Ottoman Empire could not sustain its integrity by its own power, but in dire need of a European ally. As a country which established its union recently, Germany directed its attention to the Ottoman lands for supplying the needs of its rapidly developing industry. Germany, as a latecomer to the imperial quest, had no viable option as many parts of Asia and Africa were fallen under the control of the other European powers, but that of the Ottoman territory from where the attention of the other European powers seemed to be shifted. Reciprocally, change in the attitudes of the Western powers which were formerly the allies of the Ottoman Empire against Russian threat, led to the changes in the Ottoman state which had lost its trust to these powers, turned its face to Germany which was left as a possible ally that could be trusted.

Thus, it was Germany which would have a favourable position in the Ottoman politics compared to the other states of the continent even though they had guaranteed their stance in involvement into the Ottoman politics via the institutional structure through which the Ottoman economy was governed. Due to severe relations with Britain and France compared to the previous periods, most of the private capital for the empire's railroad boom came from Germany during this period. Due to financial difficulties, construction of Anatolian Railways as well as Baghdad and Southern Railways were realized through German financing. Encouraged by the smooth working of the Administration of the Public Debt and supported by the German Emperor, who understood how to use the political influence of his country in the interests of commerce, the Deutsche Bank of Berlin undertook the construction of a railway in Asia Minor and stipulated that the tithes of certain provinces appropriated as a guarantee for the receipts of the line which were to be administered by the Council of the Public Debt.²⁴⁰ With the agreement concluded with the Deutsche Bank for the construction of Anatolian Railways in 1888, a new period started in the Ottoman railroad development that between the years 1888 and 1893-although three of them were unsuccessful, one was unused-sixteen railway concessions were

²⁴⁰ Morawitz, p. 282.

granted by the Ottoman government, with 4,820 km of railways in the Asiatic part of the Empire and 530 km in the European part.²⁴¹

The growing influence of Germany in the railway construction on the Ottoman territory did not mean an absolute dominance, though, as England, France and Russia were questing for chance in interfering into the Ottoman land via railways as part of their imperial interests. Therefore, although Germany became actively involved in railway building in the Ottoman Empire; still, during this period, in accordance with the balance policy pursued by Abdulhamid II, Britain and France gained concessions while Russia was trying hard to affect the Ottoman railway policy. Thus, the concession of the Mersin-Adana railway line which was completed in 1886, was given to a British company in 1883 and Britain continued to operate the extensions of railways that it had built earlier. Although assuming a dominant position in the Ottoman Public Debt Administration in Constantinople and taking over the Smyrna– Kasaba and Mersin–Adana railways in the 1880s when the British began disengaging from Turkey, France induced the damage of its position at the Porte no less dramatically than had the British occupation of Egypt a decade earlier when concluded the defence treaty with Russia in 1894.²⁴²

Instead of Britain which now obtained the shortest route to India with the opening of the Suez Canal and thus reduced its interests in building railroads in the Ottoman land; in accordance with its Eastern policy, France began to be effective in constructing railways in the Ottoman lands while it sustained the privileges for operating those which it had built. Beyond the privilege for extending the İzmir-Kasaba railroad up to the Afyonkarahisar, concessions in the southern regions were also given to France. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, France started to construct the railways in Syria. A French company formed in 1889, constructed 87 km. long Jaffa-Jerusalem line and added 75 km. branch lines to Ghazza and 50 km. to Nablus, which was completed in 1892. In addition to that, the French capital constructed the line between Damascus, Homs and Aleppo with extensions to Beirut. Connecting the principal cities of Syria with the coastal periphery, French investors held a 644 kilometre long rail line on the Ottoman territory during the period. Although actively involved in the southern regions, France was also given concessions in the western part of the empire. Beyond Mudanya-Bursa line, in 1892

²⁴¹ Hecker, p. 249.

²⁴² McMeekin, p. 36.

concession was given to a French entrepreneur called Baudouy to build the line that would connect Selanik to İstanbul.²⁴³

Within the context of rapidly developed German-Ottoman relations, economic activities between the two increased. Thus, Germany which did not have even one kilometre of railroad in the Ottoman lands until 1888 had the privilege of 2000 km of railroads in 1890. That, the concession of all the lines in Rumelia railroad project was transferred to the Deutsche Bank in 1890. In the same year, the bank received the concession for a 219 km. long line from Selanik to Manastır. Yet, with the losses in the Balkans and the aim of the Sultan Abdulhamid to establish a unity between the Islamic parts of the Empire, the route for the construction of new lines was directed towards the Anatolian lands during this period. For this end, the Anatolian Railroad project which the state built the line from Haydarpaşa to İzmit in 1873 came to the fore as the concession for the construction of the line connecting İzmit to Ankara was given to the German Deutsche Bank in 1888. The Anatolian railway of 1,000 kilometres was constructed from İzmit to Ankara via Eskişehir with a branch line to Konya between 1888 and 1896. In addition, the privilege of the Haydarpaşa-İzmit line was also given to the bank.

After the construction of the İzmit-Ankara railroad was finished, Sultan Abdulhamid wanted to extend this line to Baghdad. With strategic and military considerations in mind rather than those of economic, Abdulhamid thought that the project would ease the control of the regions lying far beyond the capital as railways would give the chance for the rapid transportation of troops. In addition to that, within the context of Abdulhamid's policy of balancing the European powers, Baghdad Railway was the most important economic initiative that would provide the close relations between the Ottoman Empire and Germany.²⁴⁴ While this project would be used for suppressing the rebellions in the Arab regions effectively, it would also mean to prevent a possible British spread to inlands of Syria and Iraq via Egypt. For this aim, in 1893 a contract was signed with the Anatolian Railroad Company for the privilege of the lines connecting Ankara to Kayseri and Eskişehir to Konya. Although Ankara-Kayseri railroad was never built, during the period between 1897 and 1903 negotiations on the construction of the Baghdad railroad continued.

²⁴³ Eldem, p. 158.

²⁴⁴ Enver Z. Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi, VIII* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 1962), p. 176.

Within the political manoeuvres of Britain, France and Russia which were against the increase of German influence in the Ottoman Empire, at the end, in 1902 the Germans signed the main contract. Indeed, the pre-concession was granted to the Anatolian Railway Company -the German company that constructed and operated the Anatolian Railway-for the construction of the Baghdad Railway on November 1899.²⁴⁵ In 1903, 200 km. long line which connected Konya to Bulgurlu started to be built as the first part of the Baghdad railroad. Almost in two years, construction of this line was completed. Diplomatic efforts promoted foreign railroads, especially of the Baghdad Railway, which were built with German steel and capital but which posed a threat to British economic and strategic interests. Yet, the Baghdad Railway project which became the part of diplomatic struggles and political manoeuvres in the Great Power politics, soon failed with the financial difficulties coupled with the political crisis started with the 1908 revolution and ended with the dethronement of Abdulhamid. However, still the construction of the Baghdad Railway line continued until the First World War.

During the period after 1888, in line with the policy of the Sultan to sustain the integrity of the Muslim parts of the empire, another project of Abdulhamid appeared on the agenda to construct a new railway line for this aim. Connecting Istanbul to the heartland of the Arab world as far south as the holy city of Medina in Hejaz, the Hejaz railroad which was started in 1901 and completed in July 1908, not only used as a means of promoting Islamic practices such as the hajj, or the annual pilgrimage to the holy city of Mecca but also served the goal of centralizing power in the hands of the sultan and his government, enabling the state to send its troops to the Arab provinces in case of rebellion.²⁴⁶ Beyond the religious concerns, the motive behind the construction of this line was about the consolidation of the state power in the Arab provinces which were among the target of the European powers for their colonial interests.

“The famous Hejaz railway constructed during the reign of Abdulhamid II, which was the first major achievement of Turkish engineering and of the Islamic world during the industrial age.”²⁴⁷ Political and military considerations in mind, the sultan aimed to secure these areas from foreign encroachment, while the integrity among the Muslim subjects of the Empire could be sustained as the nationalist movements among them to be obstructed through binding these

²⁴⁵ Özyüksel, *Osmanlı-Alman İlişkilerinin Gelişim Sürecinde Anadolu ve Bağdat Demiryolları*, p. 139.

²⁴⁶ Kia, p. 125.

²⁴⁷ Ortaylı, “Haydarpaşa to Baghdad,” p. 30.

regions to the capital of the Empire with the Hejaz line.²⁴⁸ As a totally political project developed according to the pan-Islamist policies of Abdulhamid, the Hejaz Railway 1564 kilometres in total of which 1320 km between Damascus and Mecca were constructed by Ottoman labour with the help of donations collected from the Muslim world. Although the railroad reached Medina in 1908, the line connecting Medina to Mecca was never built. This railroad was finished in 1914.²⁴⁹ After the 91 km. Haydarpaşa-İzmit railway, as a second initiative the Ottoman state set in railway construction, the Hejaz railway represented an improvement in railroad experience for the Ottomans in their attempt to build and operate a rail line with its own means. Railroad work in the Hejaz project provided opportunities for advancement through skill and experience to the Ottoman Muslims who would serve in the construction of new lines during the following decades.

Became convinced that the empire needed to build railroad mainly for reasons of military security, like his predecessors Sultan Abdulhamid was interested in the railway development in the empire. In addition to this security concern, he also thought about the possible contribution of the railroads for the increase in the wealth of the empire as railroads would help to integrate the internal market to the outside world as well as would lead to the efficiency in taxation. He would prefer the German state within the conjuncture of the time. Having recognized the threat posed by Russia, Great Britain, and France to the security and the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire, Abdulhamid also adopted a closer relationship with Germany, seeking the support of the Kaiser to modernize and centralize the Ottoman state; therefore, when the Ottomans began to build a railway system, which would connect the capital to Anatolia and the Arab Middle East, the sultan awarded the contract to the German government.²⁵⁰ The most ambitious of all these concessions, and that most fraught with political friction among the Powers, was the German Baghdad Railway scheme.”²⁵¹ Although British and French companies were not altogether disregarded from the railway construction process in order to balance the German power in the Ottoman Empire, the most important concession was given to Germany in 1888 for the construction of a line that would connect the capital to the provinces located in the south.

²⁴⁸ Özyüksel, *Hicaz Demiryolu*, p. 262.

²⁴⁹ Jacob M. Landau, *The Hejaz Railway and the Muslim Pilgrimage* (Canada: Wayne State University Press, 1971), p. 13.

²⁵⁰ Kia, p. 133.

²⁵¹ Kent, p. 2.

Concessions given for railways had great economic as well as strategic value to the Powers and became a source of Great Power rivalry and conflict. When the German government entered the field as the backer and promoter of the scheme, the political aspect of the railway was moved into the foreground, and that aspect had since overshadowed the commercial one.²⁵² This was Anatolian-Bagdad railway line over whose construction the world would be dragged into a devastating war. The construction of the line would strain the relations between Germany and other Western powers as the end point of the line was envisaged to be Bagdad where the British interests in its way to colonies became jeopardized. “This scheme, the great scheme of German imperial economic endeavour in the Ottoman Empire, symbolised also the aggressive emergence of German interests into Europe’s established areas of influence.”²⁵³ Within this competition, the process of separation of the Ottoman territory into spheres of influence along the railway lines which started with the construction of first railway lines in the Ottoman lands would be accelerated. Competed for supremacy and status on the rapidly advancing railroad network, Germany would be the main actor in the Ottoman politics during this period that the transformation of the Ottoman state-society structure would gain its meaning through its hands.

Beyond the external context shaped by the inter-state rivalry, there were internal dynamics that led to the construction of a line which would be directed to the Arab provinces through Anatolia. While the Ottoman Empire was losing the lands in the Balkans steadily, it had to turn its face to the lands remained in order to take advantage from the resources of these areas as well as to hold a firm control so that the empire would be able to keep them from the external outrage. Regarding the domestic politics, this would bring a new dimension to the railway construction in the Ottoman Empire as it did to the imperial rivalry. As this new line would transit through the inner Anatolia different from the previous lines which were following the agricultural hinterlands lying near the ports, transformation in the Anatolian land and the society would become possible. Beyond its impact on the Anatolian peninsula, the aim to reach the Arab provinces brought together a new phenomenon on the policy agenda of the Ottoman Empire. Non-Muslim *millets* were separated and the idea of Ottoman citizenship was fading away, religious motives entered into the Ottoman politics as a tool used in the modern sense of the

²⁵² Morris Jastrow, *The War and the Bagdad Railway: The Story of Asia Minor and Its Relation to the Present Conflict* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1917), p. 8.

²⁵³ Kent, p. 2.

word to sustain the control over the Muslim subjects thus to sustain the integrity of the empire. Had started with the construction of Anatolian-Bagdad railway line, this motive would be stressed with the appearance of the Hejaz railway as an Ottoman project constructed with its own capital and labour.

2.2.4. The Period between 1908 and 1914-18

Until 1908, almost 5,883 kilometre rail line was built in the Ottoman Empire. With toppling the Sultan Abdulhamid II, the government constituted by the Young Turks who were defending liberal ideas, was established. With the arrival of the CUP to power in 1908, a new phase started in the Ottoman railway development. A vital item on the CUP's internal agenda remained that of modernization of transport and communications.²⁵⁴ Since the CUP saw the infrastructural development, especially in railways, as a means for economic advancement, it strove for accelerating the investments in transportation made by foreign investors through conciliating the conflicting interests of the foreign capital owners.²⁵⁵ During the period, educational institutions were established with the aim of increasing the number of Turkish personnel that would work in railway operations.²⁵⁶

Although the party had prepared a program for the construction of railways in Anatolia, it was not able to be successful to execute the plan. Change in the regime from an autocratic one-man rule to a constitutional monarchy led to changes in the foreign policy orientation of the Ottoman Empire. The trusted ally of the Abdulhamid period, Germany was put to second rank while France and Britain gained a favourable position on the agenda of the Young Turk regime. However, this shift did not live long as the demands of the Ottoman Empire which was in dire need of foreign loans were met not by Britain or France, but by Germany.

“German investments were concentrated along the Baghdad Railway, although the line remained incomplete in several critical sections by 1914.”²⁵⁷ As Germany did not want to lose the years-long investment into the Ottoman lands where its interests were firmly bounded in an imperial challenge, it continued to act in collaboration with the Ottoman Empire. Although 700

²⁵⁴ Fromkin, p. 46.

²⁵⁵ İlhan Tekeli and Selim İlkin, “Türkiye’de Ulaştırmanın Gelişimi,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 10 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 2760.

²⁵⁶ Ibid.

²⁵⁷ Aksakal, p. 57.

kilometres of track were laid between 1911 and 1914, with the outbreak of the war, the Baghdad Railway line could not be completed and the construction was brought to a halt.²⁵⁸ Its intention to maintain good relations with the empire when compared to the attitudes of Britain and France made the Ottoman government to come to an agreement with Germany again which would set up the settlement of alliance between the two on the way to the beginning of the World War I.

Except external debt, 41% of foreign capital in the Ottoman Empire was used to railroad building in 1890, while this rate increased to 63% in 1914. During this period until the First World War, the construction of railroads continued, and indeed rapidly in this environment.²⁵⁹ Including the 200 km. long Konya-Bulgurlu line, 1887 km. of the projects were finished until the World War I.²⁶⁰ When the war was erupted, for military and strategic reasons, all railway lines were requisitioned by the Ottoman state and their management were given to an institution established during the period. Financed by the National Defence Committee, in 1915, with the helping hand of the Department of Vakıfs, the Railway School opened in İzmir where within a short time around eight hundred young Ottoman Turks had been trained, who were to operate the railways during the War of Independence.²⁶¹ Following the defeat, railways were returned back to previous owners. That, at the end of the war, according to the Moudros armistice, Konya-Adana-Halep-Nusaybin railroads were left to France, Haydarpaşa-Ankara-Eskişehir-Konya lines were left to Britain.²⁶²

In sum, the Ottoman railroad system, although disconnected and disjointed, had sprung up in a remarkably brief period; though, its railway capacity was no match of major European countries.²⁶³ From 1856 when the railroad development in the Ottoman Empire had started until

²⁵⁸ Özyüksel, *Osmanlı-Alman İlişkilerinin Gelişim Sürecinde Anadolu ve Bağdat Demiryolları*, pp. 228, 238.

²⁵⁹ The last activity in railroad development in this period was the Chester Project in 1909. It was considered to be constructed in Anatolia with railway network of 2,000 kilometers. First the opposition of the European powers, especially that of Germany and later with the outbreak of the war, the attempts of the Chester Group were postponed until the early 1920s. –for a detailed study on this subject, see Can, *Demiryolundan Petrole Chester Projesi, (1908-1923)*.

²⁶⁰ These lines were Bulgurlu-Ulukışla (38 km.), Dorak-Yenice (18 km.), Yenice-Mamure (97 km.), Radsu-Halep-Trablusşam (203 km.), Ulukışla-Karapınar (53 km.), Toprakkale-İskenderun (59 km.), Baghdad-Sumike (62 km.), Trablusşam-Tel Ebiad (100 km.), Sumike-İstabolat (57 km.), and İstabolat-Samarra (57km.)- see Özyüksel, *Osmanlı-Alman İlişkilerinin Gelişim Sürecinde Anadolu ve Bağdat Demiryolları*, p. 232.

²⁶¹ Toprak, pp. 16 – 17.

²⁶² Özyüksel, *Osmanlı-Alman İlişkilerinin Gelişim Sürecinde Anadolu ve Bağdat Demiryolları*, p. 238.

²⁶³ On the eve of World War , the Ottoman Empire had 5,759 kilometres of railways of all gauges in operation while Great Britain had 32,623 kilometres of rail, France 40,770 kilometres, Germany 63,378 kilometres, Austro-Hungary

1914, 8,334 kilometers of rail line was laid including 1564 kilometre long Hejaz Railway realized by the Ottoman Empire itself.²⁶⁴ Total length of the railroads the Turkish Republic inherited from the Ottoman Empire was over 4000 kilometres. “The nearly four thousand kilometres of railways were the most important legacy of Ottoman Turkey to the Turkish Republic, even though they had been severely damaged by years of war.”²⁶⁵ With the foundation of the republic, these lines were bought and operated under the state provision. Post-Ottoman railways had shown a railway system simultaneously coping with the political disintegration of its territory and the introduction of a completely new social and economic framework.

2.3. Impact of The Railways on The Ottoman Modernization Process

The link between railway and modernization in the Ottoman Empire operated on a number of levels since “the railway was the most effective way to take advantage of the benefits of civilisation”²⁶⁶. Railroads were perceived as a blessing of civilization by the Ottoman state which did not hold back from using the best possible means to construct a rail network in its territory.²⁶⁷ Accepted synonymous with modern society, spread of rail lines was among the priorities in the political agenda of the Ottoman statesmen. This was why the Ottoman rulers, despite financial difficulties and technical incapability, dared to commence huge initiatives for railway construction both in the Balkans and in Anatolia. As the reforms set out by the Ottoman state aimed at modernization and re-centralization of the empire, railroads were seen to serve to these objectives. For them who viewed railroad as far-reached project, it was clear that railroads bore an iconic quality for the centralization of governance and the industrialisation of society in the modern period. The construction of railroads was interpreted as a crucial step in the Ottoman Empire’s modernization process, as the empire saw railroads as an important means to establish a rational bureaucracy together with the centralization of state power. In such a context, railroads

22,981 kilometres, and Russia 62,300 kilometres. For more information, see Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 66.

²⁶⁴ “Between 1854 and 1914, the length of the railways which were constructed within the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire was 6.784 km. 42% of the capital belonged to French, %41 to German, and %17 to British.” For more information, see Cem Alpar, “Yabancı Sermaye,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 507, 518.

²⁶⁵ Toprak, p. 11.

²⁶⁶ Ortaylı, “Haydarpaşa to Baghdad,” p. 29.

²⁶⁷ Ali Akyıldız, “Demiryolları ve Değişme (Batı Anadolu Örneği),” *Yeni Toplum*, no.1 (June 1992), p. 120.

were aimed at development and modernization which, in turn, provided the Ottoman Empire with the ability to join the world market.

Deriving conclusions of how the Ottoman Empire took the railway issue into consideration, there were a number of benefits ranging from economic to political and social to strategic calculated by the Ottoman rulers. These realms of benefits were also those areas where the Ottoman Empire was modernized. Strategic concerns of the empire were based on the anxiety of the empire about its security in a time when it was open to turmoil both from outside and inside but was not powerful enough to cope with. The fact that the first reforms in the Ottoman Empire were made in the army justified the perspective of the Ottoman rulers when considering the railway construction basically for the strategic aims. During the period when national upheavals were burst out in different parts of the empire and when imperial powers were searching opportunity to take advantage from the weakness of the Ottoman Empire, railway appeared as a means to bring solution to the strategic problems of the empire. Especially in the Balkans where nationalist uprisings erupted one after another, a railway line would provide a better and faster military control in the region and ultimately would strengthen the political power of the Ottoman Empire on its dominions.

Even though the Ottoman statesmen were well aware the importance of railroads, still they might not have the full-fledged understanding about the strategic and political advantages railroads would bring until the Crimean War. With the Crimean War which demonstrated to the Ottomans the strategic importance of railways, Ottoman statesmen gave priority to railway construction in their political agenda. In the wake of the Crimean War and the subsequent Treaty of Paris, under which Ottoman Turkey was recognised as belonging to Europe, Ottoman railway construction began and for the first time the country came face-to-face with the elements of modernity to such an intensive degree.²⁶⁸ The swift transportation of the army to warring sites in an environment where the Ottoman military weakness had been proven to the outside world was made possible only through the technology of the time. “Enhancing state control was dependent on communications, which translated into the building of an extended network of telegraph cables from the 1850s onwards and of trunk railways from the 1880s.”²⁶⁹

²⁶⁸ Toprak, pp. 11 – 12.

²⁶⁹ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 61.

Under the threat of external and internal powers, the railway system happened to be the way to control the vast territory in an effective and quicker way. Its potency as a military technology, railway lines were to increase the military strength of the empire while diminishing the cost of the transportation of the army. Through the construction of railway lines, it was expected that the empire would effectively cope with the threats directed towards the order of the empire through this viable way of sending troops and thus to strengthen its military and political situation as well. It was doubtful to what extent the Ottoman Empire could achieve this aim with the first railway networks which were mainly connected short distances from ports to the agricultural hinterlands. Indeed, in the Ottoman Empire this was not the case for the railways built by foreign interests between 1860 and 1890 as these lines were essentially constructed to connect ports with productive hinterlands.²⁷⁰ Only when the German-owned Anatolian railway and Baghdad railway were built from 1888 onwards and the Hejaz pilgrimage railway from 1901 onwards, did the empire begin to acquire a network which actually connected the interior to the capital and which could play a strategic role in enhancing state power.²⁷¹

Related to the strategic aims, political concerns were as significant as military ones for the Ottoman capital which was losing its control steadily and in dire need for centralization of the authority. “To far-sighted contemporaries it was clear that the Ottoman order could survive only if the seepage of power from the centre to the periphery was reversed, and if the empire could successfully adjust to new European realities, in particular the military might of the industrializing nation-state.”²⁷² For this aim to be realized, the centre ought to have an easy access to the provinces with its military and civil bureaucrats, and this could be achieved through the railways which revolutionized the land transport in a profound way. For the Ottoman Empire, the railway was a way of establishing law and order and controlling places far from the seat of central government.²⁷³ Investments in railway construction developed the means of communication between the Porte and distant regions and strengthened the central authority.

Among the internal dynamics which constituted the ground in forming the initial motive for railway construction in the Ottoman Empire, military and administrative concerns had a

²⁷⁰ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 66.

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

²⁷² Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, p. 40.

²⁷³ Ortaylı, “Haydarpaşa to Baghdad,” p. 25.

crucial standing. That, beyond the development of the infrastructural capacity of the empire, railroads also had an administrative dimension that with the introduction of the railroads into the Ottoman land, the state increased both its public responsibilities and its power base to reach and govern its frontiers. The centrality of military concerns coupled with the centralization efforts made railway welcomed by the Ottoman rulers as a vehicle of control in domestic politics and of invigoration of power in foreign policy. As an element which had proved decisive in contexts, such as the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, rail transport had significant impact on the empire's ability to defend itself.²⁷⁴

While the Ottoman capital could take steps in its centralization efforts, regions became bounded to one another through the expanding rail system throughout the empire. "Domestically, the central state became more powerful and influential in everyday lives than ever before in Ottoman history, extending its control ever more deeply into society."²⁷⁵ Within the centralization efforts, "the apparatus of government acquired more information on its subjects, became more visible, and penetrated more deeply into the fabric of daily life throughout the empire."²⁷⁶ Transforming from a pre-modern to a modern form, "no longer was the state simply an administrative machine to dispense justice, collect revenue, and raise armies; it was now involved in such matters as education, public works, and economic development which in large part formerly fell outside its purview."²⁷⁷ The Empire now started to use modern techniques to control over the masses it governed as its political, legal and socio-economic characteristics were evolving into a modern structure. The centralization efforts through modern means brought together the change of state-society relations that while the Ottoman capital could take steps in direct and efficient control over the periphery, regions became bounded to one another through the expanding rail system throughout the empire. Railroad lines brought about a major shift in the economic, demographic, and administrative orientation of those areas where they reached.

The interrelationship between railways and re-centralization of the empire both in political and economic terms showed a significant turn in the modernization process of the Ottoman Empire. As a vehicle of control for military and taxation, the empire made its power felt

²⁷⁴ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 66.

²⁷⁵ Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, p. 54.

²⁷⁶ Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, p. 71.

²⁷⁷ Davison, p. 80.

in the countryside. The capital used this new technology to strengthen its control through modern techniques of surveillance. Railways allowed the centre to maintain a closer watch on the local exercise of power through enhanced communications; that the railway was the symbol of central control in the regions where they reached. Indeed, the effective control only became possible after railways and telegraph lines had been instituted. In doing so, railroads brought to bear outside capital, modern technologies and business organization, legal expertise, and political influence needed to solve the problems of isolated locales.

“The improvement of the transportation and communication systems also stimulated the economy and intensified commercial ties between various regions of the empire.”²⁷⁸ Ottomans had also thought about the economic benefits of railways, that initial plans about the construction of railways were made in order to reverse situation in which Ottoman’s exports were low compared to its imports due to the lack of suitable means of transportation. “Commercial concerns were a primary motivation for the construction of the first Ottoman railways, and the railways played a major part in the rapid rise of Ottoman trade volume in the second half of the nineteenth century.”²⁷⁹ In order to reduce the costs of production and transportation to competitive levels, the Ottomans had to invest large sums in an infrastructure of railroads. Though much growth in the Ottoman industrial infrastructure was restricted to the agricultural and mining sectors, the economic impact of the railroad was crucial as it gave impetus to economic development in terms of transporting exports and collecting taxes.

Together with this impact, as railways carried the economic stimulus into the countryside, on the one hand, it helped to revitalize the economic situation in the agricultural sites; it enabled the emergence of a new market based on the capitalist mode of production within the empire, on the other. “Railways expanded the market and made it more effective, dismantled subsistence economies, and demonstrated to people the superiority of the monetary economy.”²⁸⁰ The chance railroads provided for cheap and easy transport provided the opening of new lands to agriculture. New railroad lines opened up the interior Anatolia to plantation agriculture, dramatically lowering transportation costs to ship cotton to market as well as to ship supplies back into the plantation districts. “Agricultural production rose all along the route of the railway, trade

²⁷⁸ Kia, p. 116.

²⁷⁹ Toprak, p. 12.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 13.

expanded, and so did tax revenues.”²⁸¹ As a result, amount of agricultural production increased and grain harvested in Anatolia was transported to the capital of the empire and to Europe as well. “Raw materials were exported from Anatolia, and manufactured goods, particularly cotton cloth, conquered the country in return.”²⁸²

Although Europeans designed the first rail lines in the empire to facilitate raw material resource extraction and manufactured goods importation, but not balanced regional economic development, the rail lines did bring growth and jobs, and their absence could doom an area to economic stagnation. This brought together the commercialization of agriculture that now producers leaned towards those products that could be exported in large amounts. To the extent that in some areas, the scheme of building several shorter lines gave primacy to economic considerations over strategic ones. Thus, the nineteenth century was a period quite different from the earlier era, a period of integration into the world market and rapid expansion in foreign trade, particularly with Europe in which the Ottoman economy was increasingly transformed into an exporter of primary products and an importer of manufactured goods.²⁸³ Moreover, they enabled European merchandise to penetrate into the interior.

As industrialization was concentrated on urban areas and agriculture to the rural, economic development required much tighter rural-urban connections compared to the previous periods. With the railway infrastructure now reaching to the agricultural sites, easiness in transportation enabled to produce in amounts more than self-sufficiency as was in the previous periods. Since it stimulated new commerce and employment, expansion of rail service into rural areas served to hold people in revitalized rural regions. At the local level, the time and resource savings represented by railways were astonishing. Through the transport of raw materials, countryside became connected to a wider economic realm by the expansion of rail service into rural areas. Besides, “the rural population was drawn to markets not only as producers of cash crops but also as purchasers of imported goods, especially of cotton textiles.”²⁸⁴

²⁸¹ Ortaylı, “Haydarpaşa to Baghdad,” pp. 29 – 30.

²⁸² Toprak, p. 12.

²⁸³ Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*, p. 205.

²⁸⁴ Ibid.

