

Theoretical Dimensions of Modernization: A Sociological Inquiry

Ош Мамлекеттик

Университети

ТЕОЛОГИЯ

ФАКУЛЬТЕТИНИН ИЛИМИЙ
ЖУРНАЛЫ

13- саны, 2008

65-77- 66.

İhsan ÇAPCIOĞLU*

Özet

Modernleşmenin Kuramsal Boyutları: Sosyolojik Bir Çözümleme

Modernleşmenin sosyal bilimler literatüründeki üç farklı kullanımından söz etmek mümkündür. Birinci kullanım, analitik bir içeriğe göndermede bulunarak modernleşme ve modernleşen toplumsal yapının/sürecin oldukça soyut niteliklerini vurgular. Toplumlar bu nitelikleri taşıdıkları ölçüde “modern”; toplumun seçkinleri söz konusu nitelikleri elde etmede başarılı oldukları ölçüde ise “modernleşen” toplum olarak değerlendirilir. Bu anlamıyla modernleşme, bir toplumsal değişme sürecidir. İkinci olarak, modern ve modernleşme kavramları tarihsel bir içeriğe sahiptir. Üçüncü anlamıyla modernleşme, gelişmekte olan ülke liderlerinin ya da seçkinlerinin yürüttüğü bir dizi politikadan ibarettir. Bu modernleşme yorumunda liderler, kendi ülkelerinde köklü değişimlerin öncülüğünü yapan yenilikçiler olarak görülür. Bu makalede modernleşmenin boyutları kuramsal bir çözümlemeye dayalı olarak incelenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Aydınlanma, Akılcılık, Modernleşme, Modernleşme Kuramı, Gelişme, İlerleme

1. What is modernization?

The word modern of which Turkish correspondence is *çağdaş* is expressed in the Western languages through such lexical items as “contemporary”, “mundane” (English) and “mondaine” (French).⁵⁷ The concepts of “modern”, “modernized” and “modernization” have various similar

* Dr., Divinity Faculty of Ankara University, e-mail: ih sancapcioglu@yahoo.com

⁵⁷ Durmuş Hocaoglu, *Laisizm'den Milli Sekülerizm'e*, Selçuk Publications, Ankara 1995, 22.

and distinct meanings. In everyday life, the word modern refers to contemporary and to the replacement of old event, fact, process by new ones. Such use of the concept is the closest one to its Latin origin "modernus". The other meaning of modernization is concerned with the concept of progress. However, these uses do not embrace its sense in sociological domain.

It is possible to mention three uses of the concept modernization in social sciences literature. The first use of the concept addresses the content and emphasizes highly abstract features of modernization and modernized social structure/process. Those societies with these qualities are seen as "modern" and if elites in a society achieve them, then the society are regarded as a "modern" society. In this sense, modernization is a process of social change.⁵⁸ Secondly, the concepts of modern and modernization has a historical content. In this second sense, it refers to certain time periods isolated from their priors. Such time periods may go back to the periods of Renaissance and Reformation that ended with the emergence of secularism and capitalism in Europe. Additionally, modernization refers to a universal social project.⁵⁹ In its third sense, modernization involves a series of policy implemented by politic leaders or elites of developing countries. In this sense, leaders are innovators leading to radical changes. Modernity is a social change vehicle used by progressive leaders to achieve their desires/aims and its content and aspects are changed in accordance with conditions by change agents. Modernization is a series of plans and policies implemented by societal leaders to modify the society copying more developed societies. In this sense, the founder of modern Turkey Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, India's first and only women president Indira Gandhi who was killed in 1984 and Tanzania's founder president Julius Nyerere can all be regarded as innovative leaders⁶⁰.

2. The theory of modernization

The theory of modernization is an approach to social change based on the assumption that all societies throughout the world can be modernized modeling the Western society. It emerged after the Second World War, especially in the US social science circles. It regards the USA as a representative of modernity. This theory is basically dependent on major premises of structural functionalism and argues that if societies are subject to an

⁵⁸ Anthony D. Smith, *Toplumsal Değişme Analizi*, translated by Ülgen Oskay, Gündoğan Publications, Ankara 1996, 88-89.

⁵⁹ Patricia Mainardi, "The Political Origins of Modernism", *Art Journal*, 1985 45 (1): 13.

⁶⁰ Smith, *Toplumsal Değişme Analizi*, 89-90.

universal process beginning from tradition to modernity, they can develop.⁶¹ Those who adopt this theory believe that in order for societies to achieve the level of modern economic development, they should experience the processes of cultural and social.⁶²

After the Second World War, depending on restructuring and reinterpreting of the world, the modernization theory emerged and became very influential in social science literature. Kissinger argues that in the emergence of the theory the USA's thinking herself as a new world force has impact and "the official US ideology regards herself having two significant qualities, the establishment of democracy in the USA and then, transferring it to other countries, and transferring the US values to other nations."⁶³ Therefore, the US-oriented modernization theory employs this emphasis as model for both developed and developing countries as way to eliminate the gap between countries in terms of their socio-economic development levels and also, for providing an ideological plan to countries. In this framework, less developed countries are thought to copy and follow developed countries and then, achieve the level of Western style development. The theory of modernization also "conceptualizes the development as a transition process from traditional to modernity and assumes that such a transition process can be achieved through the existence of markets and international investments economically, and the establishment and adaptation of western-oriented institutions, values and conducts socially, and the implementation of parliamentary democracy politically".⁶⁴

Modernization theory with these features appears to be a model used to account for the changes experienced by non-western societies.⁶⁵ The theory emerged in a period in which the western societies regained their self-confidence after the world wars.⁶⁶ Unlike depression philosophies developed

⁶¹ İsmail Coşkun, "Modernleşme Kuramı Üzerine", *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 1988-1989 (1): 289.

⁶² Fahrettin Altun, *Modernleşme Kuramı: Eleştirel Bir Giriş*, Küre Publications, İstanbul 2005, 13.

⁶³ Henri Kissinger, *Diplomasi*, 3rd Edition, Türkiye İş Bankası Publications, İstanbul 2002, 10.

⁶⁴ Gordon Marshall, *Sosyoloji Sözlüğü*, translated by Osman Akinhay, Derya Kömürcü, Bilim and Sanat Publications, Ankara 1999, 261.

⁶⁵ Mithat Baydur, "Modernleşme Bağlamında Tanzimat", *Türkiye Günümü*, 1994 (31): 89.

⁶⁶ In understanding of modernization theory, the analysis of the relationship between the west and modernity plays a crucial role. In this regard, the relationship between the west and modernity can be interpreted in two ways: "The first interpretation states that the first achievers of modernity id western societies but it does not mean that modernity belongs to these societies. Western societies only progresses further because they achieved the modernity earlier. Such a position held by the western societies provides them with an obligation to distribute modernity to other societies. The second interpretation argues that western society produced the modernity as result of its internal dynamics and virtues it had. Non-western societies, on the other hand, cannot achieved modernity because of their internal limitations and negative features they had. Therefore, it is necessary to modernize the world. In order to achieve it, western virtues should be distributed throughout the world and negative qualities of

after the First World War and resulting political and economic chaos, the theory of modernization provided the western societies with the sense of self-confidence and pleasure with their current state. Therefore, it has some common points with the 19th century western thought. The 19th century western thought was dominated by evolutionary, progressive social change assumption. This assumption began to be revitalized by the theory of modernization. The route of social change in the 19th century was from primitive societies to civilized western societies but it was changed after the introduction of the theory becoming from traditional societies to modern western societies.⁶⁷

Evolutionary social change assumption that dominated the social science discourse in the 19th century is partly different from the paradigm of modernization that became a theory after the Second World War. Although both periods were shaped by the assumptions of Enlightening, positive social science, capitalist economy and superiority of the western culture, their definitions on “me” and “other” are quite different. The 19th century thinkers tended to categorize societies using absolute and biased distinctions like developed/primitive, developed/underdeveloped etc., while the 20th century thinkers, especially modernization theorists, began to employ more vague, more neutral classifications of society like modern/traditional, developed/developing etc.⁶⁸ Modernization theorists argued that the USA is the representative of modernity and that societies all around the world can be modern only if they model the Western society. They regarded the development of societies as an universal transition process from traditional one to modern one depending on major premises of structural functionalism.⁶⁹ Therefore, the distinction between

non-western societies should be eliminated. The common point of these two interpretation is the leadership of western society and western society's position as a founder agent. Altun, *ibid*, 152–153.

⁶⁷ Coşkun, “Modernleşme Kuramı Üzerine”, 296-297.