Railroads not only facilitated domestic economic activities but also enabled the penetration of western goods into the interior parts of the country.²⁸⁵ “Trade expanded thanks to the railways, but meanwhile the country became increasingly dependent economically.”²⁸⁶ With the construction of first railways in the western Anatolia by the British capital, demand for the import of the products of European industry increased in the region, for instance.²⁸⁷ The construction of the railway system increased the productivity of the region traversed by assuring the areas of means of transportation for all production beyond local requirements. Railway lines brought new vitality to the economy of the region, and made İzmir a major port for the export of figs, raisins, cotton, tobacco and acorns.²⁸⁸

These showed that the impetus behind the railway concessions given to the foreign capital owners was not only related to the external pressure, but also to strategic and military anxieties as well as to economic hardships of the empire. “At the turn of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman economy was still pre-mercantilist and agrarian.”²⁸⁹ Thus, for the effective and cheaper transportation from the capital to the lands where agriculture was the primary way of production and the agrarian sector the mainstay of the Ottoman economy, introduction of railway system into the Ottoman lands was seen as a development that would have positive effects for the well-being of the empire. Railway was expected to be beneficial to strengthen the economic situation of the empire through the effective management in collecting taxes and the integration it led both to the internal and external markets. With the aim of occluding the budget deficit, the Ottoman administration envisaged the increase in agricultural production and thus the increase in revenues taken from taxation. With the rise in exports they provided, railroads in the Ottoman Empire prevented the increase of deficit in the balance of payments to a certain degree. As transportation was made easier and further markets were opened by a network of railways, the Ottoman administration faced a rapid increase in its revenues. Moreover, by transfer of the pledged revenues to the supervision of the administration, it gradually extended its control over the economy.²⁹⁰ Ottoman state policies had produced positive economic results that in Ottoman Bulgaria, for example, the reforms had regularized tax burdens, brought greater internal stability,

²⁸⁵ Birdal, p. 97.

²⁸⁶ Toprak, p. 12.

²⁸⁷ Şevket Pamuk, “Türkiye’deki İlk Demiryolu: İzmir-Aydın,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol.1, no.5 (1994), pp. 35 - 36.

²⁸⁸ Toprak, p. 12.

²⁸⁹ Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, p. 19.

²⁹⁰ Birdal, p. 99.

and made life more secure; thus a Bulgarian economic expansion ensued during the middle nineteenth century, in the years before the breakaway from Ottoman rule.²⁹¹

Railroad infrastructure made the travel easier to the tax collectors as well as supplied a control mechanism for the state over its production in accordance with the integration of the internal market to the outside; as between 1889 and 1911, taxes collected throughout the empire showed 63% increase while this rate was 114% in regions through which railroads were crossing over.²⁹² Among many, one of the important reasons for this increase was the opening of new lands to agriculture in most places where railroads went through.²⁹³ Konya irrigation project, for instance, was expected to increase the tax revenues in the region as was suggested by the Baghdad Railway company in the first place. As the line progressed, the places through which it passed saw the benefits of its influence in new agricultural activity and irrigation; that the railway had such a favourable effect on cotton cultivation that production doubled within five years.²⁹⁴ As railroads did indeed open up new enterprises such as mines and lumbering, construction of new lines gave birth to networks of new towns and cities, modernize life and generated new jobs for the local population living in the regions where these lines reached.²⁹⁵

The incorporation of the Ottoman Empire into the global economy went hand in hand with the integration of the Ottoman market that transformed itself from being a sum of different regional clusters to an imperial market. During the nineteenth century, the Ottoman economy was integrated to the global markets in a much more intensive way thanks to the railroad networks established in various regions of the empire. “Opening of the relatively inaccessible interior increased the acreage and value of cultivated land, agricultural production, prices, exports, and marketing ratios.”²⁹⁶ The construction of the railways was one of the major dynamics behind the integration of Ottoman lands into the world economy. “Thanks to these railways Ottoman Turkey became integrated with the world economy and an extension of world

²⁹¹ Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, p. 71.

²⁹² Stefanos Yerasimos, *Az gelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye* (İstanbul: Gözlem Yayınları, 1980), pp. 521 – 522.

²⁹³ Akyıldız, p. 117.

²⁹⁴ Ortaylı, “Haydarpaşa to Baghdad,” pp. 28 – 29.

²⁹⁵ For a case study, transformation of Eskişehir is examined by: Ayla Efe, “Rayların Altında Kalan Makus Tarih: Değişen Eskişehir,” in *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Demiryolları Sempozyumu*, ed. Mukaddes Arslan (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 2010), pp. 117 - 125.

²⁹⁶ Quataert, “Limited Revolution: The Impact of the Anatolian Railway on Turkish Transportation and the Provisioning of Istanbul, 1890-1908,” p. 143.

markets.”²⁹⁷ Within the framework of the Ottoman Empire’s integration into the world economy, the development and commercialization of agriculture was realized through railroad-building throughout the empire. “As a result, the commercialization of agriculture proceeded rapidly in Macedonia, western, north-eastern, and central Anatolia and along the Syrian coast.”²⁹⁸ In those regions where railways were constructed, commercial plantation started to replace the traditional as traders increased their wealth through easier transportation and chance to reach different areas.

Railroads were the first enterprises to seek foreign capital on such a large scale. That while railroads probed deep into the interior of Ottoman provinces and more tightly bound the expanding agrarian economy to world market needs, the spread of European corporative enterprises in the empire, for its part, brought along an unfamiliar work day and discipline.²⁹⁹ With the growing of the commercial ties, modern methods in agriculture started to develop simultaneously with the emergence of the wage workers.³⁰⁰ In the regions rail lines crossed over, the number of wage earners increased. Economically, the neighbourhood that emerged along the lines became depended heavily on the railroad and the jobs that it developed. The railroad itself brought workers to the prairie as the heightened state of personal and social movement opened newly visible opportunities. Railroads and auxiliary sectors provided a site for employment, and together with the evolution of a worker class in the empire, brought a new phenomenon into the Ottoman Empire-strike.³⁰¹ That “the union movement began with railway workers, as did the first strikes the Ottomans had known.”³⁰² In August-September 1908, enacted mostly by the railroad workers, 27 strikes were commenced in different regions of the empire.³⁰³

Building of railways as well as the introduction of other communication facilities and of modern utilities in cities not only led to the development of new occupational groups, but also drastically changed the traditional structure of rural societies even in the remotest towns. The development of the towns along the trunk lines dominated the routes and suggested the pathways

²⁹⁷ Toprak, p. 12.

²⁹⁸ Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*, p. 205.

²⁹⁹ Donald Quataert, “The Economic Climate of the ‘Young Turk Revolution’ in 1908,” *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 51, no. 3 (September 1979), p. 1148.

³⁰⁰ Orhan Kurmuş, *Emperyalizmin Türkiye’ye Girişi* (Ankara: Savaş Yayınları, 1982), p. 72.

³⁰¹ For further information about the strikes in the Ottoman railways, see Şehmus Güzel, “Anadolu-Bağdat Demiryolu Grevi,” in *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 3 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 828 – 830.

³⁰² Toprak, p. 15.

³⁰³ Akyıldız, p. 119.

for potential settlers. Generally, after the construction of railroads, little settlements grew rapidly and became urbanized.³⁰⁴ Encouraging settlement along the routes by promoting agriculture, railways brought not only prosperity to the Ottoman lands, but also improvements in municipal facilities as well. Testified to the dramatic reshaping of the lands, the railroad itself put up more buildings and structures than what was already standing. Not only a rail city and its surrounding hinterland received a dense population but also numerous schoolhouses, hospitals and all the other facilities of a high and advanced civilization were established. “Companies, hospitals, agricultural stations and so on that were established along the railway line raised the standard of living of the population in the area.”³⁰⁵ Easy and quick transport increased the intensity of communication within the empire while it enabled the Ottoman Empire for further integration into the Western world. Growing urbanization brought together a more cosmopolite fabric, that in cities, unlike the rural structure, people were more open to changes and eager to adopt European life style.³⁰⁶

Through this way, while the birth of new commerce centres led to urbanization of the Ottoman society, some of the areas in the interior became emptied with migration. With opportunities in employment emerged with the construction of railways and auxiliary services it developed, migration from villages to cities accelerated.³⁰⁷ With the economic consequences railway brought, that of invigoration of ports and development of new ones along the rail line, internal migration became a phenomenon started at the time. According to a French consular report of 1907, which provided an overall view of immigration from Ottoman lands; for instance, the construction of railroads to the interior allowed residents from the regions of Damascus, Aleppo, and of the entire Mesopotamia to reach the coastal ports with ease for embarkation on ships for the Americas.³⁰⁸ In addition to that, the settlement of those who migrated from the areas the Ottoman Empire lost was accelerated with the railways built in Anatolia. Those migrants coming from the Balkans were settled in the agricultural lands which were opened to plantation

³⁰⁴ Akyıldız, p. 118.

³⁰⁵ Ortaylı, “Haydarpaşa to Baghdad,” p. 30.

³⁰⁶ Akyıldız, p. 118.

³⁰⁷ Ibid.

³⁰⁸ Karpat, *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 99.

with the reach of railroads to these areas. Settled along the line, they played a role in raising the level of both economic and social life in Anatolia.³⁰⁹

One of the most dramatic developments of the nineteenth century, railways enabled other developments through helping to transform society. Although the railroad technology was a powerful builder of large scale, centralized economic and political units at the same time that it undermined the position of common people, small scale economic units, and local communities. Among the transforming influences of railways, with the reduced travel times, temporal and spatial shrinkage became possible. With the accelerating sense of time, the world seemed all of a sudden to have gotten smaller. As in Europe, railroads' effects in the Ottoman periphery were the result of their effects on time and space: their speed, carrying capacity, and reliability over traditional forms of transport. Within a changing empire where clock-towers were erected in major cities, with the construction of railroads, transportation was subjected to strict timetables. "The punctual arrival of trains imparted a regular movement that Ottoman Turkey had never known before, and brought about a fundamental change in provincial Ottoman culture."³¹⁰ Thanks to the technological developments, time became to be conceptualized as a linear process where reliance on seasonal cycles became less important in sectors like agriculture and transportation. From the point of the population at large, the larger patterns of spatial and temporal change for the whole empire in a longer-term, but a more dramatic way was that of modernization of the society. Change in the perception of time and space, as railway reduced transport times and lowered transport costs, this technology had a modernizing impact on socio-cultural means. That, the railways changed the Ottoman way of life while train stations all over the country became symbols of their age.³¹¹

Initiated a new mode of mobility, railways led to the disorientation in the perception of time and space as passengers experienced a dizzying displacement while they were travelling in trains which were passing across the territory in an unprecedented speed that were not imagined before. While the railway changed the concept of time in Ottoman Turkey, it also expanded the sense of space as trains came to symbolise places beyond the horizon.³¹² People now became

³⁰⁹ Ortaylı, "Haydarpaşa to Baghdad," p. 30.

³¹⁰ Toprak, p. 15.

³¹¹ Ibid., p. 12.

³¹² Ibid., p. 13.

able to gaze at passing areas through the train windows, the movement of the train had that disorienting effect as constant locomotion made distant objects seem ‘in a whirl’. This profound shift in the alteration of the relationship between space and time was something anyone experienced when travelling on the railroad.

Reconfigured the notions of time, speed and distance, railroads enhanced meaningful communication between distant regions as well. Had limitless potential in conquering distance and nature’s constraints, railroads emerged as a site for interacting with outside people and locations. Not simply a physical act of mobility, rail travel was also establishing a social condition. The arrival of a train became a moment of congregation for the community for gathering and getting news of the events taking place far away but that would have far-reaching effects close at home. Attracted excited crowds at its platform, train reserved a brand new market based on the need to get from place to place. Forming spontaneous communitas, railway stations forged unmediated new relations to a type of unity from the diversity of its constituents as immense crowds lined the rails at every station and along the railway. Rivalling the cluster of public institutions around the mosque, train stations began to secularise society as people gravitated towards the markets, shops and businesses flourished around them; through which the railway also contributed to the modification of the concept of the public domain.³¹³

Contributed to further acceleration of mobility, the construction of railroads manifested the social dynamism and modern modes of communication. The railroad offered a powerful extension of personal mobility for anyone who rode in its cars.³¹⁴ As an icon of human mobility, railroad signified a process of modernization through which the Westernizing elites of the empire executed reform policies in order to catch up with their contemporaries in Europe. Much of their confidence and belief in themselves as modern came from their experience with the railroads. Confronted a developing set of technologies that made their world smaller, faster, and more intricately complicated, these elites participated in modernization of the empire while they were witnessing the vast expansion of Europeans across space and through time.

Although it might not be the primary factor caused the disengagement of the traditional mosaic of the social context as this process had already begun in the sixteenth century, still the

³¹³ Toprak, p. 14.

³¹⁴ Thomas, p. 9.

development of railways played the role of accelerating this evolution. That, with the beginning of the railway construction on the Ottoman lands coincided almost at the same time with that of the completion of this process of disengagement. Within the disengagement of the social fabric, the state followed the main principle of sustaining the integrity of the empire and its railway policy became the one of the cardinal means for that end. This was furthered by the state's attempt to take the responsibility to have an active role in various activities in economics, which would bring together the centralization efforts and that of modern institutions into the Ottoman socio-political arena.

Each of these realms were bounded together and thus the impact of railway development on each one of them. Railroads altered ways each underwent a process of social adaptation, economic expansion, political organization, and identity formation. Thus, economic, political, military, social and geographic factors had to be considered altogether in order to make sense of the Ottoman railways. When the Ottoman reformers welcomed the railway construction, depending on the circumstances at the time, they hoped that railways would bring benefit to each realm under consideration, though varying degrees. In these terms, the institutional reforms initiated by the administration contributed to the development and modernization of state entrepreneurship in the empire while the economic need for railways to be catalyst for the unified internal market and an instrument to the realization of market reforms which demanded a more complex inventory of regional differences. The Ottoman capital wished to increase its military strength through effectively transporting its army to the field, to provide its control over the peripheries and to have an efficient way to collect taxes. "The railway also brought security to these regions."³¹⁵

In essence, all these were interrelated processes that for example, the military might would mean the political control or collection of taxes would mean the strength of military. The development of railway construction facilitated economic modernization, increased central control over the periphery and the state had the chance to move the troops from assembly points to the concentration areas during mobilization. Although the empire acquired a railway without an industrial revolution, the railway played a fundamental role in the country's

³¹⁵ Ortaylı, "Haydarpaşa to Baghdad," p. 30.

metamorphosis.³¹⁶ Railway as the vehicle transforming both the landscape and mindscape as well, its construction in the Ottoman Empire affected different realms at the same time, thus contributing to change in each one of them. As a carrier of modern forms, railway helped to transform the Ottoman Empire as a state and as a society from a pre-modern to a modern one. It would be wrong to claim that it was the sole effect on this transformation, but a significant component. All variables both domestic and foreign had an impact on this evolution. In general terms, however, the railways were synonymous with modernization for Ottoman Turkey.³¹⁷ In parallel, up to this point, the aim was not to show the railways as the prerequisite of Ottoman modernization, but to explain how modernization of the empire progressed with that of the development of railway construction in the Ottoman lands; as “in the Ottoman Turkish experience, the railway was not an outcome of modernisation, but a vehicle by which it came about.”³¹⁸

3. CHAPTER III : ROLE OF RAILWAYS IN THE MODERNIZATION PROCESS OF THE TURKISH REPUBLIC

3.1. A General History of Modernization Under the Republican Rule

As *millets* of the empire gradually separated from the centre, only the geographical territory of today’s Turkey was left for a future Turkish state to be founded upon. After a prolonged struggle, an independent state emerged in Anatolia from the Ottoman wreckage. On the remnants of its vast territory, a new regime was erected. Originators of the Turkish Republic acted in accordance with mainstream ideals of the time, and established the new state within the parameters of a modern nation-state. The roots of the republican political order went back to the period of the National Liberation War which started in 1919.³¹⁹ The Turkish revolution which began in 1919 under the Mustafa Kemal Pasha, aimed to establish a Turkish nation of Turkish

³¹⁶ Toprak, p. 11.

³¹⁷ Ibid., p. 12.

³¹⁸ Ibid., p. 11.

³¹⁹ Feroz Ahmad, “Türkiye’nin Cumhuriyet Dönemi Siyasal Gelişmeleri,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 7 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 1992.

people on Turkish territory and to give to this new nation the equality with other civilized³²⁰ nations which its sovereignty demands evidenced by its successful defiance of the Allies as they were about to partition Anatolia.

The most salient characteristics of the new regime in terms of discontinuities and subsequent patterns of institutionalization were a shift in the bases of political legitimation and the symbols of the political community, together with a redefinition of the boundaries of the collectivity.³²¹ The defeat of the Empire at the end of the First World War was shown as the evidence of the weakness of the Ottomans, thus, the new regime was founded on principles that would cut the ties from the past. Founded in 1923 from the Anatolian remnants of the defeated Ottoman Empire, it claimed to be founded upon the principle of the nation-state with one nation, language and history contrary to the multi-ethnic and multi-religious characteristics of the Ottoman Empire. “The proclamation of the Republic on 29 October 1923 provided the political preconditions for Atatürk's quest to modernize the country.”³²² For the intelligentsia of the post-war world – who were more preoccupied with the ideas of modern and centralised state building – political authoritarianism, linguistic and cultural nationalism became the indispensable driving force in accomplishing their aspirations.³²³

Contrary to the Ottoman Empire which for much of its history brought together multiple and different ethnic and religious groups, the Turkish Republic was said to rest on a Turkish identity as nationalism spoke of one dominant nationality in its essence.³²⁴ To this end, the existing multicultural social structure abruptly mono-culturalised. Religion and ethnicity were made subservient to authoritative implementations of the nation- state for the needs of secularism and national homogeneity. The Turkish revolution completely rejected the religious basis of

³²⁰ Becoming civilized, and concepts that signify related processes, used interchangeably in the Kemalist narrative. These concepts were employed to describe similar processes. Therefore, throughout the chapter, although they have nuances, these concepts including modernization, modernism, modernity, Westernization, Westernism and Europeanization would be used interchangeably.

³²¹ S. N. Eisenstadt, “The Kemalist Regime and Modernization: Some Comparative and Analytical Remarks,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), p. 9.

³²² Osman Okyar, “Atatürk's Quest for Modernism,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), p. 50.

³²³ Atabaki and Zürcher, p. 6.

³²⁴ Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, p. 174.

legitimation and attempted instead to develop a secular national one as the major ideological parameter of the new collectivity.³²⁵

Convinced that only a strong centralised government would be capable of implementing reform, while preserving the nation's territorial integrity, the founding elite believed that modernisation and modern state building in Turkey would require a low degree of cultural diversity and a high degree of ethnic homogeneity.³²⁶ The assumption of political power by Mustafa Kemal put a new pace on the process of authoritarian modernization through which Turkey went through a basic scheme of secular reforms, as a result of which the traditional political structure was significantly changed. "The shifts in the principles of legitimation and in the symbols and boundaries of community, together with the change in the ruling class, were connected with the ideological restructuring of center-periphery relations towards modernity."³²⁷ Following the European model, the Turkish nation state project introduced itself with drastic reforms which undoubtedly had great influence on the institutional levels of society as well as on the private life of the people.³²⁸ That the Kemalist regime sought to change every single aspect of the daily lives of new Turkey's citizens with a modernization project.

When the power of Atatürk was consolidated and the fate of Turkey assured, he began to pursue his westernizing reforms with strong determination and will, with the aim of transforming Turkey into a modern nation.³²⁹ As he stated "*the purpose of the reforms that we have done, and we are doing, is to transform the people of the Turkish republic into a completely modern social community that is civilized in all meanings and forms [or images]; this is the fundamental principle of our reforms*"³³⁰. As the danger to independence had passed and the bureaucratic elite could find what they considered the ideal circumstances for successful modernization, they opted for secular Turkish nationalism.³³¹ Undertaken the revolution, the military officers who emerged from a modern educational setting and evinced strong intellectual tendencies, carried the ideology that of secular, rationalist, nationalist, anti-religious, and etatist, with relatively

³²⁵ Eisenstadt, p. 9.

³²⁶ Atabaki and Zürcher, p. 6.

³²⁷ Eisenstadt, p. 9.

³²⁸ Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç and Sibel Kalaycıoğlu, "The Nation State and the Individual: Alternative Strategies of Consent 'From Below,'" *Asian and African Studies* vol.7, no.1 (1998), p. 78.

³²⁹ David Kushner, "Atatürk's Legacy: Westernism in Contemporary Turkey," in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), p. 233.

³³⁰ *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, I (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 145.

³³¹ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 232.

weak social orientations or themes.³³² With devastating impact against the existing order, in place of the old Ottoman Empire, a new Turkey, a homogeneous and strongly nationalist Republic, with a passion for progress, freed from religious restraints and ready to give every man his due, but demanding that its own due rights be respected. In other words, Kemalists aimed to modernize the whole nation in which the subjects are being forced to live in a united homogenized structure.³³³ Transition from empire to nation was realized through alteration of state-society relationship that economic, politico-cultural and ideological reconfiguration was formalized. “The redefinition of the political community took place in a unique way: the society withdrew from the Islamic framework into that of the newly defined Turkish nation.”³³⁴

The major preoccupation of Atatürk and his colleagues at this time was the reestablishment of national sovereignty and internal cultural reorientation.³³⁵ The reforms of the Kemalist elite came as a reaction to two fundamental problems, which they attributed to the demise of the Ottoman Empire: the personal rule of the sultan as an opposition to the nation-states in Europe, and the Islamic ideology as a restraint on progress.³³⁶ Thus, “in Atatürk’s vision of modernization, two basic elements were linked: political change, involving abolition of the absolutist Ottoman state in favour of a democratic system with no walls between ruler and ruled; and the introduction of a western-type social, cultural and economic value system that would encourage individuals to develop and exercise their capacities in the economic, scientific and cultural fields.”³³⁷

As the dominant ideological stream of thought at the time, nation-state formation was taken for granted by founders of the Turkish Republic, which was contrary to the multicultural characteristics of the Ottoman Empire. In the experience of Turkey, an attempt was made to shape a nation state after the modern model of a European nation state and a concomitant

³³² Eisenstadt, p. 14.

³³³ Çağlar Keyder, “Whither the Project of Modernity? Turkey in the 1990s,” in *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, eds. Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997), p. 38.

³³⁴ Eisenstadt, p. 9.

³³⁵ William M. Hale, “The Traditional and the Modern in the Economy of Kemalist Turkey: The Experience of the 1920s,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), p. 167.

³³⁶ Fuat Keyman and Ziya Öniş, *Turkish Politics in a Changing World: Global Dynamics and Domestic Transformations* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2007), p. 301.

³³⁷ Okyar, p. 51.

nationalist ideology was to be followed.³³⁸ In order to keep pace with the developments associated to the emergence of nation-states, the founders of the Turkish Republic established a new regime based on Turkish nationalism. Under the new regime, ethnic and religious differences were delimited and people were placed into parts of an imagined monoculture. When the new regime emerged with a claim to be a nation-state, it had to do so through weakening of the traditional way of bonding between people. Within the changing world context, the system state built its legitimacy shifted from identification with religion to with the standing against it.

As religion shaped the character of the Ottoman political and social system, the new regime, within its policy to cut the ties with the past, founded itself on secular basis. Certainly republican elites were in favour of secularism as they considered the religious bigotry was the reason that had led to retardation of the society.³³⁹ “The westernization process and policies, especially with the establishment of the Republic along secularist lines resulted in the exclusion of Islamic leaders, groups and thought from the centres of the power, eliminating appearances of Islam in public sphere.”³⁴⁰ For the founders of the Turkish Republic, as the religion had been the basic obstacle for progress, and because Islam constituted the backbone of the Ottoman heritage, they wished to jettison this heritage altogether.³⁴¹

“Through its hyper-secularism, it was able to exclude the alternative, the Islamic political order, in a predominantly Muslim society.”³⁴² As a way to assert itself different from the previous order, the Turkish Republic claimed to be founded on the basis of secular state structure. The most salient and fundamental aspect of Kemalism, secularism was the foundation stone on which all the other Kemalist reforms were built as Atatürk regarded it as a necessary component of modernization and social change.³⁴³ Required many changes at political and social as well as cultural and daily levels, the nation-building project, empowered by the elite’s

³³⁸ Rittersberger-Tılıç and Kalaycıoğlu, p. 69.

³³⁹ Murat Belge, “Cumhuriyet Döneminde Batılılaşma,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 261.

³⁴⁰ İhsan D. Dağı, “Transformation of Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernization,” *Turkish Studies*, vol.6, no.1 (2005), p. 3.

³⁴¹ Metin Hepar, “Turkey: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow,” *Journal of South European and Black Sea Studies*, no.4 (November 2001), p. 1.

³⁴² Ziya Öniş, “Turkish Modernisation and Challenges for the New Europe,” *Perceptions, Journal of International Affairs*, vol.9, no.3 (2004), p. 7.

³⁴³ Sabri M. Akural, “Kemalist Views on Social Change,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), p. 126.

perceptions of positivism, hoped to remove people away from religious and traditional affiliations and turn them into westward looking nationalist and modern citizens.³⁴⁴ “Thus, under the Republican regime, secularism became a positivist ideology designed to liberate the Turks’ minds from the hold of Islam so as to allow them to acquire those rudiments of contemporary civilization considered to be desirable.”³⁴⁵ Atatürk advocated radical cultural, political and institutional rearrangements as a precondition for the adoption of western civilization.³⁴⁶ Westernization took the longing for a civilized life at the European level to the forefront and intended to bring a secular worldview by putting an end to the religious bigotry.³⁴⁷

Had their intellectual roots in positivism, the essential core of the Kemalist ideology and reforms was the concept of a secular state responsive to the social and economic needs of the people.³⁴⁸ During the succeeding years following the foundation of the new regime in 1923, “an extreme form of nationalism was used as the prime instrument in the building of a new national identity, and as such was intended to take the place of religion in many respects.”³⁴⁹ Through the principle of secularism that was clearly advocated by nationalism, religion was replaced by the latter as the cardinal cement of Turkish society. In other words, “the idea was to use nationalism to give Turks a new political identity while secularism undermined the attachments to the old traditions.”³⁵⁰ “Because they thus emphasized secularism in their thinking on modernization, they did not find a nationality in which religion was the dominant factor a suitable basis for a nation state.”³⁵¹

“The great task of the modernization was to change the Turkish people's outlook and behaviour from inward-looking, passive and shaped by collective religious and institutional values to active, outward-looking and more realistic in terms of the economic and materialistic

³⁴⁴ Efe Atabay, “Eugenics, Modernity and the Rationalization of Morality in Early Republican Turkey”, Unpublished Master Thesis, (McGill University, Institute of Islamic Studies, 2009), p. 37.

³⁴⁵ Kemal H. Karpat., *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays* (Boston, MA: Brill, 2004), p. 229.

³⁴⁶ Akural, p. 144.

³⁴⁷ Vedat Günyol, “Batılılaşma,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 258.

³⁴⁸ Özay, p. 50.

³⁴⁹ Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, pp. 181 – 182.

³⁵⁰ Karpat, *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 229.

³⁵¹ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 232.

values of the modern world.”³⁵² Atatürk’s formula for modernization called for immediate, uncompromising westernization and a concomitant rejection of traditional Islamic structures and systems.³⁵³ The crucial point of this process which was often summarized by the concept of westernization was of secularism which destroyed the principle of a theocratic Islamic state.³⁵⁴ Therefore, the primary source of legitimacy for the Ottoman monarchs, religion was deprived from its role as the republican elite put rational thinking, science and technology in its place. Although the meaning of science and rationality were never clearly defined, for the Kemalist modernization, science was regarded as a remedy for all problems of social, political and economic life. Accordingly, contemporary civilization was adopted as it was based on science which was the source of life and power.³⁵⁵ The process of modernization which accompanied secularization introduced many new cultural meanings into society to replace the ones inherited from the Ottoman past.

The regime led by Mustafa Kemal which succeeded the Young Turks, tried totally to reject the entire legacy, abolished the monarchy, banished the dynasty, and set up a secular republic.³⁵⁶ Imposed from the top by a handful of people, secularization was a necessary condition for achieving progress and civilization.³⁵⁷ Thus, in the process of westernization and secularization during the early years of the republican era, religious orders and institutions were closed down, western civil law was adopted, and religious schools and education were banned. The practice of authoritarian modernisation in post-World War Turkey was embedded in the perceived failure of the earlier attempts to introduce modernisation as the efforts of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century reformers had not protected the Ottoman Empire either from the separatism of minorities or from occupation by European powers.³⁵⁸ Criticizing the Ottomans for failing to undertake such a change from some sort of medieval backwardness to

³⁵² Okyar, p. 50.

³⁵³ John R. Perry, “Language Reform in Turkey and Iran,” in *Men of Order: Authoritarian Modernization under Atatürk and Reza Shah*, eds. Touraj Atabaki and Erik J. Zürcher (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), p. 253.

³⁵⁴ Asaf S. Akat, “İktisadi Politikalar,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 4 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 1090.

³⁵⁵ Taner Timur, “Atatürk ve Pozitivizm,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 95.

³⁵⁶ Ahmad, *The Making of Modern Turkey*, p. 15.

³⁵⁷ Karpas, *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 222.

³⁵⁸ Atabaki and Zürcher, p. 5.

the modern European level of civilization³⁵⁹, Atatürk believed that with the scope of science, the Kemalist era would be successful to fulfil the task that had become even harder as Europe continued to progress with unprecedented speed and force. Hence, with the aim to free the society from the chains of tradition referring to the Ottoman past which had prevented progress and caused for retardation while the West was advancing in science, art and culture, successive reforms were set out by the new regime in order to reach the level of contemporary civilization. The aim pursued by Atatürk was to revolutionize society by scientific means and to apply to Turkey the methods that had proved so effective in the West.³⁶⁰ In the succeeding years following the proclamation of the republic, with his belief in science as the unique guide, Atatürk took the first consistent step towards the West in the way of bringing prosperity to Turkey.³⁶¹ No such variety of change and achievement within a similar time and area appeared to take place elsewhere in the world.

3.1.1. Pillars of the Turkish Modernization Process

The last two hundred years of Turkey was all about the history of modernization. The order of the Ottoman Empire was exposed to the influence of westernization whose method and extent was designated in line with the vital problem of the empire, i.e. “how the state could be saved”.³⁶² Started quite earlier in the Ottoman Empire, westernization made its effects felt on varying degree on each period.³⁶³ Although westernization in the Ottoman Empire was not demanded by the society, but did emerge as a way the state resorted in order to protect its power *vis-à-vis* Europe, it had not been a state policy until the second constitutional period, but of a dream existed among the intellectuals. Indeed, westernization was actually one of the movements developed among the Ottoman intellectuals who were seeking to find the solution for saving the empire from decay.³⁶⁴ Emerging in the eighteenth century and gaining momentum since the

³⁵⁹ Civilization is the most common of the trio of terms that are used interchangeably in Kemalist rhetoric: civilizationism (*medenilesme*, *muasirlasma*, *cagdaslasma*), modernization (*asrilesme*, *modernlesme*), and westernization (*garplilasma*, *batililasma*).

³⁶⁰ Paul Dumont, “The Origins of Kemalist Ideology,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), p. 35.

³⁶¹ Günyol, p. 259.

³⁶² Tarık Z. Tunaya, “Batılılaşmada Temel Araştırmalar ve Yaklaşımlar,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 238.

³⁶³ Murat Belge, “Kültür,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 5 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 1292.

³⁶⁴ Şükrü Hanioglu, “Batıcılık,” in *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 5 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 1388.

nineteenth century onwards among the Ottoman administrators as a solution for the survival of the empire, search for modernization was one of the issues that found a wide range for discussion in the society in the last stages of the empire and bequeathed to the republic and reached to a permanent stage in the first years of the new regime.

Yet, the modernization efforts of both the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic had different endeavours as there was a big difference between the motives behind these efforts. Once the late Ottomans realized the decline of their state *vis-à-vis* the rising power of the Europeans they embarked on a process of adopting western ways that presumably made the West great.³⁶⁵ The Ottoman reformers had an intention to save the empire from the condition where it was trying to exist under the difficult circumstances at the time. That the West was perceived by the Ottoman elite as an expanse from which solutions could be derived to the ills of the Ottoman rule.³⁶⁶ In other words, without penetrating the spirit of the process, Ottoman rulers took westernization as a compulsory precaution to make the life of the empire longer.

With the regime change, however, the transition from an empire to a republic itself was the most important step taken towards modernization. “The Turkish Republic was an early example of a newly established political system that adopted rapid modernization as a primary goal.”³⁶⁷ With the organization a new political structure under the republican regime, theses about westernization were approached not from the perspective of saving the state, but taken for the only purpose of establishing a new society.³⁶⁸ In other words, newly established Turkish Republic perceived the Westernization as the radical turning point in mentality of working mechanism of the society which would be influential over the every level of the social life.³⁶⁹ Thus, after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, with the transition, the founding elite struggled to modernize the society in every aspect within the modernization program they set out. Attributing the failure of the Ottoman reformers to their imitation of Europe with limited success, Atatürk believed in the necessity to accept the European civilization as a whole. This was why unlike the modernization under the Ottoman rule which was restricted to certain fields

³⁶⁵ Dağı, p. 1.

³⁶⁶ Boğaç Erozan, “Turkey and the West: A History of Ambivalence,” *Orient III* (2009), p. 6.

³⁶⁷ İlder Turan, “Continuity and Change in Turkish Bureaucracy: The Kemalist Period and After,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), p. 99.

³⁶⁸ Hanioglu, “Baticılık,” p. 1388.

³⁶⁹ İnaç, p. 39.

and had a gradual progress both in promulgation and in implementation, the target of the new regime was of a complete change in areas covering all those political, economic and socio-cultural issues. What was most impressive about the republican reforms was this totality of its approach in instituting change in practically all areas of life, from the roots up.³⁷⁰

The radical movement towards the modernization came into effect with the foundation of the Turkish Republic. Constituted a coherent and systematic inclination towards the West and aimed at reaching the cultural, industrial, and economic level of the European states, with the reforms he set, Atatürk wanted to split with the past.³⁷¹ The formation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, with Atatürk at its helm, resulted in a drastic restructuring of older political and cultural institutions within the blueprint of the new, democratic and secularized nation. With the regime change, a complete modernization program started with the aim to end the duality of the preceding state. With the change in the political system as the Sultanate and the Caliphate were abolished and replaced by a democratic system with a parliament and a president, a secular state structure was formalized under the Kemalist principles. The abolition of the Caliphate removed the last vestige of the *ancien régime* which could still stand in the way of the westernization process.³⁷²

With Islamic traditionalism was rejected and Western science and positivist philosophy were elevated to supreme goals, the reforms instituted between 1923 and 1945 sought to provide the new society with solid foundations along Western lines.³⁷³ Westernization was one of the issues that had been deliberated upon in the intellectual life of the republican regime.³⁷⁴ Repeating an often stated Kemalist maxim, Kemalism aimed at putting Turkey on a level with ‘contemporary civilization’, making it a modern, strong, fully independent nation-state.³⁷⁵ Since independence was indeed the central deriving force of Kemalism, the first component of the Kemalist solution to the problem of saving/maintaining independence was of civilizationism³⁷⁶,

³⁷⁰ Jacob M. Landau, “Atatürk’s Achievement: Some Considerations,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), p. xi.

³⁷¹ Kaya and Tecmen, p. 12.

³⁷² Turan, p. 105.

³⁷³ Karpat, *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 491.

³⁷⁴ Tunaya, p. 239.

³⁷⁵ Ergun Özbudun, “The Nature of the Kemalist Political Regime,” in *Atatürk: Founder of a Modern State*, eds. Ali Kazancıgil and Ergun Özbudun (London: Hurst & Company, 1981), p. 90.

³⁷⁶ Civilizationism is a Westernist, all-encompassing conception which is underpinned by a particular understanding of science and reason.

i.e. complete and unconditional westernization. That, for the founding elite, the great transformation which took place in their country was to be defined, not merely in terms of economy or society or government, but of civilization.³⁷⁷ Regarded the need for acceleration and radicalization of westernization policy, for the republican state, legal regulation was the only viable option.³⁷⁸ For this end, the bureaucratic elite initiated a state controlled modernization process which was put into action from top-to-down. This would lead rather an authoritarian type of implementation of reforms which were designated by the bureaucratic elite for the society at large. This policy of authoritarian modernisation gradually changed the traditional social, as well as political, setting of Turkey.

In order to achieve the paramount task, i.e. to improve the standard of living of the people, the state apparatus would have to promote reforms in the legal and social as well as economic spheres in order to offset centuries of neglect and backwardness inflicted upon the Turkish nation by the Ottoman sultans.³⁷⁹ In other words, after the War of Liberation, in a country which was entirely ruined, an economy that was lagged behind and a political authority which was not sustained on firm grounds, as a big challenge lying in front of the new regime, modernization in all these areas was a great task to be accomplished in a society which had been neglected over centuries. Even though the modernization was started during the Ottoman Empire, not only the negligence of the Ottoman statesman on certain points, but also the insufficiency of these efforts did not lead to catch the Western progress even though they provided a certain level of betterment of the situation of the empire at the time. Together with the devastation of the wars, the gap widened as socio-economic life lagged behind the Western standards in many ways. In a speech he made in 1925, Atatürk himself stated this fact as; “*Let us not cheat ourselves. The civilized world is far ahead. We have to catch it and enter the realm of civilization!*”³⁸⁰ Far behind the West as a result of centuries old neglect, Turkish Republic, thus, was founded with the movement for modernization.

³⁷⁷ Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London: Oxford U.P., 1968), p. 486.

³⁷⁸ Murat Belge, “Türkiye’de Günlük Hayat,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 3-4 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 839.

³⁷⁹ Özay, p. 51.

³⁸⁰ *Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, II (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 304.

Reforms had two motives behind, one was internal and the other one was external; but only one cause- that of enduring as a nation in a newly established state. That, modernization efforts were ascribed with the matters of security and order through which the power of state would be sustained. In order to build a self-sufficient society designed in the model of civilized world, as a state to be independent and powerful standing in international arena would also be guaranteed. Within the psyche of those wars which brought the end of the Ottoman Empire, the founding elite saw the remedy in modernizing the state and the society as they viewed the reason that led to the demise of the empire a matter of lagging behind the advancements the West had undergone. These conditions that led to a perennial insecurity among the ruling Kemalist elite were instrumental in forming their main concerns around the problem of first saving, and later maintaining independence.

In order to provide the means for this cause, modernization was handled as the principle route to be followed in the agenda of the political elite at the time. Indeed, Turkish Revolution came into existence not only against to the Ottoman theocracy but foreign domination as well. This was why at the beginning, the founding elite refrained from Western connotations and needed to differentiate itself from them on certain fronts. That, even though modernization process was defensive in character at the beginning due to the recent independence struggle against to the Western world, modernization policies began to be implemented in various areas in the succeeding years as the regime strengthened its authority over the society. In fact, Turkey depended its westernization adventure on the state initiative and it desired to protect itself from the danger of the West by including itself to the western civilization. Although the republic emerged from its struggles against the Western powers, Kemalists and subsequently the republic embraced the universal validity of Western modernity.³⁸¹

One of the first tests of the Turkish Republic in its capacity as a nation was the way it would be received in the emerging international system after the First World War. To be viable, a nation needed to be globally engaged, to announce its autonomy, and to have that respected and reciprocated by others in the world. Within the conjuncture of the time when the republic was founded, to be accepted as an equal partner³⁸² with that of European powers was critical to stand

³⁸¹ Keyman and Öniş, p. 12.

³⁸² To be accepted as an equal partner, as civilized as the Europeans was expressed by Atatürk when he was addressing to a crowd in Inebolu on 28 August: "...the people of the Turkish Republic, who claim to be civilized,

as an independent state in the international arena. In setting an agenda for reconstruction and modernization, the primary concern of the new regime was survival in a newly established international order. Utilizing the legitimacy acquired after a successful independence war, Atatürk and other prominent Kemalists, managed to put into action their framing of civilizationism as the most important tool for survival in a hostile environment, and constituted it as one of the main elements of the ideology that hegemonized the political space. The reforms that were carried out based on this association between the attainment of civilization and the maintenance of independence that was mediated by the ‘gaze of Europe’. The way to realize this aim- that of gaining strength and thus reaching to the level of modern states- was seen as modernization for the political elite. Building their philosophies on this truth, Turkish intellectuals and politicians, most often thought that they were on the weaker side of international politics and if they wanted to survive they had to become stronger. In other words, independence from foreign influence would be realized as long as the new regime could prove itself as an equal member among the nations of Europe; and for the founders of the republic this made be possible only through modelling the European path.

For the Kemalist elite, while reaching the level of civilization, which was Western civilization, was the national purpose, science was interpreted as the only possible and legitimate vehicle on the path to Western civilization and the strongest tool for survival in the chaotic world of international relations.³⁸³ It was believed in the national need to progress fast and extensively, only through the adoption of new techniques successfully developed by the West could the new regime hope to hold its own in a threatening international environment. “Atatürk wanted to ward off western aggression by effecting reforms which he thought could ultimately help the Turks incorporate into the powerful western civilization.”³⁸⁴ Showing the reasons for the adoption of the scientific mindset, Atatürk declared in a speech that “*The nation has accepted as a principle of absolute truth that in the international field of struggle, science and technology that is the source of survival and power can only be found in modern civilization.*”³⁸⁵ Therefore, the reforms introduced in the 1920s and 1930s derived less from any complex thought about the

must show and prove that they are civilized, by their ideas and their mentality, by their family life and their way of living. In a word, the truly civilized people of Turkey...must prove in fact that they are civilized and advanced persons..”

³⁸³ Atabay, p. 28.

³⁸⁴ Akural, p. 132.

³⁸⁵ *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, I (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 215.

politics, social fabric, economy or traditions of Turkey than from a simple determination to pursue the path of westernization, which was recognized to be the only viable course.³⁸⁶ Founders of the republic, who accepted the universal validity of the western modernity as the way of building modern Turkey, started over a modernization process which would touch in every level of state-society relation in the shortest possible time. Therefore, the acceptance of the superiority of Western manners was the result of the bold shift that the revolutionary leaders³⁸⁷ undertook in order to repudiate the Ottoman past and to find a new place in the international arena for the Turkish Republic.

Often all too easily depicted by the republican elite, by contrast with Western societies, as pre-modern and even medieval, a closer look revealed that the Ottoman Empire had nonetheless experienced great transformations in the course of the nineteenth century. While a hundred-year transformation the Ottoman Empire was trying to achieve found its realization within the new political structure, as one of the movements of the Second Constitutional period, westernization became effective in the new regime.³⁸⁸ Yet, the motive behind this endeavour which differentiated the new regime from the Ottoman past was inextricably linked to these external reasons; that for the founding fathers, what caused the devastation of the Ottoman Empire which they were born into was the inability of the Empire to keep up with the developments Europe was undertaking. Thus, modernization meant to make the new regime -established as an independent nation state different from its predecessor- legal for both external and internal acceptance. In other words, being modern meant to show the difference of the new regime from the older one and to situate itself as an independent nation-state in the new world order established after the First World War. Therefore, the aim was clear for the ruling elite: to get rid of from the Ottoman heritage and to turn regime's face to Europe.

Finding out the means which had made Europe as powerful as itself and taking and adopting them to the new republic meant to modernize and transform the society along European

³⁸⁶ Udo Steinbach, "The Impact of Atatürk on Turkey's Political Culture since World War II," in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), p. 78.

³⁸⁷ "In their thinking about nationalism, cadres that brought success in the Independence War preserved a cardinal essence of westernism." See in Belge, "Türkiye'de Günlük Hayat," p. 845.

³⁸⁸ Hanioglu, "Batıcılık," p. 1388.

techniques and style.³⁸⁹ These means operated on a number of levels—not only diplomatic but also social, not only public but also private. All of the modern structures, technologies, and ideas presented in the republic’s founding depended on intercommunication with the world of nations. Therefore, for a rapid post-war recovery and modernization to be accomplished, the republican elite had to find ways to normalize relations with European countries given their own commitment to the revival of foreign economic relations potentially crucial for modernisation. Turkish modernization was an attempt to be incorporated into the European civilization.³⁹⁰ Through adoption and promotion of European civilization, it was believed that society under the new regime would eventually become prosperous with no reservation and condition. It was believed that the level of contemporary civilization could be reached by adopting the European technique and style to the state and society at home in every respect.³⁹¹ Atatürk believed that there was only one world civilisation –the European one – and that it had to be accepted lock, stock and barrel if Turkey was to survive in the modern world.³⁹²

Some of the roots of the Turkish Republic were laid in the movement of the Ottoman westernization.³⁹³ One of them was the role of the state in launching and implementing the reforms in the society. “The Kemalist state, like its Ottoman predecessor, was the supreme authority for all important initiatives and decisions.”³⁹⁴ As the centre had been very strong against the society at large not only during the Ottoman Empire but also in the republican Turkey, too; the process of modernization was initiated by the bureaucratic elite in both and the society was exposed to the orientation according to the centre. Westernization was treated as a

³⁸⁹ “The westernization approach adopted in the republican period regards Westernization and having strength identical” see in Mardin, “Batıcılık,” p. 248.

³⁹⁰ Berkes, p. 75

³⁹¹ Westerners believed in the wholesale importation of what they saw as Western practices. “In the debate over the degree of Westernization needed, Mustafa Kemal and his circle identified themselves with the position of the most extreme ‘Westernists’ (garbcılar) of the Young Turk era, who held that European civilization was indivisible and should be adopted in toto.” See in Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk’s Turkey*, p. 149. In other words, “in his political ideas Kemal Atatürk was an heir to the Young Turks—more especially of the nationalist, positivist, and Westernizing wing among them.” See in Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, p. 292.

³⁹² This view echoed the ideas of the Westernists (garbcılar), a small group of Young Turk intellectuals who had rejected the dichotomy of culture and civilisation and advocated adoption of a completely European lifestyle, down to the wearing of hats and a prohibition of the veil. See in Atabaki and Zürcher, p. 9.

³⁹³ Mehmet A. Kılıçbay, “Osmanlı Batılılaşması,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 152.

³⁹⁴ Dumont, p. 39.

"state policy", and hence its "top-down" character continued.³⁹⁵ As the nation state experience of the Turkish Republic was in a sense a continuation of the central oriental state of the Ottoman Empire, a tradition of central authoritarian rule became the rule of thumb in determining the political, social and economic affairs of the Turkish society.³⁹⁶ In both political systems, the Sultan in the former and mainly Atatürk in the latter, the leaders at the centre initiated the modernization process, being actively indulged throughout the periods under consideration.

Striving for the centralization and consolidation of the state power which were the primary objects in the nation-state building, the elitist policies determined the entire process of modernization. Consolidating their hold on the bureaucracy, the Kemalist leadership which was convinced of the validity of its vision and did not feel its reforms should be compromised by the reluctance of the masses to accept them- as the citizens continued to be viewed as passive objects-, set on a path of rapid westernization, via policies formulated at the centre and implemented by the bureaucracy.³⁹⁷ Through a revolution-from-above, the bureaucratic elites did initiate a change based on westernization of the society. Depicting itself in the quest of modernity, the centre with its bureaucratic elite symbolized modernization, made the society felt itself committed to enlighten the masses whose cultural backwardness would be erased. In other words, dividing the society into two fragments, as "advanced" and "backward" provided a legitimized political apparatus to the administrative elites for correcting the deficiency in the society.³⁹⁸ As they held the knowledge to the Western civilization due to their education and worldview, the elite believed that they were supposed to be the engine for modernization. Confirmed in their apprehensions that the largely peasant masses were ignorant, backward, and reactionary and should not be provided with opportunities to participate in the political decision-making process, the bureaucrats were inclined to impose westernization policies by compulsory means.³⁹⁹

They were inspired by late nineteenth-century thinkers, who regarded popular democracy as outmoded, but at the same time their project was ultimately a social and political 'grand

³⁹⁵ Belge, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Batılılaşma," p. 260.

³⁹⁶ Rittersberger-Tılıç and Kalaycıoğlu, pp. 69 – 70.

³⁹⁷ Turan, p. 111.

³⁹⁸ Reşat Kasaba, "Kemalist Certainties and Modern Ambiguities," in *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, eds. Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997), p. 24.

³⁹⁹ Turan, p. 111.

design', which was based on rationalism, guided by universal truths, and involved radical change – all things abhorred by true conservatives like Burke.”⁴⁰⁰ It was clear that while the Kemalist elite shared an authoritarian and elitist outlook, they also pursued a secularist, rationalist and scientist view. Science and secularism were the two basic principles which brought Kemalism into the parallel of positivism.⁴⁰¹ That for the question of ‘catching up with Europe’, Mustafa Kemal and his circle believed implicitly in a popularized version of nineteenth-century European positivism that in their eyes only scientific rationalism could form the basis for the modernization leap Turkey would have to make, and only a nation state could give Turkey the coherence needed to compete with the national states of Europe.⁴⁰² This was why the republican elite chose Western civilization as they believed it represented the modern civilization which incorporated values of entire humanity in thousands of years by adding an independent, scientific, and rationalist philosophy of life.⁴⁰³

It was aimed that the oriental order of the old Turkey would be given way to an occidental social organization by the means of a revolution. The Turkish model tried to eliminate the historical, cultural and geographical barriers which separated the country from modern Europe as it attempted to construct a new national culture, new institutional arrangements and establish modern behavioural patterns and values taken from European “modernity”.⁴⁰⁴ Although Turkish experience was fed by such disadvantages as being on the crossroads of western imperialist aggression, a low educational level of its culturally and ethnically diverse population, and the pains of salvaging a nation-state out of a dismantled empire, still it was one of successful defensive modernization against the spectre of colonization, able leadership of a practical and pragmatic political elite, and a prominent modernizing role of a strong military.⁴⁰⁵ The new regime was more successful in foreign relations that Turkey mended its fences very capably and managed to remain at peace which Atatürk wanted in order to concentrate on reforming Turkey

⁴⁰⁰ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 238.

⁴⁰¹ Taner Timur, *Atatürk ve Pozitivizm*, p. 95

⁴⁰² Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 232.

⁴⁰³ A. Afetinan, *M. Kemal Atatürk'ten Yazdıklarım* (İstanbul : Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1971), p. 37.

⁴⁰⁴ Rittersberger-Tılıç and Kalaycıoğlu, p. 70.

⁴⁰⁵ Selçuk Esenbel, “Reflections on Japanese and Turkish Modernization and Global History,” *New Perspectives on Turkey*, no.35 (Fall 2006), p. 6.

and its people, a task that occupied most of his energies during the fifteen years of his presidency.⁴⁰⁶

3.1.2. Kemalist Reforms-Modernization Policies

“The victory of the nationalists over both the Greeks and the sultan opened a new chapter in the drama of the Turkish revolution.”⁴⁰⁷ Following the period of wars that were finally leading to the foundation of the Turkish Republic, when the new regime achieved to prove its existence as an independent state to the international community, the modernization project which had already started with those political reforms including the abolition of the Sultanate and that of proclamation of the new regime gained pace. Indeed, “when Mustafa Kemal first began to lead the Turkish nation in its War of Independence, and later as Turkey's first president, he already had a clearly defined picture of how to help his country become a modern state on a par with the most progressive countries in the world.”⁴⁰⁸ Thus, since the beginning of the republican regime, westernization became an official state policy, and reforms especially in cultural realms were made in accordance with this policy.⁴⁰⁹

“The conclusion of a genuine peace, following the military victory, gave the nationalist government sufficient prestige and stability to take other steps.”⁴¹⁰ After the regime felt itself secure against to the external powers, it initiated a series of reforms through which the remnants of the Ottoman legacy tried to be eradicated. As the independence was confirmed with the military victories, now, it was time to develop the new state to the level of contemporary civilization in order to prove its existence and strengthen its stance in international arena as an equal partner. As Atatürk put into words: “*The success that we have won until today has done no more than open a road for us, towards progress and civilization. It has not yet brought us to progress and civilization. The duty that falls on us and on our grandsons is to advance, unhesitatingly, on this road.*”⁴¹¹ However, this was not an easy task to accomplish as there were many obstacles inherent in traditional Turkish beliefs and habits and in prevailing social, cultural

⁴⁰⁶ Landau, “Atatürk’s Achievement: Some Considerations,” pp. xi – xii.

⁴⁰⁷ Ahmad, *The Making of Modern Turkey*, p. 52.

⁴⁰⁸ Rachel Simon, “Prelude to Reforms: Mustafa Kemal in Libya,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), p. 17.

⁴⁰⁹ Cemil Meriç, “Batılma,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 235.

⁴¹⁰ Davison, p. 127.

⁴¹¹ *Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, I (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 241.

and economic ties. For the old habits were deeply ingrained, especially in the countryside where the bulk of the people lived, some of the reforms were actively opposed by various sectors of the population so Atatürk set out to alter the mentality of his people perhaps his most difficult task.⁴¹² “The attainment of modern European civilization became a new faith, the realization of which was considered possible only through intellectual conversion.”⁴¹³ To this end, Atatürk made a series of reforms ranging from political, social, and legislative to educational, cultural and economic. “Within the broad parameters of this modernization project, Turkey was able to make a transition to a democratic political order in the immediate post-war period.”⁴¹⁴

“The Kemalist experiment of the 1920s and 30s was both a classic example of nation building and a daring modernization project.”⁴¹⁵ That, during the rule of the RPP which was established by the leading cadre of the Independence War, the first fifteen years was crucial for the implementation of a radical modernization program which would touch in every sphere of the social structure and would determine the founding paradigm of the new regime. Although in the first few years of the republic, westernization had been defended in a moderate approach conciliatory with the national traditions, from the period started with the Law of Maintenance of Public Order (*Takrir-i Sükun*), an uncompromised westernist attitude was adopted.⁴¹⁶ In almost two decades, what was left from the Ottoman heritage was turned into a landscape where the whole society was rapidly transformed from an empire into a nation-state.⁴¹⁷ From education to the rights guaranteed for women, the founders of the republic would be able to reform and modernize an *ancien régime* with a considerable success in a very short period of time. The new regime set up an entirely new system of laws and courts and uprooted the customs of centuries. “In this transformation, the replacement of old, Islamic conceptions of identity, authority, and loyalty by new conceptions of European origin was of fundamental importance.”⁴¹⁸

⁴¹² Landau, “Atatürk’s Achievement: Some Considerations,” p. xii.

⁴¹³ Karpas, *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 229.

⁴¹⁴ Öniş, p. 7.

⁴¹⁵ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk’s Turkey*, p. 136.

⁴¹⁶ Mete Tunçay, “Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nde Siyasal Düşünce Akımları,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 7 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 1924.

⁴¹⁷ For further information about the Kemalist reforms that were carried out between 1922 and 1935, see Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*.

⁴¹⁸ Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, p. 486.

With the reforms set out in many fields including new laws and a new philosophy of government, Mustafa Kemal not only strengthened his position as a national leader that was gained through the victory in the Independence War, but also proceeded to renew the society in a “patriarchal lean from top to the bottom”⁴¹⁹. Within the transition from a multi-ethnic empire that had been ruled with theocracy to a republican nation-state, the so-called Turkish revolution, Atatürk preserved the legitimacy of his political authority in the society. The power he had taken from this, in addition to the political stability in the country that had ensured with the treaties concluded with the Western powers, would give him to initiate a reform program to be able to guarantee the maintenance and legitimacy of the republic with its institutions and culture. Following the proclamation of the new regime as republic, with the revolutionary reforms fulfilled from top to down, crucial changes were realized in economic, social and cultural realms. The process of modernization was heavily controlled by the state, since the new republic was considered to be vulnerable against external and internal threats. Both preferred and implemented, it was the state which played the prime role in westernization.⁴²⁰ That in its modernization attempts, the ruling elite produced transformative projects for the entire society, taking their own values as a basis with a Jacobinian attitude.⁴²¹ After the boundaries had been fixed, within them a unity of racial culture was established.

The years between 1923 and 1938 corresponded to a period in which reforms came into effect vigorously. Hence, the real victory of westernization in Turkey started with the Kemalist reforms.⁴²² Together with the abolition of the Sultanate and the Caliphate, modernization in the legal system gained pace that laws are regulated modelling from the European counterparts to the extent to be able to protect the new regime and maintain the legitimacy of it. After the total independence from foreign domination followed by the legitimization of the new authority with its institutions, modernization policies were extended to socio-cultural and economic realms. The West was taken as the model in the reforms made in such areas as military, economics, education, social and many other.⁴²³ What Atatürk tried to do was to seek to modernize an

⁴¹⁹ Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba, “Introduction,” in *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, eds. Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997), pp. 2, 4.

⁴²⁰ Belge, “Türkiye’de Günlük Hayat,” p. 841.

⁴²¹ Asaf S. Akat, *Alternatif Büyüme Stratejisi: İktisat Politikası Yazıları* (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1983), pp. 10 – 11.

⁴²² Meriç, p. 235.

⁴²³ Tunçay, “Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nde Siyasal Düşünce Akımları,” p. 1924.

archaic society, economy and administration. Therefore, the modernization efforts under the Kemalist reforms included almost every aspect of the socio-political structure. On all aspects of fine arts including music, painting, sculpture, theatre, motion pictures, language, and literature, reforms began as well.

Any ritual or practice that conflicted with the principles of the new regime and threatened the foundation of a homogenized and “civilized” polity faced either excision from the public sphere or politically expedient reinterpretation. Accordingly, beyond the political modernization including the democratization of institutions and the modernization of administration, policies regarding to the modernization of economic and social spheres would not be awaited to implement. Unification of education (Tevhid-i Tedrisat) together with the extension of it to the compulsory primary education, led to the secularization of this realm under state provision. That “the Law for the Unification of Instruction was a fundamental step in the establishment of a unified, modern, secular, egalitarian and national educational system.”⁴²⁴ With the enactment of this law which brought all educational institutions under the control of the Ministry of National Education, the duality ended as the religious lodges and convents (Tekke, Zaviye) and the traditional institutions of higher learning, the *medreses*, were closed. As part of the modernization of education policy, new alphabet and ‘Millet Mektepleri’ for its dissemination in the society were introduced while publishing in Arabic letters was banned.

In the coming years, cultural modernization would continue as curriculum would be modernized and universities to be found. These were followed by the establishment of several non-governmental organizations-the People’s Houses, the Society of Turkish Language, and the Society of Turkish History- in 1932 with the support of Atatürk. Studies in Turkish language and history would be among those which were given attention in the modernization process, too; that, Turkish Language and History Societies were established and given independent status, with their goals to protect and expand common language and provide mutual understanding of each other and to study Turkish history and increase public awareness about their history, respectively.⁴²⁵ Among the socio-cultural reforms, adoption of international time, calendar,

⁴²⁴ Winter, p. 186.

⁴²⁵ Among those subjects of homogenising state policies, studies in history and language also had overtones in civilizational discourse of the republican rule. Nationalist Turkish history thesis of 1932 was emphasizing the

numbering system and unit of measurement, adoption of Law of Surname, and change in clothes such as Hat Law and official dressing and like could be listed.⁴²⁶ Emancipation of women with the Civil Code of 1926, together with those rights given in 1930 and 1934 and regulations about their dressings held a crucial place within the context of cultural and social modernization policies of the new regime. Legal and judicial reforms, too, were among the endeavours of the republic in accordance with characteristic energy to throw off the heavy burdens it inherited from the Ottoman Empire. It successfully unloaded many of them when it adopted the most modern legal codes and established a new system of courts which have greatly expedited the administration of justice.

Like its population and geography, economic situation was inherited from the Ottoman Empire to the republican Turkey.⁴²⁷ However, what were left from the Ottoman Empire to the young republic were of a poor economic condition, with low productivity, poor communication and transportation systems together with those problems in trade and agricultural production. The Turkish republic was founded in an economic vacuum where devastation was widespread; farms and infrastructure were in ruins after years of war and destruction, trade was paralyzed, capital needed for development, financing was lacking at home, foreign banks and capitalists were themselves reluctant to invest in the new Turkish Republic, and most significantly Turkey lacked entrepreneurial and skilled manpower needed for development.⁴²⁸ Thus, another pillar of the modernization policies of the republican regime was related to economy.