⁶⁸ Celal Metin, *Türk Modernleşmesi ve İran*, (Unpublished PhD. Dissertation), Institute of Atatürk Doctrines and Reforms in Hacettepe University, Ankara 2006, 38–39.

⁶⁹ Parsons who regarded as the founder of modernization theory states that societal system is made up of elements interrelated one another. These elements contribute to the functioning and continuity of the system. Maintaining the system is realized through the elements of coherence, integration, protection of conduct codes and unity of purpose. In Parsons' structural-functional approach, society is unified through these elements. Parsons deals with the necessary conditions for functioning and balanced social structure after the political, economic and social environment of post-war period. For Parsons, societies are directed by purposes and try to find the ways of adapting to their environment. Parsons argues that modern societies have more “generalized adaptation capacity” in contrast to previous societies. Parsons' approach produced an evolution schema based on modern USA and regarded the western values as basic dynamic of modernization of societies. For Parsons, modernization is an universal process and there are certain phases to achieve the process of modernization (bureaucracy, rationalization, industrialization and democratization). Those phases that may contribute to the modernization of societies are as follows: Early Christianity, Middle Ages, anti reform, the rise of the state, industrial and democratic revolutions, and high levels of secularism, and modern USA as a state of

modern and traditional appears to be one of the most significant dichotomies.⁷⁰ Modernization theorists, although initially divided the societies into two groups as modern societies and traditional societies, later they added the third category to this classification, namely transitional societies (*transitional societies*).⁷¹ They identified the models appropriate for the categories of traditional societies, transitional societies and modern societies, and basic characteristics of these models. "Modern society is one in which urbanization, industrialization, mass media communication, high rates of literacy, secular system, democratic ideals and "universal human rights" are very evident. Traditional society is one in which the characteristics seen in modern society does not exist. Therefore, traditional society is not defined in accordance with its own paradigm but with the western modernity conceptualization. Particularly classical version of the theory assumes that since there is a serious tension and conflict between traditional one and modern one, traditional one should be eliminated to open the way of modernization processes.⁷² In this sense, the theory of modernization as a change and development model assumes that societies are in the need of cultural and social change processes to achieve the modern economic development level.

Modernization theory⁷³ argues that modernity can be distributed to all societies throughout the world, and that the reason for underdevelopment is related to the development problems of non-western societies and that when these societies become modern, their development problems will be solved. Therefore, development process is identified with modernization process. However, modernization is not a condition that can be achieved through a natural historical process but rather a social task that can be achieved following a western model. According to modernization theory, success of non-western societies in modernization depends on the adoption of systematic internal

industrialized and democratic. Additionally, he regards Israel and Greek societies as sources of modernity. These societies established a cultural innovation environment contributing to the development of modernity, although they cannot achieved the furthest points in evolutionary schema. Altun, *Modernleşme Kuramı: Eleştirel Bir Giriş*, 80-81.

⁷⁰ Dilek Yigit Yüksel, *Rus Modernleşmesi ve Türkiye (1682-1905)*, (Unpublished PhD. Dissertation), Institute of Atatürk Doctrines and Reforms in Hacettepe University, Ankara 2006, 25-26.

⁷¹ Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, "Convergence and Divergence of Modern and Modernizing Societies From the Analysis of the Structuring of Social Hierarchies in Middle Eastern Societies", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 1977 (8): 3.

⁷² Metin, *Türk Modernleşmesi ve İran*, 37.

⁷³ Basic aims of the modernization theory can be stated as only one system and common point, superiority of western society, and integration of eastern society with system. Only system is that of western and common point is industry. Around this common point eastern society is integrated into the system while western society acts as a leader. Since industrialization is perceived as an aim to be achieved, eastern societies are considered as those that try to take part in the system. See Coşkun, "Modernleşme Kuramı Üzerine", 295.

elimination and external intervention processes. Traditional elements that inhibit modernity should be eliminated from social domain and historical memory. If non-western societies want to be modern, then they should follow the change process of western societies.⁷⁴ Modernization theory lost its dominance confronting very significant criticisms during the end of the 1960's and the beginning of 1970's. In this period, the negative consequences of capitalist industrialism were emphasized and development models financed by western societies that failed to achieve social progress and development began to be subject to heavy criticisms.⁷⁵