Within the context of nation-building process, economic progress through modern means was inevitable in order to reach to the level of Western countries. As the idea of economically developed country constituted the material basis of contemporary civilization, the principal purpose for Atatürk was not the establishment of a developed economy by itself, but of reaching to the contemporary civilization through that way.⁴²⁹ On the other hand, a viable economy stood as a requisite in order to sustain the legitimacy of the state authority. The dominant view was that

history of Turks before the Ottoman era and placing the Turks into the centre of world civilisation; while the Sun Language Theory of 1936 was addressing the Turkish language as the mother of all languages in the world.

⁴²⁶ For further information about Kemalist reforms ranged chronologically, see Utkan Kocatürk, *Atatürk ve Türk Devrimi Kronolojisi, 1918-1938* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1973) and Sami N. Özerdim, *Atatürk Devrimi Kronolojisi* (Ankara: Halkevleri Atatürk Enstitüsü, 1974).

⁴²⁷ Çağlar Keyder, "İktisadi Gelişmenin Evreleri," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 4 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 1065.

⁴²⁸ Özay, p. 51.

⁴²⁹ Timur, "Atatürk ve Pozitivizm", p. 94.

independence in political arena could be achieved as long as it would be complemented with the independence in economic field.⁴³⁰ In other words, reforms in other realms would not be long-lasting if they would not supported by those in economic sphere. Hence, during the 1923-1930 period government resources were allocated mainly to the achievement of national control over the economy.⁴³¹

From the first days of the republican regime, economics was considered as a matter of concern for the existence of the state.⁴³² As in a word, national sovereignty had to rest on economic sovereignty, without which political and military victories, however great, were empty and transitory, the economic servitude of the public debts, the capitulations, the concessions, ought to give way to a free and expanding national economy.⁴³³ Believed vehemently in a strong economy as a necessary condition for the viability of the Turkish state, the Kemalist ideology included the principle of self-reliance as a key aspect of the economic development implemented with particular zeal from the foundation of the republic and during İnönü's governance in the 1930s and 1940s. Economic self-sufficiency constituted the main target in a war-deprived, economically poor country which had a burden of war reparations inherited from the Ottoman Empire. "The Turkish self-reliance strategy was shaped by centuries of gradual economic penetration into, and exploitation of, the Ottoman Empire by western capitalist interests under the hated regime of capitulations."⁴³⁴ Born into an empire which had been exploited under capitulations, the founders of the republic gave due attention to the abrogation of the foreign control and gained it with the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. Accordingly, the republican government pursued a policy of nationalizing foreign owned enterprises and revoking concessions as the government proceeded gradually to acquire foreign-owned transport and utility companies including the shipping lines that incorporated into the Turkish Maritime Lines and the railroads integrated under the State Railroad Company.⁴³⁵

⁴³⁰ Yakup Kepenek, "Türkiye'nin Sanayileşme Süreçleri," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 7 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 1764.

⁴³¹ Turan, p. 110.

⁴³² Ahmet İnel, "Devletçiliğin Anatomisi," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 419.

⁴³³ Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, p. 466.

⁴³⁴ Özyay, p. 54.

⁴³⁵ Turan, p. 109.

Compatible with this idea-that of promoting a strong economy-, as early as the foundation of the republic, Izmir Congress was held in 1923 to take decisions for economy. The main axes of the economic policy were determined in this congress.⁴³⁶ In the congress, the urgent need to seek and find the means of rapid economic development, and thus heal the economy of the nation from the wounds left by the neglect and incompetence of centuries was expressed. "In the world at large, the capitalist system was flourishing during the 1920s, and Atatürk and his colleagues, who were anxious to rebuild friendly political relations with the western powers, saw no immediate reason to break with it."⁴³⁷ Thus, the congress was the aggregation of promises which were granted in accordance with the liberal economic policy by the founders of the new state.⁴³⁸ With its decisions favouring the liberal policies, the congress played a determining role in the organization of the economic agenda of the republican regime.⁴³⁹

In his opening speech to this congress which was convened in order to chart a policy strategy to tackle the economic devastation and challenge facing the Turkish nation, Atatürk called for the inauguration of a new era of economic ideals that intended to replace the age-old fatalist attitudes. "In this speech he pointed out that by assuming sole responsibility for military and administrative affairs during the long centuries of Ottoman rule, the Turks had been unable to give thought and attention to their own economic activities and that this had led to the economic decline of the empire."⁴⁴⁰ In other words, for him, its economic situation prepared the ground for the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, meaning a higher standard of living, socio-economic development was what aimed by the Kemalist reforms undertaken in the economic sphere. As he stated: "*Let our country be prosperous. Let our people live in plenty. Let them be rich! And on this point let me remind you of a philosophical saying: Being satisfied [with what you have] is an indestructible treasure. I say, let this era of economic ideals put an end to the idea that being satisfied is an indestructible treasure and that poverty is a virtue . . .*

⁴³⁶ Kepenek, p. 1762.

⁴³⁷ Hale, p. 154.

⁴³⁸ Tefik Çavdar, "Devralınan İktisadi Miras," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 4 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 1060.

⁴³⁹ Tefik Çavdar, "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk İktisadi Düşüncesi," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 4 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 1077.

⁴⁴⁰ Okyar, p. 48.

This country of ours is one that is not only fit but most suitable to be made into a paradise for our children and grandchildren.. ."⁴⁴¹

To achieve all this, great changes would be needed-the mechanization of agriculture, the development of industry, and the improvement of communications.⁴⁴² Within the lack of capital and skilled labour as minorities who once constituted the main body of trade and commerce within the empire, lost their effect with the dissolution of it, the newly founded regime had no choice but to initiate enterprises to be able to start the economic development. Agricultural development as well as industrialization was the two which were to be restructured if to provide reforms in economic sphere. The Law for the Encouragement of Industry in 1927 was enacted while the problems in agricultural development would be discussed in the Congress of Agriculture held in 1931. The government intended to build a modern, self-sufficient industrial economy quickly with overcoming Turkey's economic backwardness relative to the West. Within this context, banking sector was strengthened. A Central Bank was established, with exclusive rights to issue legal tender and regulate monetary policy, reducing the Ottoman Bank to the status of an ordinary bank while the Republic gradually developed a customs system, and introduced regulations on foreign trade.⁴⁴³

In the nationalist economic reconstruction program initiated under Kemalism, although top priority was assigned to the establishment of banks and credit institutions to provide development financing, still, Atatürk gave equal priority to agricultural development. Technological change was to lead the way from a weak and inefficient economy still largely reliant on small-scale peasant production even after a half-century of Ottoman modernization towards a prosperous urban society based on the integration into the world market. Development in agricultural sector and industrialization promised to end centuries of backwardness relative to the West. With these initiatives taken, the Kemalist or republican model of modernization in twentieth century Turkey was able to accomplish significant industrialization and economic development.⁴⁴⁴ Since state enterprises, especially in the first two decades of the republic,

⁴⁴¹ *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, II (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 462.

⁴⁴² Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, p. 466.

⁴⁴³ Turan, p. 109.

⁴⁴⁴ Öniş, p. 7.

undertook the function of precipitation and dissemination of the westernization process⁴⁴⁵, the transformation of the Turkish economy would serve as the catalyst for social revolution by inaugurating the material basis for a modern Turkish society.

3.1.3. Modernization as Westernization⁴⁴⁶

Excluding those which were falling under the imperial grasp of Europe and exposed to modernization as part and parcel of the colonial rule, the Turkish Republic was among very few cultures that have been able to be modernized by its own means in such a limited time; and thus was a unique example within the successor states built on the lands once belonged to the Ottoman Empire. Beyond the success of the military resistance in the Anatolian mainland, the steadfast belief in the necessity for building the new state on the grounds of modernization was the main reason lying behind the success of the founding elite in their endeavour for a new regime. Captivated by their military success and enthusiasm for rapid modernisation, they deemed speed of restoring the socio-economic recovery more important at this juncture.

Indeed, Europeanization or Westernization was a process of social change whose roots extended at the end of the eighteenth century.⁴⁴⁷ Starting from the nineteenth century Russia, like in many of other underdeveloped countries, in Turkey, too, westernization as a concept for development had been considered identical with modernization and even with civilization.⁴⁴⁸ According to the Kemalist modernization project, the civilization that Turkey ought to participate was clearly designated to the West which was based on reason and not tradition, and conceived of in a singular way, encompassing all areas of socio-political life. Therefore, in order to partake in a civilization understood as such, the Kemalist regime carried out dramatic reforms in the social and political spheres. In the first two decades of the republic, the revolutionary elites made great efforts to effect radical transformations towards the westernization⁴⁴⁹ of Turkish political, economic and cultural life. For the Kemalist elite, being modern was a relentless pursuit after the Western idealization. They wanted to modernize the republic by westernizing it.

⁴⁴⁵ Insel, p. 424.

⁴⁴⁶ Modernization and Westernization are the two terms which are used interchangeably. The equivalent concepts which are used in Turkish to describe similar processes include *medenilesme*, *cagdaslasma*, *muasirlasma*, *asrilesme*, *modernlesme*, *garplilasma*, *batililasma*, *batlasma*, *batıcılık*.

⁴⁴⁷ Meriç, p. 234.

⁴⁴⁸ Tunçay, "Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Siyasal Düşünce Akımları," p. 1924.

⁴⁴⁹ "The approach that foresees the attainment to the social and the intellectual level of the Western Europe. It developed in the Ottoman Empire and gained new dimensions in republican Turkey." See in Mardin, "Batıcılık".

In other words, the essential change attempted by the founders of the republic in their revolution was one of westernization.⁴⁵⁰

Policy of westernization radicalized during the republican regime and in a sense, became the main pillar of the republican ideology.⁴⁵¹ In this frame of reference, modernization was equated with westernization, which was the case very much visible in the narrative of Turkish modernization. Modernization process was initiated intentionally by the leader himself in reference to the question of reaching the level of contemporary civilization. With the reforms carried out to modernize the society along the European lines, the regime would achieve to prove itself as an independent state among the nations of Europe, while differentiated itself from the older one and thus cut the ties from the Ottoman past. Thus, “Turkey was a rather unique case which appeared to differ from the core of Europe in civilisational terms, but at the same time wished to develop strong relations with Europe.”⁴⁵²

All reforms that had been made during the rule of Atatürk were directed towards westernization.⁴⁵³ Modernization was accepted as a way to reshape the whole society within the newly established regime through the reform package initiated right after the proclamation of the republic. In effect, the regime change itself constituted the basis of the reforms, as it was a revolution toppling down a six-century old empire. With the regime change, the medium for other reforms was opened. By reconstructing the system from top to down, modernization connoted the goal to build a Western type state and society. The Ottoman and early republican westernization processes were imposed by the political elites to the people in order to civilize them.⁴⁵⁴

The seeds of change, which made Kemalist drastic reforms possible, had been planted decades, or in some cases even a century, before 1923. Indeed, initially, modernization movements had already begun at the end of the eighteenth century during the Ottoman Empire through which a partial socio-economic and political restructuring was realized. Republican

⁴⁵⁰ Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, p. 486.

⁴⁵¹ Belge, “Cumhuriyet Döneminde Batılılaşma,” p. 260.

⁴⁵² Öniş, p. 6.

⁴⁵³ Tunçay, “Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nde Siyasal Düşünce Akımları,” p. 1925.

⁴⁵⁴ “In the role of social therapists, the Kemalists prescribed a regimen to cure the traditional Turkish social system of its irrationalities. Their intention was to bring religion, education, language and even attire fully into the domain of the therapeutic Kemalist state.” see in Akural, p. 145.

reforms were in truth an extension of a reformist movement whose first manifestations had appeared as far back as the beginning of the nineteenth century, that such a program had begun to be executed by the sultans of the Tanzimat, and the process was accelerated immediately after the revolution of the Young Turk who introduced numerous reforms, and in the few years during which they were in authority Turkey witnessed remarkable transformations.⁴⁵⁵ In other words, before Atatürk emerged on the scene as a charismatic leader of the independence, a step to modernization was taken through the reforms which were set out by the Ottoman rulers along the European lines.

Yet, what Atatürk achieved was to reshape the whole system of state-society relations via the target of reaching the level of contemporary civilization. Western civilization was accepted as the standard civilization that sanctified itself anywhere in the world and became international.⁴⁵⁶ Civilization meant European civilization, the West, the modern world, of which Turkey ought to become a part in order to survive.⁴⁵⁷ With the aim of eliminating the Ottoman state with its institutions, Atatürk was finally able to replace it with the new regime. As the doctrine of secularism came to be considered an absolute condition for modernization for a good part of the bureaucratic elite that gained the upper hand after 1923⁴⁵⁸, replacing Ottoman Islamic state with a secular republic, Atatürk achieved to first step in the modernization target. Albeit indirectly, a considerable number of social and cultural reforms made in the early years of the republic were related to secularism⁴⁵⁹ which made the republican rule the regime that had taken the clearest attitude towards the westernization of the culture.⁴⁶⁰

Transforming a multi-ethnic entity into a modern nation-state, Atatürk built a sovereign state independent from foreign powers which would be the referent point the newly founded Turkish republic would model its path. Foreseen as a modern nation-state, the new state had adopted secularism and westernization as the two building blocks of the regime among those six

⁴⁵⁵ Dumont, p. 35.

⁴⁵⁶ Tunçay, "Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Siyasal Düşünce Akımları," p. 1924.

⁴⁵⁷ Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, p. 268.

⁴⁵⁸ Karpat., *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 228.

⁴⁵⁹ Mete Tunçay, "Laiklik," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2-3 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 571.

⁴⁶⁰ Belge, "Kültür," p. 1298.

principles of the Kemalist ideology.⁴⁶¹ Seeing as an obstacle to progress, religion was made a matter of conscience and deprived from the role it had played during the Ottoman Empire. Instead, nationalism was set out as a binding force among the people of the republic while “secularism (*laiklik*, derived from the French *laïque*) became one of the main planks of Kemalist ideology”⁴⁶². Thus, secularism in the modern Turkey was realized as a logical result of the dominant ideology of the new society, i.e. nationalism.⁴⁶³ Accordingly, the nascent republic introduced many unsettling and radical reforms in an effort to distance itself from political Islam and the social hold of the Ottoman dynasty. Replacing the older institutions of the Ottoman Empire with that of contemporary modern institutions of the new republic, the task of instituting western type of system which was put forward as the target was realized.

As the republican elite was identifying themselves with Europe, after legitimizing the new authority, the question to strive for reaching the level of contemporary civilization was implemented through socio-cultural and economic reforms within the context of modernization that was identified with westernization. The goal was to catch up with the developments of the West in order to make the Turkish state respected and independent within the civilized world.⁴⁶⁴ For Atatürk, 'uncivilized people' are doomed to remain under the feet of those who are 'civilized'. Republican elite whom were born in an empire that was unable to have a close watch to the advancements in the West, were designated not to make the same fault again. In order to sustain the continuance of the state they founded, they turned their face to the western world from where they would take those means which led to its development. “For their part, the Kemalists wanted to see Turkey transformed into a modern nation state which, in the words of

⁴⁶¹ Atatürk defined in 1931 the principles of his program as Republicanism, Nationalism, Etatism- state controlled economy with public and private sectors, Populism-everything is for the people and with the people, Secularism, and Revolutionism. See in Enver Z. Karal, “The Principles of Kemalism,” in *Atatürk: Founder of a Modern State*, eds. Ali Kazancıgil and Ergun Özbudun (London: Hurst & Company, 1981), pp. 11 - 36. Later in 1937, these six principles known as Atatürk’s principles or Kemalism, were incorporated in the constitution. Categorized as six principles, these were named by himself as “Path of Kemalism” (“Kemalizm yolu”). See in Emre Kongar, *Atatürk ve Devrim Kuramları* (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1981), p. 419. These principles formulated by Atatürk for the purpose of cultural manipulation and social change. See in Akural, p. 125.

⁴⁶² Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 149.

⁴⁶³ Muzaffer Sencer, “Din ve Toplum,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 564.

⁴⁶⁴ In the words of Ziya Gökalp, a leading figure of Turkish nationalism: “There is only one road to salvation... to adapt ourselves to western civilization completely” in Ziya Gökalp, *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization: Selected Essays of Ziya Gökalp*, ed. Niyazi Berkes (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959).

Mustafa Kemal would 'live as an advanced and civilized nation in the midst of contemporary civilization'."⁴⁶⁵

Reaching and even going beyond the level of contemporary civilization was pointed out by Atatürk as the goal of the new regime for which this ideal was a matter of struggle for existence as it was founded upon the idea of change from the Ottoman tradition. This was why the founding elite were stressing the importance of modernization/reaching the level of contemporary civilization in their successive speeches. Indeed, the concept of civilization constituted the leitmotiv of all the speeches of Atatürk.⁴⁶⁶ Acting in conformity with the requisites of the time, modernization for the republican elite was the name of endorsing the fulfilment of these requisites in order to cope with the needs of the contemporary age and thus to join the ranks of civilization.⁴⁶⁷ Those were related to the every aspect that for a society to be called modernized had to display progress in political, economic, social and cultural realms as "Atatürk defined civilization as the product of advances achieved by a nation in state, intellectual and economic life"⁴⁶⁸.

Contemporary civilization, on the other hand, was the level marked by the developed countries at the age under consideration and it was the civilization of the Western world which was taken as the referent point for advancement by the republican regime. The republican elite believed that civilizations were constituted first and foremost by ideas and, consequently, that one had to search for the right idea in order to attain the desired level of contemporary civilization.⁴⁶⁹ As a civilizing project, the modernization/westernization under the republican rule was distinctively an execution of reforms whose primary goal was to civilize values and modes of behaviour in a nation-building process. Elites of the republic considered European-style civilization to be the pinnacle of progress, and they hurried to adopt the symbols of the European civilization.⁴⁷⁰ In other words, for the Kemalist elite, the civilization of the state could only be

⁴⁶⁵ Ahmad, *The Making of Modern Turkey*, p. 53.

⁴⁶⁶ Timur, "Atatürk ve Pozitivizm," p. 94.

⁴⁶⁷ For Atatürk, 'The nation has finally decided to achieve, in essence and in form, exactly and completely, the life and means that contemporary civilization assures to all nations.' See in Mustafa Baydar, *Atatürk Diyor ki: Atatürk'ün Direktifleri, Düşünceleri ve Kısaca Hayatı* (İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1957), p. 46.

⁴⁶⁸ Utkan Kocatürk, "Atatürk's Revolutions and Modernization", *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, vol.13, no.5 (November 1988), p. 5.

⁴⁶⁹ Karpas, *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 228.

⁴⁷⁰ Ibid.

possible by internalizing the western political cultures and social values. Therefore, Turkish modernization project comprised westernization as a process entailing the adoption of Western ways, values and patterns of thought. As a matter of fact, this was stated by Atatürk; “*We want to modernize our country. All our efforts are directed towards setting up a contemporary and western government. Is there a single country —with the desire of entering the realm of civilization that has not turned to the West?*”⁴⁷¹

For Atatürk, the path to reach the level of contemporary civilization was that of modelling Western type of system as modernization was associated with westernization.⁴⁷² “The concept of modernity—progress—was embodied in the term *medeniyet-uygarlık* (the last term is a recent linguistic innovation) or “civilization,” and the West came to be regarded as its source.”⁴⁷³ Resulted in a subjective evaluation, the Western civilization was believed as the superior model among civilizations. As the West was perceived to be the indisputable superior actor, modernization and westernization became synonyms in the meantime.⁴⁷⁴ That the concepts of modernization became inseparable from westernization and Europeanization in the mindset of the republican elite. In other words, given the ideological and political preferences of the state elites, modernization was always equated with westernization.

“Westernization, in the Turkish context, meant a commitment to reach not only the standards of economic, scientific and technological development of the West but to establish a secular and democratic political order.”⁴⁷⁵ The republican elite considered the West as a unique and fundamental dynamic of the social transformation and the state authority as the unique

⁴⁷¹ *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, III (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 485.

⁴⁷² To make society ‘modern’ (*muasir*) and ‘civilized’ (*medeni*) was the aim of the Kemalists. Both of these terms, which at times were used as synonyms, referred to contemporary European civilization, which the Kemalists, like the radical ‘Westernizers’ among the Young Turks before them, considered the only viable civilization in the world. For more information, see in Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 136.

⁴⁷³ Karpat., *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 305.

⁴⁷⁴ Studying the relationship between the Islamic world and West, the differentiation between “modernization” and “westernization” is essential. The former concerns the admitted need to adopt Western technologies and more generally modern science while the latter is rejected as cultural betrayal of Islamic values (particularly when it comes to the question of the role of women in society). See in Lewis, *What Went Wrong? The Clash between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East*, p. 73. Ward and Rustow construct their framework by defining modernization as a process distinct from westernization in terms of political and cultural changes of identity. Accordingly, modernization is defined in structural terms of industrialization, secularization, social mobility, science and technology, education, the shift from ascribed to achieved status, and a rise in material standards of living. See in Robert E. Ward and Dankwart A. Rustow, ed., *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), p. 3.

⁴⁷⁵ Öniş, p. 5.

instrument for this process. Western civilization was perceived as a total reality including economy, science and technology with all the belongings, not attributed to any one of the nations of Europe. In other words, for the republican elite, civilization symbolized a fixed notion of development and progress irrespective of the differences among the European countries.⁴⁷⁶ In other words, western civilization was conceived of as a singular entity that did not have an internal diversity. For the Kemalist elite, civilization was not predicated upon the properties and inherent qualities of the western societies, instead it was based on what they conceived as, universal principles, such as reason and science. Therefore, the level of progressive countries was not posed to differentiation among them, which for the republican elite, irrespective of the country of origin whether English, French or any, contemporary civilization had to be followed and its manner both mentally and institutionally had to be adapted to the Turkish society.

Westernization as a concept and program to “renew” the state and society, in effect, became an identity constituting orientation as the history of westernization was in essence the history of the response to the western challenge in the military, political, economic and cultural/civilizational realms.⁴⁷⁷ European civilization was conceived as the history of continuous revolution which constituted the fundamental characteristic of modernity as understood as a linear, continuous and cumulative process referring to a series of practices, ideas, and experiences that led European civilization as exceptional. This assumption about the linear development path indicated that all the traditional modes of production, structures of social organization, political legitimization, as well as traditional norms and values were progressively pressured and changed by patterns of this process spreading from the West to the rest of the world. On the whole, modernization attempts of the republican regime were based on this assumption that modernity was a neutral model, not a stage in the development of a specific socio-cultural formation, but a blueprint adaptable to different conditions.⁴⁷⁸ Accordingly, all

⁴⁷⁶ For Mardin, “Atatürk could be considered as a prototype in his regard of “Westernization” as progress”. See in Mardin, “Batıcılık,” p. 250.

⁴⁷⁷ Dankwart A. Rustow, “The Modernization of Turkey in Historical and Comparative Perspective,” in *Social Change and Politics in Turkey: A Structural-Historical Analysis*, ed. Kemal Karpat (Leiden: Brill, 1973), pp. 94 - 95.

⁴⁷⁸ Rittersberger-Tılıç and Kalaycıoğlu, p. 70.

societies were said to undergo the same transformations only at different periods of time and in the very end, they would all be 'modern' in a Western sense.⁴⁷⁹

Since the enactment of various laws that were inspired from the West, did not reflect the relations existed in Turkey at the time, but of those that were wished for, it was assumed that the society would evolve towards "modern civilization" in the course of time.⁴⁸⁰ Viewing Turkey as suited to being a part of civilized nations after an extensive process of modernization covered issues related to the alteration of state-society relations. The conception of the constant change as a dominant characteristic of European civilization brought together the consequent tension with the past as the Kemalist view of history was based on a strict black-and-white opposition between the forces of progress and the forces of reaction that try to reverse the process of modernization, to halt Turkey's progress on the 'road to contemporary civilization'.⁴⁸¹

Making the Turkish society to acquire the qualities of the western civilization, thus, republican reforms stood as the steps for proceeding in the path of civilization in a society which was neglected for centuries.⁴⁸² For the bureaucratic elite, the society in a non-Western context which was still immature and unable to be aware of the knowledge of truth, Turkish masses had to be enlightened towards a civilizing objective implemented through making legal regulations, educating the public by means of social and cultural activities and by building institutions serving to this aim. As Atatürk stated that he would be happy if he 'had been able to clear up some points that would be able to make the nation and the children of the future attentive and wakeful'.⁴⁸³ For this objective to be achieved, revolutionary laws were set out one after another with the aim of reaching the level of western civilization. Within the context of radical reorganization, the aim was to free institutions from their oriental character by modernizing them.

⁴⁷⁹ Kaya and Tecmen, p. 1.

⁴⁸⁰ Belge, "Kültür," p. 1300.

⁴⁸¹ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 5.

⁴⁸² In his speech of October 1927 Kemal explained the idea behind his reforms in these terms: Gentlemen, it was necessary to abolish the fez, which sat on the heads of our nation as an emblem of ignorance, negligence, fanaticism, and hatred of progress and civilization, to accept in its place the hat, the headgear used by the whole civilized world, and in this way to demonstrate that the Turkish nation, in its mentality as in other respects, in no way diverges from civilized social life.

⁴⁸³ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 11.

In parallel with the thought of reaching the level of contemporary civilization, what was aimed with the Kemalist reforms was to strengthen the national authority and to gain an equal stance among the developed nations of the world. As he stated: “*Existing civilization that started its journey from Europe, is such a gushing flood (seyl-i hurusan) that it violently destroys every obstacle that it faces. Muslim folk should avoid resisting the floods of civilization. They can secure their national existence (hayat-i milliye) only by belonging to this movement*”.⁴⁸⁴ For the founding elite, the Turks were a great people of great achievement, who had gone astray through the evil effects of certain elements and forces among them; they ought to be restored to the path of progress, to find their place in the community of civilized nations.⁴⁸⁵ The aim was to stand as an equal partner in inter-state politics as a modern nation-state ascended on its own cultural dynamics. While Atatürk's primary goal was a modernized, secular Turkey which could compete successfully with other states, nations and societies at the highest level of contemporary civilization, he also wanted to mold a Turk who, while modernized/ civilized, would still be proud of his own heritage and deeply attached to his fatherland.⁴⁸⁶ National character was stressed in the process of modernization which was expressed as to melt the contemporary renovations in the national structure in the process of both mental and institutional westernization.⁴⁸⁷

As due attention was given to the national self-identity within the context of modernization, culture and civilization was not taken as equals, while culture was related to the nation, but that of civilization was seen as one for all humanity. Expressing this view, Atatürk had told: “*Nations are many, but civilization is one, and for a nation to progress it must take part in this single civilization.*”⁴⁸⁸ Likely, in a speech delivered on September 1925 Atatürk said: “*The aim of the revolutionary measures we have been and are taking, is to bring the people of the Turkish Republic into a state of society which is entirely modern and civilized...*”⁴⁸⁹ In parallel, even though the path to modernization was directed to the western advancements, “Atatürk’s concept of modernization was not to blindly imitate the west nor blindly follow

⁴⁸⁴ Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri, II (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 416.

⁴⁸⁵ Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, p. 292.

⁴⁸⁶ Landau, “Atatürk’s Achievement: Some Considerations,” p. xiii.

⁴⁸⁷ Kocatürk, p. 7.

⁴⁸⁸ Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri, III (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 645.

⁴⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 418.

suit”⁴⁹⁰. That is to say, its basic substance and fundamentals were derived from within, and its genuine objective was determined by considering the specific needs and requirements of the nation-state.

This combination emerged as the collapse of the Ottoman Empire spawned the legacy of Turkish sensitivity to western social and cultural derision, while political and military success in the national struggle against foreign occupation forces evoked renewed pride in the concept of the Turkish state, now bolstered by nationalism.⁴⁹¹ The national discourse identified European imperial powers, which had sought to partition the Turkish homeland after World War I, as external enemies. Nevertheless, to realize Mustafa Kemal’s objective of “elevating Turkey to the level of contemporary civilization,” the Turkish state had to consider the external enemies, namely European countries, as its model.⁴⁹² Therefore, the nationalist formulation was constituted in a paradoxical arrangement in the whole Turkish modernization project, that while protecting the distinctiveness of Turkish ethnics on its road to the Western civilization, at the same time becoming a part of Western civilization, yet preventing a fully fledged “degenerated” Westernization for the sake of retaining the distinctiveness of its “Turkishness”.⁴⁹³ Indeed, the acceptance of Western civilization and the rejection of its cultural penetration “was the leitmotiv in Turkish nationalism as it evolved alongside Turkish modernization”.⁴⁹⁴

As Atatürk pointed out, “*We are not taking the western civilization for the sake of following suit. We take from that civilization and adopt those useful points which we consider fit and suitable for our structure within the bounds of world civilization.*”⁴⁹⁵ The newly constituting Turkish state, thus, tried to bring civilization in the line with the national culture of Anatolia. For this end, “Atatürk and his supporters worked out a political, cultural, social and economic scheme designed to be radically different from the Ottoman experience while still reflecting the

⁴⁹⁰ Kocatürk, p. 9.

⁴⁹¹ Frank Tachau, “The Political Culture of Kemalist Turkey,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), p. 71.

⁴⁹² Behlül Özkan, *From the Abode of Islam to the Turkish Vatan: The Making of a National Homeland in Turkey* (USA: Yale University Press, 2012), p. 104.

⁴⁹³ Atatürk’s choice of combination of these values did not make the task of reform any easier. Moreover, this dialectical contradiction between modernism and patriotism did in the end have an effect on what he tried to accomplish. See in Landau, “Atatürk’s Achievement: Some Considerations,” p. xiii.

⁴⁹⁴ Ayşe Kadioğlu, “The Paradox of Turkish Nationalism and the Construction of the Official Identity,” *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol.32, no.2 (April 1996), p. 179.

⁴⁹⁵ *Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, II (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 321.

national identity of Turkey and its presumed historical roots reaching back to the Sumerians and the Hittites.”⁴⁹⁶ In order to cope with modern Europe, the old Turkic culture ought to be revived as western technology be adopted at the same time. In other words, Turkish ethnic culture and national norms were to be preserved, while the adoption of European science and technology as a necessity of national survival was advocated. It was about to adopt the western science and technique in order to make the Turkish state as powerful as those civilized nations as “the basic goal of Kemalism was spiritual and material modernity, or “progress,” within the framework of a national state.”⁴⁹⁷

3.1.4. A Corollary to Kemalist Modernization: Scientism⁴⁹⁸

“The major ideology in the formation of the Turkish Republic was to achieve a radical transformation into a society which was expected to be ruled by a Western rational mind and scientific reasoning.”⁴⁹⁹ For the republican modernization movements, if the Turkish society was wanted to be developed, the attempt ought to be Westernization by appropriating science. This emphasis on rationality and science which emerged out of the Western Enlightenment also put great marks on the Turkish modernization perspectives. For Atatürk, the most important contributions of the West were in the social structure and in the positive sciences preponderant in this society.⁵⁰⁰ That was why he set out reforms to include every aspect of social and cultural life under the domain of science. With the belief that the transfer of the ‘scientific thinking’ would answer social, administrative and moral questions, the Kemalist project depended on the indispensability of scientific thinking for modernization. In the issue of westernization, what formed the basis was that of attitude deliberately carried out by Atatürk in his belief about the superiority of science.⁵⁰¹ Advocated secularism and rationalism that was clearly rooted in the ideals of the revolution, this ideology manifested a modern cosmology derived from the Enlightenment.⁵⁰² Amazed by the Western material success and science which meant progress,

⁴⁹⁶ Z. Y. Hershlag, “Atatürk’s Etatism”, in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 176 - 177.

⁴⁹⁷ Karpat., *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays*, p. 305.

⁴⁹⁸ Scientism is a world-view that regards science as the *only* way of knowing and disregards possibility of anything beyond the scope of science.

⁴⁹⁹ Rittersberger-Tılıç and Kalaycıoğlu, p. 70.

⁵⁰⁰ Mardin, “Batıcılık,” p. 249.

⁵⁰¹ Günyol, p. 259.

⁵⁰² Although the influence of the Enlightenment, Comte’s positivism and Durkheim’s solidarism was not negligible, Mustafa Kemal and his associates rarely borrowed their ideas directly from foreign models, but were guided by

the elite believed that the source of Western superiority depended upon a scientific materialist philosophy. Its rationalism was intimately linked to scientism, as the essence of positivism lied in the assumption that universal laws akin to the laws of science constituted the basis for the evolution of societies.⁵⁰³ Since it was believed that the Western material success was due to science, for the Kemalist elite, to become a disciple of materialism also meant to become modern, civilized, and progressive. In other words, as their belief was based on the universality of science's domain, the idea of passage to civilization was foreseen through the adoption of scientific thinking. As Atatürk stated, "*As an advanced and civilized nation, we will live in the midst of contemporary civilization...Those nations which insist on the maintenance of irrational traditions and irrational beliefs, do not progress*"⁵⁰⁴.

Harmonizing both the positivist motifs passed from Comte to Durkheim and the cultural analysis approaching to evolutionism, Ziya Gökalp had a considerable impact on the mindscape of the republican era.⁵⁰⁵ Theorized on how to reconcile Turkish culture with modernization and westernization, he reflected the elitist aspect of the Kemalist variant of positivism. That, during the republican period, within the modernization process, positivism began to share its domain with the philosophy of evolutionism.⁵⁰⁶ It was assumed that once the institutional kernels of a modern system established, the process of modernization led to an irreversible structural and organizational developments in all social spheres and to sustained growth in the common evolutionary direction. Convinced that past Islamic practices had led to failure, the Kemalist elite believed in evolutionary progress. For the ruling elite, if foundations of the society would be modernized, it would eventually reach to the level of civilized countries.

For Atatürk, contemporary civilization is based on science.⁵⁰⁷ Therefore, Atatürk's ideal of westernization was about to determine the methods of development based on scientific

convictions that had already inspired several generations of Ottoman Turkish reformers and, duly assimilated, had become part of the national intellectual patrimony. See in Dumont, p. 41.

⁵⁰³ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 238. Zürcher alleges that the Kemalist elite shared several elements of French positivism. These included anti-clericalism, scientism, biological materialism, authoritarianism, intellectual elitism, distrust of the masses, nationalism and social Darwinism.

⁵⁰⁴ *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, I (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 87.

⁵⁰⁵ Ekrem Işın, "Osmanlı Modernleşmesi ve Pozitivizm," in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 361 - 362.

⁵⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 361.

⁵⁰⁷ Timur, "Atatürk ve Pozitivizm," p. 95.

knowledge. A national development provided by the state control under the leadership of the republican elite was seen the way to reach the level of contemporary civilizations. This development included political, economic and socio-cultural progress while all the structure with its institutions inherited from the Ottoman Empire was exposed to change. For the Kemalist thinking, sound and systematized knowledge could serve as a reliable and indispensable guide not only in matters pertaining to material aspects of civilization but also in all sorts of social, administrative, and moral questions.⁵⁰⁸ Modern civilization rested largely on its scientific achievement and how European science and the European scientific method would be adapted and adopted in Turkey were the questions the republican elite were preoccupied.⁵⁰⁹ In order to replace the Ottoman order that had lied in front of the modernization movement of the new regime, reforms had vital importance to be able to institute a secular and democratic social order in which the contemporary way of thinking would be adopted for the end to proceed in the path of reason and science as a straight line to Atatürk, who pronounced that “*For everything in the world, for civilization, for life, for happiness, the truest spiritual guide in life is science. To look for any other guide than science and technology, is blindness, ignorance, and heresy*”⁵¹⁰ (*Hayatta en hakiki mürşit ilimdir*).⁵¹¹ As understood from this famous dictum of Atatürk, scientism⁵¹² and biological materialism (as well as social Darwinism) occupied a more prominent place in Kemalist thinking.⁵¹³

“Atatürk’s concept of modernization represented a whole with its political, social, cultural and economic aspects and forms a series of principles and revolutions based on a rational line of thought.”⁵¹⁴ That the six principles of Kemalism were formulated in response to the emerging needs of the modernization process as a rationalization of this determination to

⁵⁰⁸ Atabay, pp. 25 -26.

⁵⁰⁹ Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, p. 437.

⁵¹⁰ *Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, I (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 57.

⁵¹¹ This dictum of Atatürk demonstrates a world view depended upon a scientific materialist philosophy. “By the end of the nineteenth century, positivism, although originally an idealistic ideology, had merged with Büchnerian biological materialism to produce a mindset that can best be called ‘scientism’: an unshakeable belief in progress through science. Darwinism and also social Darwinism were very much part of this mindset.” See in Atabaki and Zürcher, pp.4 – 5.

⁵¹² The scientism of the Kemalist elite demonstrates that gradually science would be exalted to a position of religion in order to refute religion’s role in the social domain as religion was believed to be the source of backwardness that had made the Ottoman Empire lose its power and prestige in the world *vis-à-vis* Western states.

⁵¹³ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 149.

⁵¹⁴ Kocatürk, p. 14.

modernize.⁵¹⁵ Within a systematic modernization program (called “Kemalism”⁵¹⁶), science was taken as the basis to render development. On the way to modernization, science and rationalism remained the basis of Kemalist principles and reforms as he proclaimed in his 1933 anniversary speech: “*Sciences are a torch*⁵¹⁷ kept in hand and mind by the Turkish nation in its march on the way to progress and civilization.”⁵¹⁸ The Turkish society which had lagged behind the West due to the impediments of the political and social order of the previous regime was exposed to transformation through a method of modernization determined by the Kemalist principles which envisaged a secular and democratic social order that would be open to progress in the light of science. Since religion could not be reconciled with scientific thinking, the cornerstone of civilization according to the Kemalists, its control was necessary for progress, thus, secularism was also promoted and supported in the name of science.⁵¹⁹ With the reforms, his aim was to build a new regime and within it modern individuals who would have critical thinking. For this end, he set out those means which would carry the Turkish society to the level of contemporary civilization.

With institutional and cultural reforms, he strived to replace the traditional with that of objective, modern construct which would enable to raise a new generation in the path of contemporary civilization. The modernization project through the rationalized services of the state sought to transfer the citizens of the state into scientific-minded, modern individuals and future generations that would safeguard Turkey’s place among the other modern nation states.⁵²⁰ To this end, a national and secular education system replaced the old methods with the requirements of contemporary advancements of science and technology. It was supposed that turning away from Islam toward scientific knowledge would embody a new Kemalist man, highly logical and experimental; thus, Turkish youth was vociferously encouraged to study

⁵¹⁵ Steinbach, p. 78.

⁵¹⁶ “Kemalism (Atatürkçülük in Turkish) is the view oriented for the goal of changing some of the basic structural elements inherited from the Ottoman Empire and of setting up a community inspired by the Western civilization- which was to be regarded as the first step towards the course of world civilization- in lieu of them in the Republic of Turkey. “ See in Şerif Mardin, “Atatürkçülüğün Kökenleri,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 86.

⁵¹⁷ Symbol of torch signifies advancement on the path to civilization. One of the towers exists in the mausoleum of Atatürk (Anıtkabir) is called Tower of Reforms in which a hand raising a radiating torch to the skies symbolizes the reforms that carried the Turkish Republic to the level of contemporary civilization.

⁵¹⁸ *Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, I (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 47.

⁵¹⁹ Atabay, p. 27.

⁵²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 27- 28.

science.⁵²¹ To educate people and thus to bring up a new generation whose members would accept the primacy of rational thinking was the prerequisite for bringing about a society in which science and technique would function properly. Rational thinking constituted the basis of the modernization project of the republican regime; as without making people believe in the inalienability of rationalism and science, even a modern legal system would be able neither to protect nor to sustain the continuance of a society guided by science.

In order to accept the guidance of science, individuals ought to be educated by modern techniques and would be made free from dogmas and open to critical thinking. For this end, among many, the first thing to do was to make secularism accepted in the society as a way to guarantee rights and freedoms gained through a modern democratic system of governance. This was very important for Atatürk who conceived the inevitability of secular thinking for a society in which economy, science and technology would fulfil their functions as they do in civilized countries. In Atatürk's own words he intended to 'explain how a great nation, which was thought to have come to the end of its national existence, had gained its independence and had founded a national and modern state based on the latest principles of science and technology'.⁵²² As being developed meant to reach the level of contemporary civilization and thus to engage in westernization, and thus being modernized, for the ruling elite, modernization was tied to economic and technological development. Since a powerful state apparatus, a modern and effective military securing it, technological power, wealth and etc. was realized in the West, the founders of the republic aimed to forge the state to this level through acting like the West.⁵²³ Thus, western science and technology would be used for strengthening the Turkish infrastructure, economy and political foundation.

The advancement Western countries had gained was tied to their acceptance the guidance of the principles of science and technology. Therefore, for the founding fathers, the task that had to be undertaken was to take the guidance of science and technology if the Turkish society would be carried to the level of contemporary civilization and developed in all fields. Fascinated with European progress, their activity was of modernizing the society with the help of science which was thought as a necessary cure to bring progress and close the civilizational gap between their

⁵²¹ Akural, p. 128.

⁵²² Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 11.

⁵²³ Belge, "Kültür," pp.1294 – 1295.

state and Europe. It was portrayed that the driving force of technology made societies modernized, developed and industrialized. It was assumed that if material change as an inherent part of modernization would be accepted, social and cultural adjustments necessitated by the same change would follow the progress. Within the framework of this new program, realization of westernization especially in the cultural field was sought.⁵²⁴

The principal and most obvious association they made was that modern peoples and nations could marshal empirical data, and control and build global networks that advanced moral progress.⁵²⁵ These broad constructions were wrapped up in what the founding elite considered their national identity—theirs was a modern “civilization.” Their view of history only confirmed these beliefs. In essence, Kemalist modernization was based on this fact which foresaw the search the guidance of science and technology. As the new elite tried to place Turkey on a path of secularization and westernization, what came to be named as Western science became a rallying tool for the Republican elite.⁵²⁶ For the Kemalist elite, faith in technology and moral progress proceeded as the steam age seemed to them to inaugurate a new epoch, one of undeniable progress. It was assumed that the material and technological advances in European society had “moral” repercussions that revealed through civilized material and social progress. The path and the method of Kemalist modernization was summarized by Atatürk in his own words as the following: *“We cannot shut our eyes and assume that we live in isolation. We cannot fence off and live without having any contacts with the world. On the contrary, we shall live on the scene of civilization as a progressive and civilized nation. Such life is possible only through, science and technology. We will take the science and technology from any country wherever they may be found, and put them in the heads of all individuals of the nation. There is no condition or reservation concerning the adoption of science and technology”*.⁵²⁷

Science and modern techniques were seen essential to prevent a society from collapse. Therefore, science and technology were imported by the republican elite as they believed in them as the basis of the Western power and their progress, and thus of the contemporary civilization. For the end which was based on the idea of making the society gain qualities of the civilized

⁵²⁴ Belge, “Cumhuriyet Döneminde Batılılaşma,” p. 260.

⁵²⁵ Thomas, p. 11.

⁵²⁶ Atabay, p. 24.

⁵²⁷ *Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, II (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 367.

nations, the task to be accomplished was covering a whole with its political, economic and socio-cultural aspects. This was why reforms were set out successively in various realms. Besides, Atatürk's revolution and principles embraced the paths of reason and logic that would raise Turkey in the shortest time to the level of contemporary civilization. That Atatürk's method of modernization depended on the principle of "carrying out many a great task in a short time." The measure of time, according to Atatürk, must be envisaged *"by taking into consideration the contemporary concept of speed and movement but not by following the benumbing mentality of the past centuries."*⁵²⁸

As the authority of the new regime gained strength, the extent of those reforms which attempted to modernize the society was extended and henceforth the state made itself felt increasingly throughout the society. That, the republican state embarked on efforts to spread westernization throughout Anatolia.⁵²⁹ The aim of modernizing a social structure completely in the shortest possible time necessitated medium of transmitting the ideas of revolution to the society. Hence, the regime's transport crisis and railway development were being tackled with revolutionary ideas and methods. As a symbol of technology by itself and as a means in conveying the reforms to the different parts of the country, railway became the prototype in the Kemalist modernization whose main pillar was that of scientific and technological advancement. As the technology of the time, this medium would be train which helped to construct the nation-building process not only through binding different areas of country together under a single authority, but also through conveying the revolutionary ideas to the bottom of the society as it provided the chance for state elite to travel to the countryside in a rather easier way.⁵³⁰ Educators, members and other social reformers also used rail line to their advantage to promote their civilizing activities in such peripheral places in inner Anatolia.

⁵²⁸ *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, I (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 37.

⁵²⁹ Belge, "Türkiye'de Günlük Hayat," p. 841.

⁵³⁰ Some of these travels of the state elite including Atatürk are given in photographs in Hasan R. Soyak, *Doğumundan Cumhuriyetin İlanına Kadar Fotoğraflarla Atatürk ve Atatürk'ün Hususiyetleri* (İstanbul: Hayat Yayınları, 1966).

3.2. Railway Development during the Republican Period

Transportation was one of the sectors which showed a marked improvement in the period between 1923 and 1950.⁵³¹ Railways were regarded as one of the most important means for transportation during the republican era.⁵³² As the main actor of the economic affairs, the state took control of railroad transportation into its hand as railroads signified more than an enterprise for the state which was trying to strengthen its authority in every corner of the country at a time when political and economic turmoil both at home and in international arena was posing a threat to the existence of the new regime. While the Great Depression made itself felt and tariff walls were escalating between the states, the state had to find ways to increase the amount of capital and goods. For this end, it had to extend beyond major cities and reached to the inner Anatolia. Economic intentions were not the only reason why the republican regime was in great need of the transportation medium at the time, i.e. railroads; but there were also political, military, social and cultural aims. Rapid economic reconstruction and modernization was intended to realize by concentrating resources on the transport sector, primarily the railways.

Debating the potential place of foreign economic relations in national development, the Kemalist elite recognised a danger of subjugation by foreign powers, but they were confident of averting it through state control of foreign trade and investment. Therefore, railroads had to be nationalized and extended to different areas of the republic as the regime was threatened both from inside and outside. As discontents against to the new regime and its reforms had already led to uprisings, according to the military concerns, limitations were imposed on the construction of railways in some parts of the country.⁵³³ Especially those areas mainly populated by the Kurdish majority were prioritized by the republican elite who were trying to implement a national political agenda which was based on the national rhetoric of homogeneous society with one language, geography and history. In case of any possible revolt, to be able to make military transfer easily to these regions was crucial for the state to show its power in order to sustain the unity of the republic.

⁵³¹ Korkut Boratav, "Türkiye'de Devletçilik," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 416.

⁵³² Tekeli and İlkin, "Türkiye'de Ulaştırmanın Gelişimi," p. 2758.

⁵³³ İnel, p. 424.

In addition to the internal threats the state felt against to its own authority, the republic was cautious about the developments outside its borders. Having experienced the hardship of the mobilization due to lack of efficient means of transportation during both the First World War and the Independence War, the republican elite was aware of the dire need to improve the infrastructure throughout the country as they were following the political atmosphere in the outside world. The shocking defeat on home territory in the First World War marginalised the position of Turkey in Europe. National pride was damaged, as was the prestige of the regime itself both at home and abroad. Although the regime proved itself with the Independence War fought with great hardships, increasingly, state officials of the new regime understood that only by modernising the country's economy and military forces could the regime hope to restore its reputation, guarantee its future and resume an active role in European affairs. To be able to prevent a threat against its borders in a possible war that would erupt in Europe, the state had to have full control over the railroads and to add new roads in certain regions.

Beyond this need for defensive purposes, within the nation-building process, with its target to homogenize the society socially and culturally in accordance with its national program, the state had to reach in every corner of the country. In order to provide the legitimacy of the new regime and sustain the authority of the republic throughout the country, the state had to carry its ideals and reforms to the people whose loyalty needed to be diverted from former ties of tradition including religion and regionalism to the national belonging of the new regime. Accordingly, one of the six principles of the Kemalist ideology, revolutionism necessitated to make people accept the reforms and henceforth to sustain the maintenance of them. “In effect, it expressed the intent of the party to replace any traditional institution it considered inimical to progress”,⁵³⁴ as revolution implied a much wider change. As a first and foremost a code word of the Kemalist method of attaining the particular all-encompassing civilization, revolutionism would feed the basis of the ideology of the state through guaranteeing for the permanency of the other principles. In other words, for the duration of reforms and thus the authority of the regime itself, the reforms had to be approved by the society and this was the target of the principle of

⁵³⁴ Akural, p. 141.

revolutionism promoted by the republic.⁵³⁵ For this end, thus, the state would use railways as a means to disseminate of these revolutionary ideas.

To modernize the society and to reach the level of contemporary civilization was the target of Atatürk's principles which were set down right after the Turkish Struggle for Independence had won. Following the foundation of the Turkish Republic, one of the points or perhaps the first point to be accomplished in the path of civilization was economic development as the biggest problem in front of the founders of the republic was that of economic legacy inherited from the Ottoman Empire.⁵³⁶ In other words, since twelve years of almost continuous warfare had brought enormous losses to an already sparsely peopled and impoverished country, when the Turkish Republic came into being in 1923, the most urgent problem it had to face was that of economic development. As reforms in social and political realms which were not backed by the ones in the economic sphere would be destined to collapse, to build up a national economy was among the first attempts of the republican elite after the proclamation of the change in political authority.

Since the most important aspect of economics was related to the role it played in "the survival of the state" for the founders of the republic, establishment of a national economy that would secure the existence of the state appeared among the main objectives of the republican statesmen.⁵³⁷ For this end, while laws and regulations were issued and congresses were held, the state took the control of big investments through the plans set up in line with the principle of statism. Yet, formidable problems were inherent in this process of modernisation. In a poor economy that lacked capital and infrastructure, on the way to modernization, large scale construction activities were launched as means of communication, highways and vehicles were extremely limited in number. Through the economic policy in which five-year plans were put in action and the structural and institutional modernization of the economic units through the Western science and technology, republican elite was able to build a national economy in which

⁵³⁵ Devoted to the cause of modernization and to a relentless struggle to transform Turkey into a rapidly advancing country capable of playing an important role in the chorus of European nations, the revolution meant among other things a transformation in outlook, the adoption of western ways of life, a fight against ignorance and superstition, the import of new techniques, economic development and, in particular, a constant resort to science. See in Dumont, pp. 34 -35.

⁵³⁶ Insel, p. 420.

⁵³⁷ Ibid., p. 419.

highways, railways, bridges and dams were constructed, and brand new cities were erected in Turkey.

As had the Tanzimat reformers and the westernized Young Turks, Atatürk and the Kemalist elite believed in the merit of exogenous determinants of change.⁵³⁸ As technology and science were seen as the base for the western power and progress, technology of the time, railways were given utmost importance by the republican elite. Complementing each other, for political, economic and socio-cultural reasons, railways were viewed as a way to achieve the goals in these various realms. Beyond these aims, it would be the site for proving the determination of the new regime in following the developments closely and its eagerness to adopt them and to implement them in the Turkish society in the shortest possible time. Beyond their functions in building up a national economy, a nation-state and socio-cultural aims-to conveying reforms to the society, railways were also always used as a mean to propagate the principles of the new regime. They showed that Turks were open to change towards Westernization.⁵³⁹ Railway development dominated the initial stages of this modernisation process, and it remained among the driving forces of economic expansion in 1920s as Kemalist economic policy placed railway development in the forefront, both as an end and means. Its emphasis on new locomotives and wagons embodied the idea of a rapid breakthrough in the reconstruction and modernisation of the country.

“Railway building had been a top priority among the modernization projects of the Kemalist republic.”⁵⁴⁰ By itself, it became a site for a modernization discourse as in every kilometre of rail line; the state saw itself to take a step in the path towards the end of reaching the level of contemporary civilization. In every opening of a new station, the republican elite used this as a way to legitimize its power through attributing to its principles, differentiating itself from the older regime, to refer to the outside world, and even during the multi-party trials, for strengthening its stance as a party in intra-state politics. It was a way to legitimize itself, and thus the principles over which the republican regime took its ground, among which the aim of

⁵³⁸ Akural, p. 142.

⁵³⁹ In the Kemalist view, to demonstrate to the world that Kemalist Turkey was indeed civilized was the “second independence war” or the “moral (manevi) independence war” against the ‘darkness’ and uncivilized political, social, and cultural phenomena.

⁵⁴⁰ Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, p. 262.

reaching the level of civilizations was put forward as an ultimate goal for the new generations to fulfil as a task inherited from the founder of the republic.

3.2.1. A Brief History of Railway Development

In the wake of military defeat and the collapse of the imperial regime, the old state railways were unable to meet the transportation demands of the Turkish nation and accumulated massive deficits.⁵⁴¹ To overcome these problems, and to help hold the country together under the new regime, the fledgling republican government unified state railways under its newly established Ministry of Public Works. As establishing an independent national economy was the target the republican elite was striving for, railroads were among those sectors which had to be taken under state control in order to get rid of western imperial pressure.⁵⁴² Hence, “the railway gained a new significance with the establishment of the Turkish Republic.”⁵⁴³

In 1923 the republic inherited the Baghdad Railway which ran from Istanbul to Konya, Adana and Aleppo, with connections to Ankara and Izmir. Eastern and central Anatolia, however, were almost entirely without modern transport.⁵⁴⁴ After the revolution, the new Turkish government quickly displayed a positive attitude towards railway investment, including post-war modernisation. The task of the republican modernization plan for railway infrastructure was to develop the advantages of the country’s cross-road position and its transit potential with an aim to enhance its integration into the European continent and to support the economic development of the country while providing continuous increase of quality of transport services.

One of the main concerns of the state, development of railways had a crucial stance among the government projects that were realized. Therefore, although Turkey emerged from more than ten years of war exhausted and poverty stricken, even in this wretched state, the country allocated a considerable lump of its budget to the national railway system.⁵⁴⁵ Regarding railway technology, the role played by the military at the initial stage of the opening of the

⁵⁴¹ For further information about the railways during this period, see Mehmet Özdemir, *Mütareke ve Kurtuluş Savaşı'nın Başlangıç Döneminde Türk Demir Yolları: Yapısal ve Ekonomik Sorunları (1918-1920)* (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2001).

⁵⁴² Establishing a politically and economically independent state and abolishing every kind of western privilege were the aims of the principles set out by the new regime in political and socio-economic realms. See in A. Afetinan, *Devletçilik İlkesi ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin Birinci Sanayi Planı 1933* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1972), p. 1.

⁵⁴³ Toprak, p. 20.

⁵⁴⁴ Hale, p. 157.

⁵⁴⁵ Toprak, p. 20.

railways ought not to be overlooked. Although inadequacy of railroads depending on their spread to limited area designated by the foreign investors who built the network in the economically developed regions rather than the whole country caused serious damage during the war, railroads which were the part of the Independence War basically fulfilled its role as a vehicle of military use. In other words, during the period when the lack of an efficient transportation system was the major problem, railroads served in some of the strategic missions to a certain extent. One of the critical aspects of railway, its potency as a military technology, was both literally and symbolically central to the national struggle that transportation of troops and logistic material to the fronts became possible through the railroads that were inherited from the Ottoman Empire.

The operation of railroads during the Independence War served for the new regime in two fronts that not only they played a strategic role in gaining the national struggle, but also experiences afforded during the period became crucial to railroad development when the new regime was founded. The significance of railroads during the war years would play the determining role in the railroad policy of the founders of the republic who experienced the trauma of the long war years, observed the role of railroads in the national struggle. Military leaders of the war years became the bureaucratic leaders in the new regime and gave due attention to the railway development in the republic. The close relation between the national defence and the railroad development was very effective in the decision for the urgent need for the nationalization of railroads in order to abolish the foreign control over them. As the First World War and the Independence War demonstrated the importance of railways and necessity of the change in railway policies, the state was forced to take control of the railways.

Indeed, the Turkish Republic inherited from the Ottoman Empire both technical personnel- who got experienced in the construction of railroads during the imperial period- and an extended railway network. Yet, transportation policy in the republican era distinguished from the previous period on certain fronts such as dependence on railways to a large extent in transportation policy, prioritizing the unity of the domestic market over integrity into the international market, purchase of infrastructure companies from foreign hands, and the increasing role of the state in railway operations.⁵⁴⁶ Since the beginning, while the military concerns were of prime importance in the decision to improve the railway network,

⁵⁴⁶ Tekeli and İlkin, "Türkiye'de Ulaştırmanın Gelişimi," p. 2761.

administrators of the republic sought to ensure the economic development of the country as well.⁵⁴⁷ “With an eye to security, as well as to the need for connecting agricultural regions in the interior with national and international markets, the government began an energetic program of extending the Ankara line eastwards to Sivas and Erzurum and linking Diyarbakir with Fevzipaşa the pre-war Baghdad Railway.”⁵⁴⁸

The Independence War and the railroads were twin engines in the development of modern Turkey, operating with independent causes and effects but simultaneously and in relation to one another. The convulsive working out of war, technology, and the modern nation over three decades was what made the building of a modern Turkish Republic. Under the circumstances of the time, railway development had a utilitarian aspect due to the economic and political situation in the country. The construction of a railway network connecting the inland to the major cities and especially to the capital of the state was necessary for political stability. The link between railroads and national defence would keep its position in the formation of the new state along with the economic implications the railroad would affect. In addition to the roles it played in economic and socio-cultural realms, military aims following the political concerns of authority were always being the determinants in railway policy of the regime. The sites for the addition of new lines were quite related to the strategic aims, especially related to the Kurdish issue the state had to deal at the time. The importance of the railways was recognized after the rebellions referring to the vulnerability of the state from the viewpoint of defence.

From both military and commercial standpoints, it was essential and inevitable that all railways in Turkey be standardized under the state rule serving to the cause of nationalization. For the national concerns, lines which were operated by foreign capital had to be nationalized and railway construction policy had to be adjusted in accordance with the national goals. Nationalization of railways which were in the hands of the foreigners during the Ottoman Empire was followed by the transformation of these lines into a national railway network in order to provide integrity to the transportation for the domestic market.⁵⁴⁹

⁵⁴⁷ Tekeli and İlkin, “Türkiye’de Ulaştırmanın Gelişimi,” p. 2761.

⁵⁴⁸ Hale, p. 157.

⁵⁴⁹ Tekeli and İlkin, “Türkiye’de Ulaştırmanın Gelişimi,” p. 2758.

Excluding the 1922-23 phase of second attempt of Chester Group⁵⁵⁰, the Izmir Congress of 1923 constituted the milestone in understanding the railway development in the republican era. By early 1923, in the Izmir Economy Congress, railroads were taken as one of the problems that would be tackled by the new state. In order to improve the economic conditions of the country, the development of railroads was stressed in the congress for enabling an efficient transportation and connection between production centres and market places. In the congress, the need for improvement in the transportation network in general including canals, harbours, and roads and the demand for a railroad construction in particular were expressed that Atatürk stated: “*We must turn our country into a network of railways and. motor roads ... for while the West and the world use cars and trains, we cannot compete against them with donkeys and ox-carts on natural tracks.*”⁵⁵¹

In addition to that, another important issue that was held in the congress for the development of the national economy was about financing of these transportation investments. As a war-ridden country, one of the main problems in economics during the early republican period was the lack of capital in initiating investments for building a national economy. Characterized as capital-intensive investment, financing transportation infrastructure such as railroad construction necessitated large sums of capital the new regime would not be able to cope with. Thus, to deal with such a big investment, foreign capital was inalienable for the development of the national economy. Yet, benefiting from Western capital and technology was tied to national interests, as precautions were stated in the congress report in order to prevent privileges that investor countries would possibly try to gain from their investments in Turkish railway construction. It meant that having the Ottoman example in terms of the concessions

⁵⁵⁰ The first phase of the Chester Project covered the period between 1908 and 1914 during the Ottoman rule. The second attempt in the republican period was mainly related to the construction of railroads between Ankara and Mosul, stretching from the west of Anatolia to the east. Although the law regarding the project was approved in 1923 by the National Assembly, in the following months it failed to be realized due to exterior conditions. Despite its failure, the project was important in showing the intention of the new regime to construct a railway network in the country and its willingness to use foreign capital in development of infrastructures. This liberal policy would be accepted as a method in the public work program of 1923. For further details, see Bilmez B. Can, “Suya Düşen Bir Tatlı Hayal: Şarki Anadolu Demiryolları,” *Kebikeç*, no. 11 (2001), pp. 165 – 204 and Can, *Demiryolundan Petrole Chester Projesi, (1908-1923)*.

⁵⁵¹ *Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, III (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), 571.

granted to foreign investors regarding kilometric guarantees, profit guarantees and/or natural resource usage, the new regime was aware of the negative aspects of the previous experience.⁵⁵²

Until the Great Depression hit the world's economy in 1929, development strategy was drawn on the encouragement of free enterprise during the 1920s. In practice, state entrepreneurship during the 1920s was largely limited to basic public utilities and state monopolies, which had a primarily fiscal purpose and of the former, the railways were easily the most important.⁵⁵³ With the decision the government took in 1924 to buy out the foreign-owned railway companies, while 3000 kilometres of track had been bought and another 2400 still remained in foreign hands by 1930, eventually all would be bought by the Turkish state.⁵⁵⁴ The government at first hoped that progressive cultural and political reforms under a self-reliant, anti-imperialist regime would automatically yield substantial economic development through private enterprise.⁵⁵⁵ This was why the state itself did not attempt to evolve into a major actor in securing economic development until the failure of the private sector to fulfil the expectation for the realization of economic development, together with the 1929 depression and its unfavourable effects on the Turkish economy, the reluctance to involve foreigners in economic activity, and the apparent economic successes of the Soviet Union all contributed to the evolution of a policy of etatism⁵⁵⁶, or state capitalism.⁵⁵⁷ In other words, inability of the republican regime in taking crucial steps regarding rapid economic progress in its first decade together with the developments appeared in domestic and international arena in 1930s led to the adoption of etatist policies.⁵⁵⁸ Therefore, "etatism was an almost inescapable solution to the host of problems Turkey faced in the early 1930s."⁵⁵⁹

The serious economic crisis erupted in 1929 revealed the need for the government to review the economic policy preminent at the time.⁵⁶⁰ That, with the economic depression,

⁵⁵² Gündüz A. Ökçün, *Türkiye İktisat Kongresi 1923-İzmir: Haberler-Belgeler-Yorumlar* (Ankara: Sermaye Piyasası Kurulu, 1997), p. 67.

⁵⁵³ Hale, p. 157.

⁵⁵⁴ Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, p. 195.

⁵⁵⁵ Akural, p. 139.

⁵⁵⁶ "Etatism meant, in effect, the intervention of the state as a pioneer and director of industrial activity, in the interests of national development and security, in a country where private enterprise was either suspect or ineffective." See in Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, p. 471.

⁵⁵⁷ Turan, p. 110.

⁵⁵⁸ Kepenek, p. 1764.

⁵⁵⁹ Hershlag, p. 175.

⁵⁶⁰ Çavdar, "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk İktisadi Düşüncesi," p. 1077.

etatism would become the backbone determining the economic policy of the republic. Although “some development had already been undertaken in the first ten years of the republic, notably in the extension of the railways and the organization of the tobacco, match, and alcohol monopolies”⁵⁶¹, under the conditions prevailing in Turkey, particularly during the world crisis, an active role in the economic field was incumbent upon the state. Accordingly, five-year plans were launched successively, as etatism was promulgated in 1931. In 1936 the ruling party, RPP, had it written as an amendment to the constitution. In essence, etatism foresaw the active participation of state in economic life in order to lead the country in the shortest time possible to prosperity although private enterprise would continue to be fundamental in Turkey’s economic system. Even though existence of private sector was kept as fundamental to economy, with etatist economic policy, state would become an active participatory in investments.⁵⁶² A National Industrial Development Plan was prepared in 1933 and put into effect during the 1934-1938 period as the industrial backbone of Turkey, comprising the State Economic Enterprises, was in large part built during this time.⁵⁶³ In parallel with the protectionist policies, restrictions over the foreign capital were concentrated in the years following 1930 during which most of the nationalizations were carried out mainly in municipal services, sectors of mining and railways.⁵⁶⁴

The main target of etatism was rapid economic development in support of political and economic independence⁵⁶⁵, and the state was able to reach this aim. That significant success was registered in overall economic growth, in laying the foundations for modern industry, and in the efficient mobilization of resources.⁵⁶⁶ Financing new industrial enterprises, together with regulations in trade including tariff protection, was made the state play an important role in economic development. Etatist policy of the republican regime was not solely limited to the investment in industry, but also included the administration of public goods including mines, forests, canals etc. Management of industries, electric network and petroleum were taken under

⁵⁶¹ Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, p. 471.

⁵⁶² Emerged in the 1920s and 1930s as a pragmatic experiment in etatism, the Turkish development strategy was derived from Kemalism, the brain child of Kemal Atatürk, but its articulation and implementation owed more to such faithful followers as Ismet İnönü who personally elaborated and encouraged etatism, putting his imprint on such projects as the construction of state railroads and the design of protectionist industrialization policies. See in Özey, p. 49.

⁵⁶³ Turan, p. 110.

⁵⁶⁴ Boratav, p. 415.

⁵⁶⁵ Hershlag, p. 174.

⁵⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

the state control while foreign trade was monopolized in 1931. Together with these steps taken for the establishment of a national economy, the development of the means of transportation, despite its cost and difficulty in the rugged terrain of Anatolia, was the second requisite to Turkey's economic advancement.

Within the policy for foundation of a national economy, "the state did interfere where major investments were concerned and by far the most important investment concerned railway building."⁵⁶⁷ Emerged as the principle source of economic activity in accordance with the principle of etatism, the state owned the major industries of the country including railways. As industrial plans were closely associated with railway routes, railway lines formed the main arteries of the domestic market, linking every corner of the country together.⁵⁶⁸ The railway was a key part of national policy that the government was determined to build a web of railway lines across the country, and equally determined that these should not be placed in foreign hands.⁵⁶⁹ In this period, with the increasing interest of the state in control of economics, the ultimate aim was to establish an integrated domestic market through nationalization of the infrastructure companies by purchasing them from the foreign capital.⁵⁷⁰

Nationalization of railroads which were used to be in the hands of foreign capital in the previous period constituted one part of the state's railroad policy. Etatist policies were effective in the railroad policy during the period between 1931 and 1940 when twenty foreign companies including railroad companies were nationalized. Therefore, this period witnessed the fastest new railroad construction with an average of 250 km. each year.⁵⁷¹ For the other part of the republican railroad policy, the state aimed to construct new lines throughout the country in accordance with how national integrity and functioning of a national market necessitated. During the early republican period, construction of railways was evaluated as a tool serving for the development of the national economy and was directed to ensure the distribution of the productive resources domestically while concerns for defence had also played an important role

⁵⁶⁷ Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, p. 195.

⁵⁶⁸ Toprak, p. 21.

⁵⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 20.

⁵⁷⁰ Tekeli and İlkin, "Türkiye'de Ulaştırmanın Gelişimi," p. 2761.

⁵⁷¹ Doğan Avcıoğlu, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün, Bugün, Yarın* (İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 1987), pp. 451, 456.

in the arrangement as well.⁵⁷² Accordingly, eight hundred kilometres of track were laid between 1923 and 1929, and in 1929 another 800 kilometres were under construction.”⁵⁷³

3.2.2. Railroads under the Republican Rule

When the Turkish Republic was declared in 1923, approximately 4.000 km. of the lines built and operated by various foreign companies remained within the national borders of the new State.⁵⁷⁴ “In 1923 the government had considered allowing private companies to operate the new lines, but in 1927 their ownership was transferred to an annexed budget institution, the General Directorate of Railways and Ports.”⁵⁷⁵ “Meanwhile, the government decided to buyout the foreign-owned railways, beginning in 1928 with the Istanbul-Adana and Mersin-Adana lines.”⁵⁷⁶ These lines were nationalized by Law No: 506, passed on 24.05.1924 and establishing the "General Directorate of Anatolian-Baghdad Railways". Following Law No: 1042 passed on 31.05.1927 the name was changed to "General Administration of State Railways and Ports" in order to unite the railway construction and operational activities under one authority and to broaden the scope of functioning. The nationalization of the existing lines operated by private companies involved the state in a debt of some 350,000,000 Swiss francs.

The government concentrated on an expansion of the railway network. More than 2,000 miles of new railroads were constructed by the state during the years 1927-45. With the objective of transporting goods in a most efficient way, the republican state made railway construction an industrial priority, and by 1940 the railway network was almost doubled by reaching 8637 kilometres. The sums spent for these new lines, which passed mostly through still thinly populated areas, represented up to World War II some 8 or 9 percent of the annual governmental expenditure, totalling in all some 350-400,000,000 Turkish Liras. Thus, railway construction and operation developed by the government led eventually to the formation of a Turkish national railway system. That, the administration functioning as a supplementary budgeted public enterprise until 29.07.1953 was converted to a Public Economical Enterprise under the name

⁵⁷² Arif Merdol, “Cumhuriyet Dönemi Ulaşım Modelleri,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 10 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 2772.

⁵⁷³ Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, p. 195.

⁵⁷⁴ The young Republic inherited 4559 kilometres of railway lines from the Ottoman Empire.

⁵⁷⁵ Hale, p. 157.

⁵⁷⁶ Ibid.

"Republic of Turkey General Directorate of State Railways Administration (TCDD)" with a government decree No: 233 in power of law.

In terms of transportation, Anatolia experienced a railway revolution in the first 25 years of the Kemalist regime.⁵⁷⁷ The period from the War of Independence until the end of the Second World War showed a quite homogeneous nature in terms of the transportation policy of the republican regime.⁵⁷⁸ Two methods were applied to implement the national and independent railway policy. First method was to build new railways in order to establish a network structure which would ensure the national integrity and national economy. Second method was to nationalize the railways by purchasing those lines which were in the hands of foreign companies. These companies whose investments concentrated on railways during the Ottoman Empire continued to work in the early years of the republic and were nationalized after 1928.⁵⁷⁹ Between 1922 and 1927, the state tried to develop rail networks with limited domestic resources. Railway construction process continued slowly until 1927. From 1927 onwards until 1933, the government changed this strategy and resorted to foreign capital for railroad construction.⁵⁸⁰ With this policy change, construction process accelerated with foreign companies which provided medium-term loans to the government for railway construction. However, due to financial difficulties and poor work quality offered by foreign companies, duration of constructions extended and serious technical problems occurred in building of railways.

The effect of 1929 world economic crisis on Turkey was felt in 1931 and it resulted in the decline of railway construction in 1931 and 1932. As the impact of the depression decreased and construction contracts started to be given to Turkish companies, railway construction accelerated again in the following years. During 1930s, with the etatist policies adopted by the government, nationalization of railroads was prioritized. The length of the constructed railways reached to

⁵⁷⁷ Between 1923 and 1950, the constructed railways were 3000km Freight in railway transport was 20 tone-km per person in 1923, 79 tone-km per person in 1938 and increased to 147 tone-km in 1950. Key indicators related to transport sector indicate that railway lines which were 4,100 km in 1929, increased to 5,100 km in 1929, to 7,100 km in 1938, to 7500 km in 1945 and, to 7700 km in 1950. The reason behind the rapid increase in length of the railways between 1929 and 1945 was the statist policies corresponded from 1930 to 1938. For more information, see Boratav, p. 416.

⁵⁷⁸ Tekeli and İlkin, "Türkiye'de Ulaştırmanın Gelişimi," p. 2761.

⁵⁷⁹ "Haydarpaşa was also nationalized during this period." See in Seyfettin Gürsel, "Dış Borçlar," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), p. 471.

⁵⁸⁰ İlhan Tekeli and Selim İlkin, "Cumhuriyetin Demiryolu Politikalarının Oluşumu ve Uygulaması," *Kebikeç*, no. 11 (2001), p. 138.

3186 km. in this period. The railway construction slowed again between 1939 and 1945 due to the Second World War. From 1923 until 1935, railway connection between western and central Anatolia was completed while during the period between 1935 and 1945, the link from the inner parts to eastern Anatolia was accomplished with the construction of junction lines.⁵⁸¹ Among the main concerns of the state at the time, development of railroads was conducted through realization of new projects as well as nationalization of the old lines. Hence, the railway development during the republican era could be examined in two parts; construction of new lines and nationalization of existing ones in the following part.⁵⁸²

3.2.3. Railways Constructed by the State

Following the proclamation of the republic, as in all areas, railways were handled in accordance with the national policy by the republican administrators who saw the economic development to be depended first and foremost to the infrastructure and strove for construction of railroads in the country.⁵⁸³ “A fairly adequate railway network had been constructed in western Anatolia in the Ottoman era, but the Erzurum and Diyarbakır plateaus, which formerly had not even been regarded as part of Anatolia, now belonged inseparably to it, and the railway had to be extended eastwards.”⁵⁸⁴ Between 1924 and 1945, 3383 km long new rail lines were laid.⁵⁸⁵ From 1923 to 1945, on average 200 km long line was added per year and railway network expanded up to 7500 km.⁵⁸⁶ The first step the government took in railway development was to deal with construction of railroads between certain centres and the new capital Ankara. As the cosmopolitan port of Istanbul had to be relegated to the background, from now on every road would lead to Ankara which was rebuilt and equipped with the best transportation and communications facilities.⁵⁸⁷ The main railway lines which were constructed by the state during the republican period could be listed as in the below.

⁵⁸¹ Merdol, p. 2772.

⁵⁸² Within the constraints of the thesis, construction and nationalization of some main lines are explained. For detailed analysis about the railway development during the republican era, see İsmail Yıldırım, *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Demiryolları, 1923-1950* (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 2001); Tekeli and İlkin, “Türkiye’de Ulaştırmanın Gelişimi,” and “Cumhuriyetin Demiryolu Politikalarının Oluşumu ve Uygulaması”; and Merdol.

⁵⁸³ Yıldırım, p. 85.

⁵⁸⁴ Toprak, p. 20.

⁵⁸⁵ Tekeli and İlkin, “Türkiye’de Ulaştırmanın Gelişimi,” p. 2761.

⁵⁸⁶ Merdol, p. 2772.

⁵⁸⁷ Toprak, p. 20.

Ankara- Sivas Line

Ankara-Sivas line was the most important rail line in the republican era and its first part which was 80 km opened for business in 1915. During the First World War and the national struggle, due to the lack of railway network in the east of Ankara, difficulties had been experienced. These difficulties determined the railway policy of the new regime. As a result, Ankara- Sivas line would be among the first railway line that was handled in the republican period. Initially, the line was built for military purposes, and later the route of the railway was changed due to the economic benefits. The line was 602 km long and its construction was completed in 1930.⁵⁸⁸

Samsun- Sivas Line

Samsun-Sivas line was important for the government as it linked Samsun, Black Sea port city, to Ankara. Its construction started in 1924 and 372 km line was completed in 7 years.⁵⁸⁹ Due to the geographical conditions, the construction time was extended and the money spent was more than expected by the state.

Kütahya- Balıkesir Line

The purpose of the Kütahya-Balıkesir line was to have the shortest path between western Anatolia and Ankara. Its construction began in 1925 in Kütahya.⁵⁹⁰ 242 km long Kütahya-Balıkesir line was completed in 1932.⁵⁹¹ 954 km long Ankara-Balıkesir transport before the construction, decreased to 592 km after the completion of this line. As a result, the way from western Anatolia to Ankara was shortened and this line became one of the most important railway lines in the republican Turkey.⁵⁹²

Ulukışla - Kayseri Line

There were two main objectives behind the construction of Ulukışla-Kayseri line. One of them was of connecting the Black Sea and the Mediterranean Sea, and the other was providing the economic improvement of production centres like Kayseri. Its construction began in 1928

⁵⁸⁸ H. Woods,, *Economic Conditions in Turkey* (London, 1934), p. 33.

⁵⁸⁹ Mehmet Ferit, "Buhran ve Bizim Demiryollarımız," *Demiryolları Mecmuası*, vol. 8, no.85 (March 1932), p. 26.

⁵⁹⁰ *Demiryolları Mecmuası*, vol. 5, no. 46 (I.Kanun 1928), p. 85.

⁵⁹¹ *Demiryolları Mecmuası*, vol. 8, no. 88 (June 1932), pp. 267 – 268.

⁵⁹² Yıldırım, p. 82.

and was completed in 1993.⁵⁹³ Before the construction of this line, between Ankara and Adana was 1066 km. However, after completion, it was decreased to 699 km. Hence, this line provided the transportation of products harvested from Çukurova to inland in a faster and cheaper way.

Fevzipaşa-Diyarbakır Line

Construction of the Fevzipaşa-Diyarbakır line started in 1927 and was completed in 1935. The reason for the long construction period was the negative impact of the 1929 world economic depression on the Turkish economics between 1931 and 1932.⁵⁹⁴ By the completion of this line which was 404 km, the cost of copper operation became cheaper as its transportation became easier. By the construction of this line, republican government reached one of the objectives of its railway policy that in this period in which railways were seen as an important factor in operation of economic resources of the country, reaching to copper was a significant step taken in this regard.⁵⁹⁵

Filyos-Irmak Line

Filyos-Irmak line was planned with the aim of smooth transportation of the Zonguldak coal to the inner parts of the country. Started in 1927, 390 km. long line was completed in 1935.⁵⁹⁶ Due to military reasons, its planned route was changed and the distance of the line was extended. One of the economic objectives of the government it aimed to reach with the construction of this line was to reach to coal of the region and with the completion of this line, this goal was achieved.

Afyon-Karakuyu Line

As İzmir-Aydın line was not connected to the railway network of the country, it constituted an obstacle to the economic development of the country and resulted in significant drawbacks in terms of military.⁵⁹⁷ The construction of this line between Afyon and Karakuyu was intended to solve this problem. Started in 1934 by Afyon and reached to 112 km, this line provided the connection between the region and the country's other railways. Through this way,

⁵⁹³Yakup H. Kalgay, "Bir Karış Fazla Demiryolu Siyasetimiz ve Mesut Neticeleri," *Demiryolları Dergisi*, vol.19, no. 224-226 (I. Teşrin-I. Kanun 1943), pp. 64 - 65.

⁵⁹⁴ Yıldırım, p. 88.

⁵⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 90.

⁵⁹⁶ *Demiryolları Mecmuası*, vol. 11, no. 130 (I. Kanun 1935), p. 506.

⁵⁹⁷ Yıldırım, p. 95.

the economic goal that was desired was reached that transportation between the western Anatolia and the other regions became cheaper.

Sivas-Erzurum Line

The construction of this line had an important stance in the republican railway policy⁵⁹⁸ that its building was given to a Turkish company instead of foreign investors who were active in dealing with railway infrastructure before. Its construction started in 1933 from Sivas and it was completed sixteen months earlier than what was planned. With the success of Turkish company, this line was completed earlier and it reached to Erzurum in 1939.⁵⁹⁹

Malatya-Çetinkaya Line

The purpose of the Malatya-Çetinkaya line was to connect the country's eastern part with the south-eastern regions together with Mediterranean. Construction of this line was started in the tenth anniversary of the republic, in 29 October 1933.⁶⁰⁰ It was completed earlier than what was planned and 140 km of the line was opened for business in 1937.⁶⁰¹ With the construction of this line, the distance of railway transportation considerably shortened.

Diyarbakır-Kurtalan Line

In the railway policy of the republican government, one of the goals was to reach to the borders of the country through railways. Previously, railways had reached to Diyarbakır; but due to the financial problems, reaching to the border could not be achieved. Started in 1937 with the participation of Kemal Atatürk in its opening ceremony, the aim of the Diyarbakır-Kurtalan line was to reach borders of Iraq and Iran via railways.⁶⁰² Although the completion of this line was delayed due to the Second World War, 159 km was completed in 1944.

⁵⁹⁸ Kemal Atatürk stated the necessity of the railways from Ankara to Erzurum in a speech in Erzurum in 1924 as he stated that “Şarkı diğer vatan aksamına bağlayacak bir şimendifer hatının buraya (Erzurum) kadar temdidini Türk Cumhuriyeti için hayati bir mesele addediyorum”.

⁵⁹⁹ Woods, p. 30.

⁶⁰⁰ *T.C. Nafia Vekaleti Bayındırlık İşleri Dergisi*, vol. 6, no. 6 (II. Teşrin 1939), p. 19.

⁶⁰¹ *Demiryolları Dergisi*, vol. 13, no. 153 (II. Teşrin 1937), p. 370.

⁶⁰² *Demiryolları Dergisi*, vol. 17, no. 197-200 (I. Teşrin 1941), p. 803.

3.2.4. Nationalization of the Existing Rail Lines

When the Republic was declared, 3,756 km long railway was under operation of foreign companies.⁶⁰³ Under the conditions specified in the Treaty of Lausanne, the state renegotiated the ownership of the railways with the foreign companies under the policy of nationalization. Taken over foreign capital in this area, the republic regarded the refinement of it within a certain period of time as an aim for economic policy.⁶⁰⁴ Once run by foreign investors under the Ottoman rule, railroads were among those utilities which were taken under state provision and nationalized. With this nationalization policy of the state that started with purchasing of 1378 km long line in 1924, the total railways which were nationalized during the process reached to 3840 km until 1948.⁶⁰⁵

Purchase of Anatolian and Mersin-Adana Railways

According to the Treaty of Sevres (1920), the Anatolian, Mersin-Adana, and Baghdad Railways within the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire were managed by British, French and Italian financial groups.⁶⁰⁶ French and British strove for establishing greater control over these railways and the British was able to get the control as they became the owner of these lines through the company established with the name of “National Railways of Turkey”.

In the parliamentary commissions relating to the purchase of these lines, the issue of nationalization was taken with great significance.⁶⁰⁷ Although the government initially was against the purchase of Anatolian Railways because of financial reasons, they have acted according to the opinion of the majority of the parliament on the purchase of these lines. The Anatolian railway which was 1032 km and Mersin-Tarsus-Adana railway which was 68 km were purchased with the law enacted in 1928, through which the first nationalizations of the railways were realized.

⁶⁰³ Yıldırım, p. 123.

⁶⁰⁴ Çavdar, “Devralınan İktisadi Miras,” p. 1059.

⁶⁰⁵ Yıldırım, p. 145.

⁶⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 125.

⁶⁰⁷ *TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 106 – 107.

Purchase of Mudanya-Bursa Railway

As the owner company of Mudanya-Bursa railway became unable to run this line due to the competition of other means of transportation, it wanted to sell this 41 km long line to the government.⁶⁰⁸ Although the government did not want to buy this line at first, this line was acquired in 1931 with the idea that the possible impair the suspension of railway transportation would give to the people of the region.

Purchase of Samsun-Çarşamba Railway

Since the company which was the owner of the Samsun Railway was making losses, it came to agreement for the acquisition of the line by the government in 1933. Government nationalized the line in 1935 in order to avoid economic difficulties the people of the region might face in case of halting the operation.⁶⁰⁹

Purchase of İzmir-Kasaba Railway

In 1927, there was a six-year agreement between government and the company which operated the İzmir- Kasaba Railway. According to this agreement, the right to purchase of this line belonged to the state. At the end of the sixth year, the company and the government could not come to a new agreement as the company wanted to keep operating the line without improving the infrastructure. Since this was not acceptable by the government, it made attempts to buy this line. Hence, the line was purchased with a law passed in 1934.⁶¹⁰

Purchase of İzmir-Aydın Railway

609 km long İzmir-Aydın railway started from İzmir passed through Afyon and reached to Eğridir. After national struggle, when the company which had operated this line wanted to acquire it, the government gave positive response to the acquisition of this line. Thus, the company continued to operate the line smoothly between 1923 and 1933.⁶¹¹ As the profit of

⁶⁰⁸ TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, vol. 1, no. 16, p. 1.

⁶⁰⁹ TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, vol. 15, no. 203, p. 1.

⁶¹⁰ Kalgay, p. 67.

⁶¹¹ Yıldırım, p. 135.

operating of this line decreased with the impact of 1929 crisis, the company sold this line to the government. After negotiations, the state got the ownership of Izmir-Aydın line in 1935.⁶¹²

Purchase of Şark Railways

Despite its geographical and economic importance, this line was not properly operated by the owner company. Thus, the government interfered into the situation, as the commissions established in 1936. The company and the government came to an agreement about the purchasing of this line by the government. In 1937, the line started its operation under the state control.⁶¹³

Purchase of Baghdad Railway

Planned as 2000 km long, but completed to 1319 km, the Baghdad railway was inherited from the Ottoman Empire and 966 km of it remained within the boundaries of the republic.⁶¹⁴ Since Çukurova was occupied by the French forces during the First World War, the operation of this line was given to a French company. With various agreements in the succeeding years following the war, this line was purchased by the Turkish state.

3.3. Impact of Railways on the Modernization Process under the Republican Rule

3.3.1. Railways as a Site for Legitimation of the State Power through the Modernization Discourse

This chapter quests how the newly founded state positioned itself as the legal power through the discourse it used for railway development as a sign for modernization in order to differentiate itself from its predecessor and to strengthen its authority as a modern nation-state throughout the society. For the modernization discourse of the Turkish Republic through which religion ought to be replaced by nationalism as a unifying force, the state ideology was based on the ground where secular understanding became the milestones of the rationalism, scientism and positivism of the new state. According to the Kemalist elites in Turkey, as the main obsession

⁶¹² Ali Çetinkaya, "Aydın Demiryolunun Satın Alınması," *Ülkü*, vol.5, no.28 (June 1935), p. 324.

⁶¹³ Yıldırım, p. 140.

⁶¹⁴ Kalgay, p. 63.

was the technological backwardness, positivism served as an ideology that was giving a commensurate response to this need.⁶¹⁵

Railways contributed to the modernization process both in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey. Yet, the role railways played in Turkish modernization was quite important to the extent that it was among those factors which were to be called keystones of modernization. The railway symbolized the "civilization and enlightenment" policy of the republican regime. It was the symbol of a new, modern state for Turkey and its people. It was the site for the new regime to differentiate itself from the older one and to show their willingness to be part of contemporary civilization referring to the West.

The decision to inaugurate a railway system in the Ottoman Empire was taken in direct response to foreign pressure, in particular, to British diplomatic and commercial interests. The railway in the new regime, on the other hand, began as a political railway and the industrial aspects arose later. Change over to the modern standards with an eye to technological independence and giving priority to development symbolized with construction of railways, thus railway policy became a political issue. For the new regime, it meant to reach the level of civilized nations, to differentiate itself from the past and to build a nation-state. Being a product of the national movement, modern Turkey was a societal process which denied all its ties with the previous structure and aimed to overcome the barriers of the traditional Islamic society.⁶¹⁶ With its founding aspirations to identify itself as different and removed from its Ottoman origins, in order to shed the burden of heritage, Atatürk established a modern, secular Turkish nation.

This was why the republican regime, although inherited more than half of the total lines from the Ottoman Empire; could still use the discourse of modernization through railway development in order to prove its difference from the older regime on the basis of modern science. Cultural material left behind in the wake of Ottoman displacement from the apex of Turkey's political and social hierarchy became an exigent cause for and target of deliberate reinterpretation to suit the new political direction of the country.⁶¹⁷ Railways as a metaphor of

⁶¹⁵ Belge, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Batılılaşma," p. 264.

⁶¹⁶ Sencer, p. 564.

⁶¹⁷ This view was upheld by Mustafa Kemal himself: "If you remember the past of some six years ago," he said at the end of the twenties, "you will realize that we now have different foundations and different principles governing

modernization were used as a site for the state to firm its power through stressing its revolutionary basis where “each new station was a means of strengthening the Republican discourse.”⁶¹⁸ Railways became the site for limited engagement with the Ottoman past and served as signposts for a modern future.

The building of railways had been such an important part of the Kemalist modernization scheme that beyond its role in the project of nation-building⁶¹⁹, railway development was articulated as a symbol of modernization. The tenth-anniversary celebrations of the Republic in 1933 symbolized the consolidation of the Kemalist regime in Turkey. That the transition of the People’s Party from a fairly closed, elitist, political organization whose activities were confined almost completely to the National Assembly, to one which attempted to monopolize cultural and social life in order to make the mass of the people aware of the Kemalist modernization programme was symbolized by the celebrations of the tenth anniversary of the republic in 1933.⁶²⁰ The striking characteristic of these celebrations showed how the ruling elites preferred to portray material achievements – such as the construction of railways, factories, and bridges – as the major achievements of the young Republic.⁶²¹ The Tenth Year Anthem, which was written in 1933 and still sung at many national holidays and celebrations, announced the success of the regime in transportation with the following line, which was added by Mustafa Kemal: “We have covered the motherland with the iron nets from end to end.”⁶²²

The sense of urgency about resuming the modernisation drive, the railways appeared as the first priority for a rapid breakthrough on the ‘bloodless front’ to re-launch the process of national modernisation and development. In his speech on August 30, 1930, in Sivas, İnönü

the state, the common relations between members of the nation, the advance on the way to civilization-in one word everything that concerns our structure, our organization and our national needs. These great changes effected by our nation in the space of only six years represent grandiose movements, more sublime and intense than what is commonly meant by the word revolution.”

⁶¹⁸ Toprak, p. 21.

⁶¹⁹ “Iron and steel production had become a symbol of independence for the republican government.” See in Kepenek, p. 1767.

⁶²⁰ Erik J. Zürcher, “Institution Building in the Kemalist Republic: The Role of the People’s Party,” in *Men of Order: Authoritarian Modernization under Atatürk and Reza Shah*, eds. Touraj Atabaki and Erik J. Zürcher (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), p. 110.

⁶²¹ Halil Nalçaoğlu, “Turkey, Nation and Celebration: An Iconology of the Republic of Turkey,” in *National Days/National Ways: Historical, Political, and Religious Celebrations around the World*, ed. Linda K. Fuller (Westport: Praeger, 2004), p. 269.

⁶²² When the “Tenth-Year March” was written, Atatürk interfered only one line of it. Instead of “yurdun her bir tepesinde dumanlar tütüyor”, he added “demir ağlarla ördük anayurdu dört baştan” to the verse.

emphasized this point with reference to the first program of the Government formed under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in 1920, *"While it was facing the biggest challenges, while its existence in the future was at risk, while its barefooted citizens were struggling against the invaders with sticks in their hands, while it was having lost all of its resources, and while it did not have even a penny in its treasure, it says in its first program that it will operate trains from Ankara to Yahsihan."*⁶²³ As the link between modernization and railways was affecting this articulation in itself, there was also a process of re-signification of railways during the republican period which now took the political ownership of this technology. For the Kemalist regime, not only should railways drive the rebuilding and modernisation of the country, but society could make a qualitative leap forward through the technological transformation of the railways themselves. The signification devolved on railways in the context of nation-state building comprised not only the line to differentiate the new regime from its predecessor, but also the stress over the railway development in order to join the ranks of civilization. Although these two discourses were interrelated, what was crucial to note that railway construction in Anatolia had already started under the Ottoman Empire, even this included more kilometres than achieved during the republican era; and moreover, railway development went hand in hand with the modernization process in the Empire. Yet, despite its modern railroad systems and telegraphs, the Ottoman Empire found itself unable to maintain an open channel to the outside world of nations and destined to collapse.

Locating the politics of railway reform in the project of nation-building, republican elite used railway policy in a manner through which railways were coded as a technology and as a signal sign of modernization in order to legalize its standing via differentiating itself from the former regime even though it inherited more than it constructed. As the structure of the Turkish economy was shaped by the development priorities and strategies of the government since the 1920s, self-sufficiency was regarded as a matter of national defence and the state investments in large, capital-intensive projects such as railroads were justified on this ground. Beyond the position that railways occupied in the articulation of Turkish nationalism and the Kemalist ideology within the discourse of national integrity, national market and national defence,

⁶²³“Railway Policies throughout the Eighty Years History of Our Republic”. Available online at: http://www.tcdd.gov.tr/tcdding/tarihce_ing.html (28 July 2013).

railways constituted the ground for dismissing the previous period and thus legalizing its power over this dismissal towards the contemporary civilization.⁶²⁴

The new state denoted a struggle to appropriate railways not only in a political and strategic sense, but also to appropriate the right to re-signify its historical meaning. This re-articulation of railways lied in the perception of modernization by the state elite whose modernization project excluded non-positivist world view and depended on the guidance of science and technology. Reflecting this reality, the railroad, particularly early in the period, was commonly portrayed as a universal panacea, a technological patent-medicine-cure for all manner of individual and community ills. According to rail promoters in the new regime, the laying of steel rails would expand markets for local products, raise land values, encourage settlement, attract new businesses, reduce unemployment, break down isolation from older cultural centres, make life more convenient, and promote national unity and patriotism.

3.3.2. Modernization Encoded in Railways

After the Independence War, confidence and immense faith in progress and modernization took root in the Kemalist circles, that within the context of nation-building process, railways had a significant stance in the narrative of national imagination through its role in national development, growth, and modernization. In addition to the role of the railway as a technology in service of both maintaining and extending the authority of the new regime that was based on authoritarian means, railways were important in the dominant narratives of state ideology as vehicles of modernization, progress and “civilization”. In ways that confirmed the widely circulating ideas about Turkish progress, the Kemalist elite saw great potential in the railroads to define progress and to promote civilization in the society. Even the narratives which were emphasized to such an extent in state discourse in which the service of railways as strategic instruments of state control whether military, political, and socio-economic was obscured under the state argument defending railways as a beneficial tool on which was predicated such modernization as was necessary for the Turkish Republic to join the ranks of civilization. As

⁶²⁴ Speaking to the Assembly in November 1924, after the laws against the theocracy had gone into force, Atatürk remarked: 'The Turkish nation has perceived with great joy that the obstacles which constantly, for centuries, had kept Turkey from joining the civilized nations marching forward on the path of progress, have been removed.' See in Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, pp. 267 – 268.

Atatürk stated in the opening speech to the Grand National Assembly in 1924, “*Except for the railway, it is hard to disseminate the means and even the ideas of civilization. Rail is the way to prosperity and civilization.*”⁶²⁵

In parallel with those railroads which were perceived as a signal sign of modernity by the Ottoman statehood when gave the first concessions to the British imperial government, railways in Turkey during the republican era were also viewed as imperative to historical progress. Ushering into it the structures and cultures of modern civilization, railway technology was consequently shaped and inflected the perception of modernization in a regime which accepted the universal validity of the western modernity as the way of building modern Turkey.⁶²⁶ As foundation of the nation-state was symbolizing a journey into modernity, technology of the time, railways remained one of the crucial constituents of this journey. Beyond its symbolic meaning, literally, too, train was inevitable in building up of a national unity not only for the role it was playing in transportation during the World War I and the Independence War, but also its centrality within the national economy.

The answer to the question of how the contemporary civilization would be achieved was clear: Economic development.⁶²⁷ In the opening speech to the Assembly on 1 March 1922, Atatürk expressed this fact as, “*Function and the momentum of the economic life is commensurable to the status and degree of the transportation means of roads, railways, and ports.*”⁶²⁸ The republican elite strove for the economic advancement through building railroads and making great internal improvements while enhancing its industrial and commercial conditions. As İnönü stated, “*Building of new railroads should be considered as a breakthrough not only for the security of the state and reconstruction of the country, but especially for the economic expansion.*”⁶²⁹ Railways stood as economy's main driving force during a gradual modernising process of the Turkish Republic. The railway represented a compound technology; embracing complicated, precise mechanisms of several branches of technology, such as

⁶²⁵ Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri, II (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 357.

⁶²⁶ “The two dominant beliefs of Atatürk were in the Turkish nation and in progress; the future of both lay in civilization, which for him meant the modern civilization of the West, and no other. “ See in Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, p. 292.

⁶²⁷ Timur, “Atatürk ve Pozitivizm,” p. 94.

⁶²⁸ Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri, I (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 242.

⁶²⁹ İlhan Turhan, “İsmet İnönü: Konuşma, Demeç, Makale, Mesaj ve Söyleşileri, 1933 – 1938”. Available online at: <http://www.ismetinonu.org.tr/ismet-inonu-1933-1938.htm> (5 July 2013).

construction, communications facilities, supplying of coal and water, and the utilization and administration of machines, tools, and power. It was the symbol of the formation of a national network of economy, culture and technology.

Railway construction was expected to drive Turkey's modernisation in various ways. Its primary function was to improve transport facilities for economic, political and military purposes. The iron horse promised to overcome or reduce the major geographical problems of poor accessibility of inner Anatolia. New markets might be developed at home as Anatolian land could be opened for economic development. That the key in the railroad policy of the state was a strategy of rapid economic modernisation, that the republican leadership prioritised railway development as the stimulus for beginning economic modernisation immediately and as a potential means to quicken the process in socio-political realms. That, embracing a total involvement into affairs related to the whole society, the aim of the state when it intervened into the economics was not related only to the establishment of the economic structure, but more to the realignment of local relations around the new centre; and railways were among the means for achieving this aim⁶³⁰ This was put into words by Atatürk as the following: “*In Turkey, economic growth would become possible only through railways. Nation’s happiness and independence would go through these ways.*”⁶³¹

3.3.3. Tracking the Perception of Modernization in the Railways

Under the circumstances of the period, with the railway policy it launched, the republican regime aimed not only to establish its authority in the shortest possible time and to strengthening the national defence, but more important than that, to make contributions to the socio-economic and cultural development of the country.⁶³² In other words, the significance of railroads for the state during the early republican period derived not only from military objectives, but also from social and political concerns as they helped the state to construct the history of modern regime with its claims to progress, civilization, and modernity. Beyond the role they played during the Independence War, railways had historical and symbolic functions after the war as well, when a new regime was ascending on the grounds of nation-state as the republican elite both constantly

⁶³⁰ İnsel, p. 424.

⁶³¹ *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, II (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 307.

⁶³² Ünsal Yavuz, “Cumhuriyet Devri Demiryolu Politikasına Yaklaşım Biçimi,” in *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Demiryolları Sempozyumu*, ed. Mukaddes Arslan (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 2010), p. 88.

invoked railroads as self-evident markers of their society's modern success, and at the same time spoke in the vaguely unifying language of national progress and purpose. They saw themselves at the vanguard of modern state formation as they gladly shouldered the responsibility to hold up their modern nation- state on the world stage. With the political ideology that supported the republic's modernizing project, their faith in the technology, in its possibilities for a particular vision for Turkey to join the ranks of the civilized nations made a whole generation which was active in politics become 'Railroad Republicans'.

Founders of the new regime wanted desperately to be modern. Modernization in the Turkish Republic, similar to the colonial and post colonial cases, was initiated under the hegemony of the state and performed for only sake of being "modern", that it was not a process that was motioned in its own dynamism but an "elite driven" one.⁶³³ During the great period of national formation, they had just begun to assemble an idea of what the railroad was but not what it might mean for their lives and their nation. Railroads served as the visual basis of the modernization process during the early republican period when dramatic changes in every aspect of life were experienced. In this context the railroads became especially important because they changed the way they understood the possibilities and challenges of their world.

Railway was a symbol of modernization and it was used as a means of cutting the cultural ties with the Ottoman past. The aim was to demonstrate the building of a new regime through the rejection of tradition and the Ottoman past using the differentiation developed by the republican railroad policy. For the elite, railroads were a vital part of the technological equipment of western civilization that had increased to a very marked extent the productive capacity of that civilization. The construction of rail network throughout the country was associated with progress and technological triumph because the railway opened inner Anatolia, appeared to have conquered the mountains, and facilitated the extraction of natural resources. For the progress of civilization, those bonds of steel might unite a divided and a backward country, as the elite at this time saw the railway as a transformative technology that would speed up travel and transportation of goods and bring civilization to the wilderness of Anatolian landscape. The vision of a modern Turkey embraced not only a rural landscape shaped by technology and mechanization, but also as an embodiment of modernity and a major step ward transforming the

⁶³³ Bozdoğan and Kasaba, pp. 3 - 4.

countryside into a secular, Westernized society. As Behiç Erkin, the Minister of Public Works at the time, expressed in the opening ceremony of Kayseri station in 1927, “*The Independence War that once rose from east to west thanks to the genius of Atatürk, by his courtesy again and with the help of this line, now carried forward from west to east.*”⁶³⁴

Its grandiosity epitomised the tremendous but naive optimism with which the Kemalist leadership addressed economic policy at the beginning of 1920, when Atatürk spoke of overcoming the economic crisis and beginning to build a modern industrial economy. On 1 November 1925, as Mustafa Kemal pointed out, “*In order to overcome the social and economic disruptions, the first step that must be taken is to extend the rail lines to regions that of devoid from transportation facilities*”⁶³⁵. Beyond its material contributions to economic development and strengthening of political authority throughout the country, railroads also served for the republican aims as a symbol of the modern. Sign of belonging to the modern world, railroad symbolized that the newly founded republic was targeting to be part of that world. Clearly, the Republic’s idea of itself as a modern nation was tied to its standing in the world. Differentiating itself from the previous regime and striving to find a place for itself in the newly emerging international arena, political elite of the republic gave great endeavours to follow the technologic developments of the time.

Technological progress formed the basis of the modernization process understood by the republican elite. Railroads in the modernization process were used as symbols to stress the closeness of Turkish society to the West. This progress was viewed as a process of development that led to modernity in the West. As a vehicle that led to deep-rooted changes in economic, political and socio-cultural realms, railroads were among the issues the state elite gave due attention to. They were eager for the railway to open up the wonders of the remote corners of the nation, to improve transportation and communication, and to bind the nation with a band of steel for the sake of progress and civilization.⁶³⁶ As one of the two symbols of Industrial Revolution, progress and development, railroads signified the modernity. That was why the republican elite

⁶³⁴ Ümit Sariaslan, “Raylarını Kurtuluş Savaşı'nın döşediği demiryolları: Cumhuriyetin Trenleri” (October 2012). Available online at: <http://kentvedemiryolu.com/icerik.php?id=958> (21 July 2013).

⁶³⁵ *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, III (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), p. 579.

⁶³⁶ Longworth, p.46.

wished to establish lines throughout the country. The Kemalist leadership's determination to embark immediately on rapid economic recovery, modernisation and development within the framework of railway development effectively meant that the recovery and expansion of the railway system were seen as the prerequisite for industrial development and a guarantee for the regime's survival. As İnönü stated; *“For the national government, railways stand as a requirement to the national unity, defence and politics. It is an issue of centuries-long legacy for defending national independence.”*⁶³⁷ Succinctly, railroads stood at the cross-roads of sustaining the national independence and reaching the level of contemporary civilization since economic advancement seen as the basis for political sovereignty and socio-cultural renovation for civilization.

⁶³⁷ İsmet İnönü, *Hatıralar*, II (İstanbul, 1987), p. 263.

CONCLUSION

Associated with the rise of capitalism and development of the nation-state system, modern epoch was epitomized with the Industrial Revolution that inherently linked to the development of science and technology. The first stage of industrialization was symbolized by the combination of steam and iron, and was a process inextricable from the railways, which opened the doors to new markets over a vast area for the industrializing countries. Involving enormous social and economic changes, industrial revolution became the benchmark for defining the level of development in societies while the railway system was already being articulated as a forerunner of modern industry. Thus, when emerged as an alternative, modern vehicle of transportation in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the birth of the steam locomotive in England initiated a new era, i.e. the railway age. To the extent, the last quarter of the nineteenth century was the period during when the building of railways reached its peak, as often referred to as the “Golden Age” of railroad construction.

One of the most significant developments in transportation history, railway had a crucial stance in transforming socio-economic and political landscapes wherever it reached. As a technology deeply embedded in international and domestic political practices, railroads functioned as a transformative element of the international political system as they had effects on force, security, geography, diplomacy, and state-society relations, and the transnational process that constructed them. As a vehicle transforming not only the physical landscape but also the social, economic and political landscapes as well, railway held a significant place in historiography of both the West and the East in terms of industrialization, modernity and nation-building. The advent of the railway had a greater and more immediate impact than any other technological or industrial innovation before or since.

The railroads emerged as not only the leading industry of the period but also the most visible indicator of modernity. Railed steam locomotion was embraced as a measure of a superior civilization as railroads set in motion many interconnected and progressive economical and social changes. In terms of cause and effect, railways represented an effect for most of the industrialized countries, whereas they might be perceived as a cause for the developing countries; and as such were a factor both representing and lending momentum to development and transformation. The terms related to “the development” were united with the technology and

the railway became the most important symbol of the technology. Therefore, most of the countries were willing to have railways which would bring prosperity and successful national development. Railroads were embraced as vehicles of modernity and progress referring to “the civilizing influence of steam” which would change for the better the “political, social, moral and religious condition of the millions.”

It was almost at the same time when railroads started to spread throughout the Europe and America, and the Ottoman Empire was on the wake of undergoing the reforms of the Tanzimat era. In a period in which the Empire was following the developments of the West closely, it did not take long for the Ottoman statesmen to realize the significance of railroads. Considering its role in multiple realms, railway had a significant role in the transformation of the Ottoman Empire from a pre-modern to a modern structure. As engines of change, development of railways in the Ottoman Empire was influential to the extent that it symbolized what belonged to the Western world and thus the process of modernization. The link between railway and modernization in the Ottoman Empire operated on a number of levels since the railway was the most effective way to take advantage of the benefits of civilisation. Railroads were perceived as a blessing of civilization by the Ottoman state which did not hold back from using the best possible means to construct a rail network in its territory.

Accepted synonymous with modern society, spread of rail lines was among the priorities in the political agenda of the Ottoman statesmen. As the reforms set out by the Ottoman state aimed at modernization and re-centralization of the empire, railroads were seen to serve to these objectives. For them who viewed railroad as far-reaching project, it was clear that railroads bore an iconic quality for the centralization of governance and the industrialisation of society in the modern period. The construction of railroads was interpreted as a crucial step in the Ottoman Empire’s modernization process, as the empire saw railroads as an important means to establish a rational bureaucracy together with the centralization of state power. In such a context, railroads were aimed at development and modernization which, in turn, provided the Ottoman Empire with the ability to join the world market. In the Ottoman Turkish experience, the railway was not an outcome of modernisation, but a vehicle by which it came about, thus, in general terms, the railways were synonymous with modernization for Ottoman Turkey.

Although there was a difference between the Ottoman and republican modernization processes, the conditions for the ground of the reforms under the republican rule were prepared

by the late Ottoman period. As a matter of fact, it should be noted that even though there were several handicaps in the modernization process during the Ottoman Empire, the parameters of the revolutionary reforms of the republican regime were laid down in the preceding period. The socio-political developments and the rise of intelligentsia as a force behind the reforms evolved in the Second Constitutional era gave the impetus and the feedback necessary for the vitalization of the Kemalist modernization. The Ottoman accumulation provided the elites with a steppingstone towards acquiring a full-fledged modernization program. Yet, the modernization project of the republican rule had certain points that differentiated it from the preceding efforts of the Ottoman statesmen.

Even though the reform movements began almost two hundred years before, the purpose of the Kemalist reforms differentiated them from the previous ones. Consolidation of state power in the republican regime was formalized on the basis of modern values –which referred to western and secular-, and was targeted to a total change in the social structure through replacing the traditional structure with a new one. Among the distinguishing features of the foundational paradigm of the Turkish modernization program, endorsement of secularism had an indispensable position for all of the Kemalist modernization efforts. In parallel with the aim of restructuring the society on modern values, secularism served as the basis of the reform project. The most important aspect of modernist ideology in the republican regime was that of providing social progress while the main goals of the modernization process were centralization and fortification of state apparatus. Unlike the Ottoman modernization which was limited in scope due to the decentralized structure, its theocratic character and of heterogeneous composition of the empire, modernization process under the republican rule was targeted to be as comprehensive as to cover economic, social and political reforms as well as to be received by the society en masse.

The impact of the transition from the Ottoman state to a republic was not restricted to politics. Changes in economic, educational, and administrative areas through the revolutionary reforms of the Kemalist elite deriving from the exported modernist ideology led to the reconstruction of the social structure. Assuming the role of leadership in conducting the reforms on the way of rationalization and modernization of state apparatus, the bureaucratic elite carried out these reforms in accordance with the requirements of modernization with the aim to join the ranks of civilized nations. The modernization project of the republican regime was primarily a

nation-state oriented project that had crucial impacts on the socio-political and economic structure. In an attempt to force the transformation into a nation-state, regulations were imposed from above.

Reforms were carried out in accordance with the main priorities that of constructing a new-modern collective identity and thus of establishing a nation-state. The central goal in implementing these regulations was to build a modern society through abolishing the old structure. With this project, western-educated nationalist political elite strove for changing the masses which were of largely traditional and rural population. The aim of closing the cultural gap of the population from that of civilized societies gave an elitist and an authoritarian overtone to the reformation agenda of these modernizing elites, the majority of whom belonged to the military and civil bureaucracy.

For the restructuring of the society at large, various reforms were carried out in this social engineering project. While the society was exposed to abrupt change, further centralization and strengthening of the state power were to be achieved. As the modernizing elite believed that the structural transformation that would lead to the overall modernization within the society could only be brought by imposing revolutionary laws from above, they devoted a significant part of their energies to promulgation and imposition of them. For the modernizing elite, what was problematic was the centuries-old negligence of the society and its backwardness compared to the civilized nations of Europe. Within the framework of modernization, Atatürk made many reforms in every aspects of life, that ranging from administration to education, all aspects of Turkish society had to be exposed to transformation in line with this aim. The target of the Kemalist elite with the modernization process they initiated was to reach the level of contemporary nations as an independent and an equal partner which could achieve to break away from the older ties-referring to the Ottoman past-that had been impediment in its path to civilization.

Like its legacy for the modernization process, advancement in railway development was inherited from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic. Not only an extended railway network, but also technical personnel who got experienced in the construction of railroads during the imperial period were ceded from Ottoman Empire. Yet, transportation policy in the republican era distinguished from the previous period on certain fronts such as dependence on railways to a large extent in transportation policy, prioritizing the unity of the domestic market

over integrity into the international market, purchase of infrastructure companies from foreign hands, and the increasing role of the state in railway operations. The republican state developed a railway policy in which the nationalization of railroads which were used to be in the hands of foreign capital in the previous period as well as the construction of new lines was achieved.

Railways became the site for limited engagement with the Ottoman past and served as signposts for a modern future. The sense of urgency about resuming the modernisation drive, the railways appeared as the first priority for a rapid breakthrough on the 'bloodless front' to relaunch the process of national modernisation and development. For the Kemalist regime, not only should railways drive the rebuilding and modernisation of the country, but society could make a qualitative leap forward through the technological transformation of the railways themselves. The new state denoted a struggle to appropriate railways not only in a political and strategic sense, but also to appropriate the right to re-signify its historical meaning. Cultural material left behind in the wake of Ottoman displacement from the apex of Turkey's political and social hierarchy became an exigent cause for and target of deliberate reinterpretation to suit the new political direction of the country. Railways as a metaphor of modernization were used as a site for the state to firm its power through stressing the revolutionary basis of the new regime. This re-articulation of railways lied in the perception of modernization by the state elite whose modernization project excluded non-positivist world view and depended on the guidance of science and technology. Reflecting this reality, the railroad, particularly early in the period, was commonly portrayed as a universal panacea, a technological patent-medicine-cure for all manner of individual and community ills.

During the early republican period, railways meant to be a tool serving for the development of the national economy and were directed to ensure the distribution of the productive resources domestically while concerns for defence had also played an important role in the arrangement as well. Beyond these, railways played an important role in the Turkish modernization to the extent that it was among those factors which were to be called keystones of modernization. The building of railways had been vital in the Kemalist modernization scheme that beyond its role in the project of nation-building, railway development was articulated as a symbol of modernization. It was the symbol of a new, modern state for Turkey and its people. It was the site for the new regime to differentiate itself from the older one and to show its

willingness to be part of contemporary civilization referring to the West. In other words, the signification devolved on railways in the context of nation-state building comprised not only the line to differentiate the new regime from its predecessor, but also the stress over the railway development in order to join the ranks of civilization.

Technological progress formed the basis of the modernization process understood by the republican elite. Railroads in the modernization process were used as symbols to stress the closeness of Turkish society to the West. This progress was viewed as a process of development that led to modernity in the West. As a vehicle that led to deep-rooted changes in economic, political and socio-cultural realms, railroads were among the issues the state elite gave due attention to. They were eager for the railway to open up the wonders of the remote corners of the nation, to improve transportation and communication, and to bind the nation with a band of steel for the sake of progress and civilization. Considering machinery to be the “bane of civilization” led to the articulation of the isomorphic relationship between railways and civilization within the historical teleology of modernization binding railway development to progress and modernity.

The total rail line in the Turkish Republic was 5639 km. in 1930 and 6639 km. in 1935 while reached to 7671 km. in 1950. As seen, while an intensive railway construction was realized in the first years of the republic, it was getting decreased especially after the Second World War. After the Second World War, in a period when major developments in international order, foreign relations, political regime and economic development policies had occurred, one of the policies which underwent significant changes in the republic was about transportation. Therefore, in order to explain both the qualitative and quantitative changes in transportation means after the proclamation of the republic, it would not be wrong to divide the period into two as 1923-1945 and the post-1945. Pre-war railway development policy was replaced and since 1947, Turkey gave priority to highways in transportation. With the foundation of the Turkish General Directorate of Highways in 1950, the construction of highways was carried out rapidly with modern machinery, thus, the importance of the railway decreased that after 1950, except the renewals, only 330 km new railway line was added to the national railway network. According to the Turkish Republic State Railways (TCDD) records, the ratio of the railway in the whole national transportation diminished to 6% while it was approximately 90% in 1948.

Not only in Turkey, but also in many parts of the world including Europe, the golden age of the railways continued until the second half of the twentieth century. Although used very intensively during the two World Wars, the railways showed a decline in terms of route mileage after 1950s in parallel with the developments in airway and highway. Yet, with the technological innovations and the accelerated need for the public transportation, the importance of railways increased again. After the mid of the 1970's, railway became the second fastest and safest transportation system after airways due to the development of high-speed trains as a result of which a new age for the railways began in the last quarter of twentieth century. The Japanese introduced the Shinkansen which has 240km/h speed which would be followed within last 30 years by the European countries. Therefore, one more time in its history, railways became to be identified with development.

While in many progressive industrial nations railways acquired a new image with high-speed trains and continued to play an important role in public transport, in Turkey the railway was abandoned to its fate. Since the period following the Second World War, within an ambitious economic development effort which was supported by increasing amounts of economic aid from the United States and by credits from Western Europe, as every segment of the economy that was received attention, including manufacturing, agriculture, and mining, development of transportation facilities, too, was among the most significant of the social overhead investment projects. Under the Democrat Party rule, the economy's increasing sophistication was beginning to reduce the role of railway development in stimulating economic growth. The development program during the period first and foremost included the construction of a national highway network which would bring the railway age to an end as the Democrats' liberalism replaced the one-party etatist economic policy. In other words, since the railway had been so closely identified with the state, giving priority to highways meant effectively a death sentence on the statism of the single-party regime.

With the Democrat Party rule, imported oil took the place of local coal as highways of railroads. Never again after the RPP rule would railway development had the highest priority as both end and means for the Turkish Republic. Highways replaced it as the would-be driving force of modernisation by 1950s. The share of rail transport in the country's transportation declined gradually. Kept its primacy with the Bosphorus Bridge that was opened in 1973,

highways had stood at the forefront in land transportation. In 1970s, however, transportation policy that was based on highways started to be questioned due to the OPEC's oil price increase and the economic crisis in Turkey at the time. Although the recommendations arose about the development of railways again, what was done about the matter had been limited. The modernisation and expansion of the Turkish railway system did continue to a degree, but chronic under-funding and gradual progress was the order of the day. Among the main lines, within the framework of CENTO Project, only Yolçatı-Genç line was stretched to Tatvan-Van-Kotur and connected to Iran. In 1979, the length of railways reached to 8132 km in total and from the 1950s to the present, only 611 km. line had been added to the railway network. Thus, all things considered, that was no mean achievement. With the policies that hindered the development of the railway in Turkey, the actual potential of the railway was not being used. When compared with the European countries, Turkish railways remained very old in every aspect, from technology to services and facilities. The result of this under-investment bequeathed to the successive governments a ramshackle railway transport system that remained a burden still in the 2000s.

Indeed, with the introduction of multi-party politics into the Turkish democracy, together with the establishment of the new international order after the Second World War, the change in Turkey was not bound only to the transport sector. Since the defeat of totalitarian regimes in Germany, Italy and Japan and the victory of the Western democracies in the Second World War promoted the political and economic liberalization trend, these factors inevitably had an impact on Turkey. Together with the more apparent loneliness of Turkey with the Stalin's hostile attitude in the post-war period, Turkey was forced to lean to the West. The identification of Turkey with the Western political and economic philosophy and policies was further enhanced after the country joined NATO in 1952, and was thus formally insured against outside aggression. That it was left to Atatürk's successors to take the further step of making Turkey an actual ally of the West when Turkey joined the NATO alliance, the Council of Europe, and other western organizations, and established a special relationship with the United States. While these new ties were based on concrete security and economic interests, they also manifested a will to become part of the West. Thus, under Menderes, even though the transportation policy had changed as the state preferred highways to railways, neither the continuity of the Kemalist

process had in any way been interrupted insofar as modernization of the political system and the economic development strategy; nor was the western orientation called into question, but the country joined the West in an institutional sense, setting the course for the following decades.

Until the 1980 coup, this picture seems to have been modified during the 1960s and 1970s, with the emergence of new political parties and groups calling for a radical revision of Turkish foreign policy and a change in the principles governing the policies and structure of the state. Yet a closer look suggests that Turkey has not abandoned its commitment to western alliances and treaties and has remained faithful to the "western inspiration" which has for so long guided its conduct at home and abroad. It is quite clear that Turkey's commitment to NATO, the Council of Europe, the EEC, and other western forums has remained unshakable, and transcends mere political or economic considerations. Modernization referring to Westernization has remained a solid pillar of political culture, helping to accelerate Turkey's integration into the West and retard any movement in the opposite direction. Thus, contrary to the negligence of railway development throughout the years since the beginning of the multi-party politics, the standard vision of Turkey's revolutionary legacy as a safely westernizing venture has been kept as part and parcel of the Turkish Republic.

It was Europe, after all, which inspired generations for Westernization in Turkey as they struggled to modernize their country. That, even today, Europe is still considered as the torchbearer of western civilization. The roots of Turkish modernization go back for centuries, but its contemporary strength largely reflects the impact of Mustafa Kemal, whose ideological system and reforms not only contributed to the transformation of Turkish society, but also helped shape a new self-image for Turkey as a member of the western family of nations. This image was to become the inspiration for much of Turkey's course in the world. On the other hand, however, for all their modernizing force, railroads, after they were condemned as clumsy and old-fashioned with years-long negligence, failed to live up to all the exaggerated initial expectations of their enthusiasts. Notwithstanding, with the transportation policy of the ruling Justice and Development Party, this picture seems to change. Today, railroads have been discovered again as a symbol that links Ottoman economic dynamics to the post-imperial and early republican history of Turkey, with a subtext that is suggestive of the historical roots of Turkey's economic integration with the European Union today. Although being criticized by the hesitant Kemalists,

whatever the goal it might pursue, JDP's efforts for Turkey's EU membership is used to be described by the state elite as the last stage of Westernization. In this context, EU integration process has been taken as the long and coherent process continuing from the early Westernization attempts of Ottoman Empire, as the European Union integration process was generally perceived as the concrete and inevitable result of two hundred years of Westernization process of Turkey.

In this context, as the EU integration process is considered as a civilization project which is the inevitable and ultimate ring of the two centuries Westernization endeavours and the most dynamic factors shaping present-day Turkish society are the changes wrought by science and technology, discussions about modernization and technological innovation do continue in the Turkish politics. As the railway system has suffered from a legacy of under-investment, the JDP government set up an agenda with the aim to modernize the railways through a range of projects with major investment in high-speed lines, rail-led solutions to freight and distribution, and urban transportation in major cities across the country. Turkey has grown its rail network to around 11,000 route km (as at March 2011), and has a programme of expansion currently underway. Apart from the rehabilitation of existing railway lines, the construction of new railways is targeted within the railway policy of the ruling government. The JDP government intends to construct Ankara-Istanbul, Ankara-Konya, Ankara-Izmir and Istanbul-Bulgaria high-speed lines. Among the major infrastructure projects, on the other hand, the construction of the Kars-Tbilisi-Baku railway has started with the aim to provide a connection hub among Europe, Central Asia and the Middle East, thus to capitalise on the strategic geographical location of the country on border crossings. As the preferred solution for freight, too, railways have increasingly gained importance for the JDP government which wished to enhance the competitiveness of the economy in the market through domestic and international rail routes.

The flagship project, however, is the Marmaray Project (the Rail Tube Tunnel under Bosphorus in Istanbul), which was completed on 29 October 2013. As a symbol connecting the Asia to Europe and a realization of the Sultan Abdulmecid's plan, this project has become a prototype for signifying the Turkey's Westernization dream through the means of railway development. In the opening ceremony, the President stressed the role of railways in reaching to the civilized nations as was the Prime Minister who emphasized the railway investments

undertaken during his rule as a success to cover the motherland with the iron nets when he opened the Kartal-Kadıköy line in 2012. Introduced technologically high-speed trains, with these investments, railways gained significance as these developments have given an aura of modernity and reflected positively on the JDP regime. It also underscores how the railway was at the centre of events and reminds us once again just how important its story is to understanding modern Turkish history in general.

Today, railway is one of the most important and common transportation systems throughout the world. Together with the environmental concerns, railway transportation is still the feasible solution for the problems that would otherwise emerge by highway transportation in both economic and social realms. This has also started to be recognized in recent years in Turkey where last-fifty years' highway development brought its economic and social problems, thus, the ruling government has given due attention for railway development. That means the aspiration of covering the motherland with iron nets has not been come to an end. More significant than that, in spite of the country's relentless push for Westernisation and modernisation over many decades, its European credentials are questioned on the grounds that its modernisation process has failed to conform to key European norms relating to democracy and human rights. Therefore, this dream, too, is still waited to be realized. That, in its endeavour to become a full member of the EU for decades, Turkey is still striving to achieve its centuries-long aspiration of being accepted as an equal partner in the civilized world identified with the West. What is assumed with the full membership is the guarantee for Turkey's irrevocable acceptance as a 'Western state'.

The current phase of turning towards the West is part of a long process traced back to the Ottoman Empire. The maxim of reaching the level of contemporary civilization put into words as an extension of the Ottoman reform movement for a target designated for the new generations of the republican Turkey. Despite the years-long yearning for this ideal, it keeps its ambiguity of whether Turkey could be successful in achieving it or not. The relevant question is where Turkey stands in this level and to what extent Turkey is part of this civilization is unclear. This has always been the part of party politics, each accusing the other side of failing to achieve the necessary steps sufficient to reach the level of contemporary civilization as pointed out by the founder of the republic. Considering the whole process, there are many problems that need to be

discussed regarding how pro-Western efforts have been successful in making Turkey a modern country. Even today, it cannot be said that Turkey has reached to the level of contemporary civilizations; not only in terms of democratic credentials for providing the socio-cultural and political betterment, but also in terms of the technical progress to found a sound financial structure and a developed infrastructure. Therefore, it seems both of these dreams, attainment to the level of civilized nations and improvement of a railway network throughout the country, will continue to preoccupy the Turkey's mindscape, so long as the railways will remain as the signifier for modernization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Afetinan, A., *M. Kemal Atatürk'ten Yazdıklarım* (İstanbul : Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1971).
- Afetinan, A., *Devletçilik İlkesi ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin Birinci Sanayi Planı 1933* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1972).
- Ahmad, Feroz, "Türkiye'nin Cumhuriyet Dönemi Siyasal Gelişmeleri," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 7 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 1991-1998.
- Ahmad, Feroz, *The Making of Modern Turkey* (New York: Routledge, 1994).
- Ahmad, Feroz, "The Late Ottoman Empire," in *The Great Powers and the End of the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Marian Kent (London: Frank Cass, 1996), pp. 5 - 29.
- Akat, Asaf S., *Alternatif Büyüme Stratejisi: İktisat Politikası Yazuları* (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1983).
- Akat, Asaf S., "İktisadi Politikalar," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 4 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 1090-1112.
- Aksakal, Mustafa, *The Ottoman Road to War in 1914 : The Ottoman Empire and the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- Aksan, Virginia, "War and Peace," in *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 81 - 117.
- Akural, Sabri M., "Kemalist Views on Social Change," in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 125 - 152.
- Akyıldız, Ali, "Demiryolları ve Değişme (Batı Anadolu Örneği)," *Yeni Toplum*, no.1 (June 1992), pp.114 - 121.
- Alpar, Cem, "Yabancı Sermaye," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 507 - 518.
- Angevine, Robert G., *The Railroad and The State: War, Politics, and Technology in Nineteenth-Century America* (California: Stanford University Press, 2004).
- Atabaki, Touraj and Zürcher, Erik J., "Introduction," in *Men of Order: Authoritarian Modernization under Ataturk and Reza Shah*, eds. Touraj Atabaki and Erik J. Zürcher (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), pp. 1 – 12.

- Atabey, Efe “Eugenics, Modernity and the Rationalization of Morality in Early Republican Turkey”, Unpublished Master Thesis, (McGill University, Institute of Islamic Studies, 2009).
- Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, I-II-III (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997).
- Atilla, Nedim A., *İzmir Demiryolları* (İzmir: Stil Matbaacılık, 2002).
- Avcıoğlu, Doğan, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün, Bugün, Yarın* (İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 1987).
- Bakan, Selahaddin and Bırdışlı, Fikret, “The Analysis of Nationalism, Statism, State Nationalism and State Economy in Turkey’s Modernisation Process: Comparing The Nation State of Europe to the State Nationalism in Turkey,” *Süleyman Demirel University The Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, vol. 15, no.1 (2010), pp. 357 - 376.
- Barkey, Karen, *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- Baydar, Mustafa, *Atatürk Diyor ki: Atatürk'ün Direktifleri, Düşünceleri ve Kısaca Hayatı* (İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1957).
- Belge, Murat, “Cumhuriyet Döneminde Batılılaşma,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 260-264.
- Belge, Murat, “Türkiye’de Günlük Hayat,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 3-4 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 836-876.
- Belge, Murat, “Kültür,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 5 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 1288-1304.
- Berkes, Niyazi, *Türkiye’de Çağdaşlaşma* (İstanbul: Doğu-Batı Yayınları, 1978).
- Berkowitz, Christine A., “Railroad Crossings: The Transnational World of North America, 1850-1910”, Unpublished Phd Thesis, (University of Toronto, Department of History, 2009).
- Bilton, Tony, *et al.*, *Introductory Sociology* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
- Birdal, Murat, *The Political Economy of Ottoman Public Debt: Insolvency and European Financial Control in the Late Nineteenth Century* (London: Tauris, 2010).
- Boratav, Korkut, “Türkiye’de Devletçilik,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 412 - 418.
- Bozdoğan, Sibel and Kasaba, Reşat, “Introduction,” in *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, eds. Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997), pp. 3 - 14.

- Buchanan, Carrie M., "A Changing Sense of Place in Canadian Daily Newspapers: 1894-2005", Unpublished Phd Thesis, (M.J. Carleton University, School of Journalism and Communication, 2009).
- Budak, Ali and İnaç, Hüsamettin, "Ottoman Modernization and Literature: A New Approach towards the Transformation Process from Empire to the Nation-state," *Ozean Journal of Applied Sciences*, vol.1, no.1 (2008), pp. 89 - 104.
- Can, Bilmez B., *Demiryolundan Petrole Chester Projesi, (1908-1923)* (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 2000).
- Can, Bilmez B., "Suya Düşen Bir Tatlı Hayal: Şarki Anadolu Demiryolları," *Kebikeç*, no. 11 (2001), pp. 165 - 204.
- Clapham, John H., *An Economic History of Modern Britain* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1959).
- Clark, Edward C., "The Ottoman Industrial Revolution," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol.5, no.1 (January 1974), pp. 65 - 76.
- Coulls, Anthony, *Railways as World Heritage Sites* (Paris: ICOMOS, 1999).
- Çavdar, Tevfik, "Devralınan İktisadi Miras," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 4 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 1048 - 1060.
- Çavdar, Tevfik, "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk İktisadi Düşüncesi," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 4 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 1074-1084.
- Çetinkaya, Ali, "Aydın Demiryolunun Satın Alınması," *Ülkü*, vol.5, no.28 (June 1935), pp. 324 - 327.
- Dağı, İhsan D., "Transformation of Islamic Political Identity in Turkey: Rethinking the West and Westernization," *Turkish Studies*, vol.6, no.1 (2005), pp. 1 - 16.
- Davison, Roderic H., *Turkey: A Short History* (Huntingdon, England: Eothen Press, 1981).
- Deringil, Selim, "The Invention of Tradition as Public Image in the Late Ottoman Empire, 1808 to 1908," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol.35, no.1 (January 1993), pp. 3 - 29.
- Dumont, Paul, "The Origins of Kemalist Ideology," in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 25 - 44.

- Efe, Ayla, "Rayların Altında Kalan Makus Tarih: Değişen Eskişehir," in *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Demiryolları Sempozyumu*, ed. Mukaddes Arslan (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 2010), pp. 117 - 125.
- Eisenstadt, S. N., "The Kemalist Regime and Modernization: Some Comparative and Analytical Remarks," in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 3 - 15.
- Eldem, Vedat, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun İktisadi Şartları Hakkında Bir Tetkik* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1994).
- Engin, Vahdettin, *Rumeli Demiryolları* (İstanbul: Eren, 1993).
- Erozan, Boğaç, "Turkey and the West: A History of Ambivalence," *Orient III* (2009), pp. 4 -15.
- Esenbel, Selçuk, "Reflections on Japanese and Turkish Modernization and Global History," *New Perspectives on Turkey*, no.35 (Fall 2006), pp. 5 - 20.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya N., "Introduction," in *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 3 - 17.
- Ferit, Mehmet, "Bühan ve Bizim Demiryollarımız," *Demiryolları Mecmuası*, vol. 8, no.85 (March 1932), pp. 26 - 36.
- Findley, Carter V., "Political Culture and the Great Households," in *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 65 - 80.
- Fromkin, David, *A Peace to End All Peace: Creating the Modern Middle East, 1914-1922* (New York: H. Holt, 1989).
- Giddens, Anthony, *The Consequences of Modernity* (California: Stanford University Press, 1990).
- Gingeras, Ryan, *Sorrowful Shores: Violence, Ethnicity, and the End of the Ottoman Empire, 1912-1923* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Goffman, Daniel, *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Göçek, Fatma M., *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).
- Göçek, Fatma M., *Rise of the Bourgeoisie, Demise of Empire: Ottoman Westernization and Social Change* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

- Gökalp, Ziya, *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization: Selected Essays of Ziya Gökalp*, ed. Niyazi Berkes (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959).
- Göl, Ayla, "The Requirements of European International Society: Modernity and Nationalism in the Ottoman Empire," Working Paper Series: Australian National University. Dept. of International Relations (2003/4), pp. 1 – 32.
- Gülsoy, Ufuk, *Hicaz Demiyolu* (İstanbul: Eren, 1994).
- Günyol, Vedat, "Batılılaşma," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 255 - 259.
- Gürsel, Seyfettin, "Dış Borçlar," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 470 - 485.
- Güzel, Şehmus, "Anadolu-Bağdat Demiryolu Grevi," in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 3 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 828 – 830.
- Hale, William M., "The Traditional and the Modern in the Economy of Kemalist Turkey: The Experience of the 1920s," in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 153 - 170.
- Hall, Stuart, *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies* (London: Blackwell, 1996).
- Hanioğlu, Şükrü, "Baticılık," in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 5 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 1382 – 1388.
- Hanioğlu, Şükrü, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).
- Harrington, Ralph, "Construction and Cataclysm: The Railway in Nineteenth-century London," pp. 1 - 9. Available online at: <http://docutren.com/archivos/aranjuez/pdf/06.pdf> (Retrieved on 17 March 2013).
- Hecker, M., "Promoted Private Activity," in *The Economic History of the Middle East, 1800-1914: A Book of Readings*, ed. Charles Issawi (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), pp. 240 – 253.
- Heper, Metin, "Turkey: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow," *Journal of South European and Black Sea Studies*, no.4 (November 2001), pp. 1 - 19.
- Herrera, Geoffrey L., *Technology and International Transformation: The Railroads, the Atom Bomb, and the Politics of International Change* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006).

- Hershlag, Z. Y., "Atatürk's Etatism", in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 171 - 180.
- Hertner, Peter, "The Balkan Railways, International Capital and Banking from the End of the 19th Century until the Outbreak of the First World War," *EABH Annual Conference 'Finance and Modernisation'* (May 2005), pp. 1 – 9. Available online at: http://www.bnb.bg/bnbweb/groups/public/documents/bnb_publication/discussion_2006_53_en.pdf. (Retrieved on 21 June 2013).
- Hobsbawm, E. J., *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- Holcombe, Charles, *A History of East Asia: From the Origins of Civilization to the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge: The University Press, 2011).
- Hopkins, Eric, *The Rise of the Manufacturing Town: Birmingham and the Industrial Revolution* (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publications, 1998).
- Huang, Wayne, "The Death Railway: Semblances of Modernity," pp. 1 – 11. Available online at: http://www.arts.cornell.edu/knight_institute/publicationsprizes/discoveries/discoveriespring2013/02waynehuang.pdf (Retrieved on 27 February 2013).
- Işın, Ekrem, "Osmanlı Modernleşmesi ve Pozitivizm," in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 352 - 362.
- İnanç, Hüsamettin, "Identity Problems of Turkey during the European Union Integration Process," *Journal of Economic and Social Research*, vol.6, no.2 (2004), pp. 33 – 62.
- İnönü, İsmet, *Hatıralar*, II (İstanbul, 1987).
- İnsel, Ahmet, "Devletçiliğin Anatomisi," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 419 - 425.
- Jastrow, Morris, *The War and the Bagdad Railway: The Story of Asia Minor and Its Relation to the Present Conflict* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1917).
- Jefferson, Mark, "The Civilizing Rails," *Economic Geography*, vol.4, no.3 (July 1928), pp. 217 - 231.
- Kadıoğlu, Ayşe, "The Paradox of Turkish Nationalism and the Construction of the Official Identity," *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol.32, no.2 (April 1996), pp. 177 - 194.
- Kalgay, Yakup H., "Bir Karış Fazla Demiryolu Siyasetimiz ve Mesut Neticeleri," *Demiryolları Dergisi*, vol.19, no. 224-226 (I. Teşrin-I. Kanun 1943), pp. 60 - 69.

- Karal, Enver Z., *Osmanlı Tarihi, VIII* (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 1962).
- Karal, Enver Z., "The Principles of Kemalism," in *Atatürk: Founder of a Modern State*, eds. Ali Kazancıgil and Ergun Özbudun (London: Hurst & Company, 1981), pp. 11 - 36.
- Karkar, Yağub N., *Railway Development in the Ottoman Empire, 1856-1914* (New York: Vantage Press, 1972).
- Karpat, Kemal H., *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays* (Boston: Brill, 2002).
- Karpat, Kemal H., *Studies on Turkish Politics and Society: Selected Articles and Essays* (Boston, MA: Brill, 2004).
- Kasaba, Reşat, "Kemalist Certainties and Modern Ambiguities," in *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, eds. Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997), pp. 15 - 36.
- Kaya, Ayhan and Tecmen, Ayşe, "The State of the Art: Various Paths to Modernity," *IME, Identities and Modernities in Europe, Work Package 4* (December 2009), pp. 1 – 49.
- Kayaoğlu, Turan, *Legal Imperialism: Sovereignty and Extraterritoriality in Japan, the Ottoman Empire, and China* (USA: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- Kaynak, Muhteşem, "Osmanlı Ekonomisinin Dünya Ekonomisine Eklemlenme Sürecinde Osmanlı Demiryollarına Bir Bakış," *Yapıt, Toplumsal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, no.5 (1984), pp. 66 - 84.
- Kenneth, Frampton, *Modern Architecture: A Critical History* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980).
- Kent, Marian, "Introduction," in *The Great powers and the End of the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Marian Kent (London: Frank Cass, 1996), pp. 1 - 4.
- Keşen, Yakup, "Türkiye'nin Sanayileşme Süreçleri," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 7 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 1760-1796.
- Kerr, Ian J., *Engines of Change: The Railroads That Made India* (USA: Praeger Publishers, 2007).
- Keyder, Çağlar, "İktisadi Gelişmenin Evreleri," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 4 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 1065 - 1073.

- Keyder, Çağlar, “The Ottoman Empire,” in *After Empire: Multiethnic Societies and Nation-Building: The Soviet Union and the Russian, Ottoman, and Habsburg Empires*, eds. Karen Barkey and Mark von Hagen (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1997), pp. 30 - 44.
- Keyder, Çağlar, “Whither the Project of Modernity? Turkey in the 1990s,” in *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, eds. Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997), pp. 37 – 51.
- Keyman, Fuat and Öniş, Ziya, *Turkish Politics in a Changing World: Global Dynamics and Domestic Transformations* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2007).
- Kılıçbay, Mehmet A., “Osmanlı Batılılaşması,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 147 - 152.
- Kia, Mehrdad, *The Ottoman Empire* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2008).
- Kocatürk, Utkan, *Atatürk ve Türk Devrimi Kronolojisi, 1918-1938* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1973).
- Kocatürk, Utkan, “Atatürk’s Revolutions and Modernization”, *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, vol.13, no.5 (November 1988), pp. 3 - 15.
- Kongar, Emre, *Atatürk ve Devrim Kuramları* (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1981).
- Köşgeroğlu, Fahrettin E., “An Approach for Conservation of Railway Heritage: Assessing and Experiencing the Izmir-Aydın Railway Line”, Unpublished Master Thesis, (Middle East Technical University, Department of Architecture in Restoration, 2005).
- Kurmuş, Orhan, *Emperyalizmin Türkiye'ye Girişi* (Ankara: Savaş Yayınları, 1982).
- Kushner, David, “Atatürk's Legacy: Westernism in Contemporary Turkey,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 233 - 244.
- Landau, Jacob M., *The Hejaz Railway and the Muslim Pilgrimage* (Canada: Wayne State University Press, 1971).
- Landau, Jacob M., “Atatürk’s Achievement: Some Considerations,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. xi - xiii.
- Lewis, Bernard, *What Went Wrong? The Clash between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East* (New York: Harper Collins, 2002).

- Lewis, Bernard, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London: Oxford U.P., 1968).
- Longworth, Heather A., “Tracks, Tunnels and Trestles: An Environmental History of the Construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway”, Unpublished Master Thesis, (Acadia University, Department of History, 2007).
- Mardin, Şerif, “Batıcılık,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 245 – 250.
- Mardin, Şerif, “Atatürkçülüğün Kökenleri,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 86 – 88.
- McMeekin, Sean, *The Berlin-Baghdad Express: The Ottoman Empire and Germany's Bid for World Power* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).
- McMurray, Jonathan S., *Distant Ties: Germany, the Ottoman Empire, and the Construction of the Baghdad Railway* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2001).
- Merdol, Arif, “Cumhuriyet Dönemi Ulaşım Modelleri,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 10 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 2769 - 2772.
- Meriç Cemil, “Batılaşma,” in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 234 - 244.
- Mitchell, Timothy, “The Stage of Modernity,” in *Questions of Modernity*, ed. Timothy Mitchell (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), pp. 1 - 34.
- Moffatt, Maurice P. and Rich, Stephen G., “The Railroads in a Changing Society,” *Journal of Educational Sociology*, vol.27, no.7 (March 1954), pp. 314 - 322.
- Morawitz, Charles, “The Public Debt of Turkey,” *The North American Review*, vol.175, no. 549 (August 1902), pp. 275 - 288.
- Nalçaoğlu, Halil, “Turkey, Nation and Celebration: An Iconology of the Republic of Turkey,” in *National Days/National Ways: Historical, Political, and Religious Celebrations around the World*, ed. Linda K. Fuller (Westport: Praeger, 2004), pp. 261 - 283.
- Neumann, Christoph K., “Political and Diplomatic Development,” in *The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, ed. Suraiya N. Faroqhi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 44 - 62.
- Novichev, Aron D., *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Yarı-Sömürgeleşmesi* (Ankara: Onur Yayınları, 1979).

- Okyar, Osman, "Atatürk's Quest for Modernism," in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 45 - 53.
- Orsi, Richard J., *Sunset Limited: The Southern Pacific Railroad and the Development of the American West, 1850-1930* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).
- Ortaylı, İlber, "Batılılaşma Sorunu," in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 134- 138.
- Ortaylı, İlber, "Haydarpaşa to Baghdad," in *Iron Track: Age of the Train*, ed. Selahattin Özpallabıyıklar (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2003), pp. 24 - 31.
- Otte, T.G. and Neilson, Keith, *Railways and International Politics: Paths of Empire, 1848-1945* (USA: Routledge Press, 2006).
- Ökçün, Gündüz A., *Türkiye İktisat Kongresi 1923-İzmir: Haberler-Belgeler-Yorumlar* (Ankara: Sermaye Piyasası Kurulu, 1997).
- Öniş, Ziya, "Turkish Modernisation and Challenges for the New Europe," *Perceptions, Journal of International Affairs*, vol.9, no.3 (2004), pp. 5 - 28.
- Özay, Mehmet, "Turkey in Crisis: Some Contradictions in the Kemalist Development Strategy," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol.15, no.1 (February 1983), pp. 47 - 66.
- Özkan, Behlül, *From the Abode of Islam to the Turkish Vatan: The Making of a National Homeland in Turkey* (USA: Yale University Press, 2012).
- Özbudun, Ergun, "The Nature of the Kemalist Political Regime," in *Atatürk: Founder of a Modern State*, eds. Ali Kazancıgil and Ergun Özbudun (London: Hurst & Company, 1981), pp. 79 - 103.
- Özdemir, Mehmet, *Mütareke ve Kurtuluş Savaşı'nın Başlangıç Döneminde Türk Demir Yolları: Yapısal ve Ekonomik Sorunları (1918-1920)* (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2001).
- Özerdim, Sami N., *Atatürk Devrimi Kronolojisi* (Ankara: Halkevleri Atatürk Enstitüsü, 1974).
- Özyüksel, Murat, *Osmanlı-Alman İlişkilerinin Gelişim Sürecinde Anadolu ve Bağdat Demiryolları* (İstanbul: Arba, 1988).
- Özyüksel, Murat, *Hicaz Demiryolu* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000).
- Pamuk, Şevket, "Türkiye'deki İlk Demiryolu: İzmir-Aydın," *Toplumsal Tarih*, vol.1, no.5 (1994), pp. 35 - 37.
- Pamuk, Şevket, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

- Perry, John R., "Language Reform in Turkey and Iran," in *Men of Order: Authoritarian Modernization under Atatürk and Reza Shah*, eds. Touraj Atabaki and Erik J. Zürcher (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), pp. 238 – 259.
- "Railway Policies throughout the Eighty Years History of Our Republic". Available online at: http://www.tcdd.gov.tr/tcdding/tarihce_ing.html (Retrieved on 28 July 2013).
- Rittersberger-Tılıç, Helga and Kalaycıoğlu, Sibel, "The Nation State and the Individual: Alternative Strategies of Consent 'From Below,'" *Asian and African Studies* vol.7, no.1 (1998), pp. 69 - 79.
- Rustow, Dankwart A., "The Modernization of Turkey in Historical and Comparative Perspective," in *Social Change and Politics in Turkey: A Structural-Historical Analysis*, ed. Kemal Karpat (Leiden: Brill, 1973), pp. 93- 120.
- Quataert, Donald, "Limited Revolution: The Impact of the Anatolian Railway on Turkish Transportation and the Provisioning of Istanbul, 1890-1908," *The Business History Review*, vol. 51, no.2 (Summer 1997), pp. 139 - 160.
- Quataert, Donald, "The Economic Climate of the 'Young Turk Revolution' in 1908," *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 51, no. 3 (September 1979), pp. 1147-1161.
- Quataert, Donald, "Transportation," in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1600-1914*, eds. Halil İnalcık and Donald Quataert (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 798 - 823.
- Quataert, Donald, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Sarıaslan, Ümit, "Raylarını Kurtuluş Savaşı'nın döşediği demiryolları: Cumhuriyetin Trenleri" (October 2012). Available online at: <http://kentvedemiryolu.com/icerik.php?id=958> (Retrieved on 21 July 2013).
- Satan, Ali, "Osmanlı Devri Demiryolu Kronolojisi," in *Osmanlı'da Ulaşım: Kara, Deniz, Demiryolu*, eds. Vahdettin Engin *et al.* (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2012), pp. 309 - 340.
- Sencer, Muzaffer, "Din ve Toplum," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 560 - 569.
- Simon, Rachel, "Prelude to Reforms: Mustafa Kemal in Libya," in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 17 - 23.

- Soyak, Hasan R., *Doğumundan Cumhuriyetin İlânına Kadar Fotoğraflarla Atatürk ve Atatürk'ün Hususiyetleri* (İstanbul: Hayat Yayınları, 1966).
- Steinbach, Udo, "The Impact of Atatürk on Turkey's Political Culture since World War II," in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 77 - 88.
- Tachau, Frank, "The Political Culture of Kemalist Turkey," in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 57 - 76.
- Tekeli, İlhan and İlkin, Selim, "Türkiye'de Ulaştırmanın Gelişimi," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 10 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 2758 - 2768.
- Tekeli, İlhan and İlkin, Selim, "Cumhuriyetin Demiryolu Politikalarının Oluşumu ve Uygulaması," *Kebikeç*, no. 11 (2001), pp. 125 - 163.
- Thobie, Jacques, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Yabancı Sermaye", in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 3 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 724 – 739.
- Thomas, William G., *The Iron Way: Railroads, the Civil War, and the Making of Modern America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011).
- Timur, Taner, "Osmanlı ve Batılılaşma," in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 139 – 146.
- Timur, Taner, "Atatürk ve Pozitivizm," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 94 - 96.
- Toprak, Zafer, "Railways, The State and Modernity," in *Iron Track: Age of the Train*, ed. Selahattin Özpallabıyıklar (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2003), pp. 10 -23.
- Tunaya, Tarık Z., "Batılılaşmada Temel Araştırmalar ve Yaklaşımlar," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 1 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 238 - 239.
- Tunçay, Mete, "Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Siyasal Düşünce Akımları," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 7 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 1924 - 1928.
- Tunçay, Mete, "Laiklik," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, 2-3 (İstanbul: İletişim Publications, 1985), pp. 570 - 578.
- Turan, İlter, "Continuity and Change in Turkish Bureaucracy: The Kemalist Period and After," in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 99 - 121.

- Turhan, İlhan, “İsmet İnönü: Konuşma, Demeç, Makale, Mesaj ve Söyleşileri, 1933 – 1938”. Available online at: <http://www.ismetinonu.org.tr/ismet-inonu-1933-1938.htm> (Retrieved on 5 July 2013).
- Wagner, Peter, *Modernity as Experience and Interpretation: A New Sociology of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008).
- Ward, Robert E. and Rustow, Dankwart A., ed., *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964).
- White, Sam, *The Climate of Rebellion in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Winter, Michael, “The Modernization of Education in Kemalist Turkey,” in *Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey*, ed. Jacob M. Landau (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), pp. 183 - 194.
- Wittrock, B., “Modernity: One, None, or Many? European Origins and Modernity as a Global Condition,” *Daedalus, Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, vol.129, no.1 (2000), pp. 31 – 60.
- Woods, H., *Economic Conditions in Turkey* (London, 1934).
- Worringer, Renée, “Sick Man of Europe" or "Japan of the Near East"?: Constructing Ottoman Modernity in the Hamidian and Young Turk Eras,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 36, no. 2 (2004), pp. 207 - 230.
- Yavuz, Ünsal, “Cumhuriyet Devri Demiryolu Politikasına Yaklaşım Biçimi,” in *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Demiryolları Sempozyumu*, ed. Mukaddes Arslan (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 2010), pp. 83 – 90.
- Yerasimos, Stefanos, *Az gelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye* (İstanbul: Gözlem Yayınları, 1980).
- Yıldırım, İsmail, *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Demiryolları, 1923-1950* (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 2001).
- Zürcher, Erik J., *Turkey: A Modern History* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004).
- Zürcher, Erik J., “Institution Building in the Kemalist Republic: The Role of the People’s Party,” in *Men of Order: Authoritarian Modernization under Atatürk and Reza Shah*, eds. Touraj Atabaki and Erik J. Zürcher (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), pp. 98 – 112.
- Zürcher, Erik J., *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk’s Turkey* (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2010).

Periodicals

Demiryollar mecmuası

T.C. Nafia Vekaleti Bayındırlık İşleri Dergisi

TBMM Zabıt Cerideleri