The approach called addiction theory criticized heavily major premises of modernization theory.⁷⁶ Major criticisms directed to modernization theory are mostly about political crisis experienced by western societies and failure of the development programs introduced in non-western societies.⁷⁷ In these criticisms, trends towards the west in the 19th century are called transition to modern society. Accordingly, in order to maintain the superiority of west-oriented technology and to mitigate the negative reactions a theory called modernization was developed. Moreover, orientalism that was subject to criticisms is stated to continue.⁷⁸ However, modernization theory firstly introduced a systematic theoretical framework that dealt with development problem of non-western societies following modern western thought tradition. It argued that non-western societies can also be modernized and tried to find the ways for it. Although modernization theory is mostly dependent on a frameworks of western-oriented, ethnocentric, progressive, evolutionary and enlightenment, it points out that non-western societies can also be modernized and participate in modernization process. Therefore, it represents a periodical and strategic change.⁷⁹

3. Dimensions of modernization

After dealing with the different uses of the modernization concept, it is useful to deal with its historical use. The process of modernization emerged between 17th century and 19th century firstly in Western Europe and North America as a result of changes experienced in the systems of society, economy

⁷⁴ Altun, *Modernleşme Kuramı: Eleştirel Bir Giriş*, 154.

⁷⁵ *Ibid*, 13.

⁷⁶ For more information on addiction theory, please see David F. Michalec, *Attachment Dimensions, Faith Development, and Religious Practices: An Exploration Among Non-Traditional College Students*, (Unpublished PhD. Dissertation), University of Detroit, Michigan 2002.

⁷⁷ Altun, *Modernleşme Kuramı: Eleştirel Bir Giriş*, 155.

⁷⁸ Yücel Bulut, *Oryantalizmin Kısa Tarihi*, Küre Publications, İstanbul 2004, VIII.

⁷⁹ Altun, *Modernleşme Kuramı: Eleştirel Bir Giriş*, 156.

and politics and later, it distributed to other European countries. During the 19th century and the 20th century it distributed to South America, Asian and African countries.⁸⁰ Although its pace and density varied, it was mostly expressed by the concept of modernization as well as of development.

Development in a sense is "practical" use of modernization. Political scientists such as Apter, Almond, Pye and Binder analyzing societies in Asia, Africa and Latin America used modernization as "development". Therefore, modernization includes both practical solutions to social problems and self-satisfactory economic development.⁸¹ In this sense, development refers to changes in economic patterns of society making possible sustained growth while modernization refers to change process in the fields of social, cultural, political and psychological occupying to economic development. In other words, development refers to changes in infrastructure of a society but modernization to those in supra structure of it.

Some social scientists like Daniel Lerner, however, identify modernization with "westernization". Lerner who is one of the leading figures in modernization theory in the USA published *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East* in the 1950's.⁸² Lerner deals with change process in Turkey as well as other Middle East countries such as Iran and Syria. He regards Atatürk's revolutions as modernization attempts towards "westernization". Lerner states that in the Turkish modernization, both reason and positivist thought are dominant.⁸³ Çiğdem, on the other hand, makes a distinction between "modernity" and "modernization" based on Habermas⁸⁴ and points out that this distinction is not only valid for western society but also in non-western societies. He states that modernity refers to a projection and reflection while modernization refers to institutional-structural evolution that makes possible this project. In this sense, non-western societies can be modernized but not be modern. Non-western societies can only be related to

⁸⁰ Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, *Modernleşme: Başkaldırı ve Değişim*, translated by Ufuk Coşkun, Doğubatı Publications, Ankara 2007, 11.

⁸¹ Smith, *Toplumsal Değişme Anlayışı*, 90.

⁸² "Lerner who came Turkey in 1948 asks the villagers in Ankara, Balgat village: "What would you do if you are the president?" The answer of the villagers made him surprised: "... we cannot be the president" Lerner said that if I asked this question to a taxi driver in New York, I may hear many plans. For Lerner, the difference between the villagers and the US people is "empathy". Modern people (e.g. taxi driver in New York) may put themselves in the position of others but traditional people (villagers) cannot do that. Because, empathy is an ability that can be gained through visiting other places, seeing, reading. Therefore, modern people have a "movable personality". See Haluk Şahin, "Empati ve Kör Nefret", *Radikal*, 28 January 2007.

⁸³ Kadir Canatan, *Bir Değişim Süreci Olarak Modernleşme*, İnsan Publications, İstanbul 1995, 12-13.

⁸⁴ Ahmet Çiğdem, "Batılılaşma, Modernite ve Modernizasyon", *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, İletişim Publications, İstanbul 2002, (3): 68.

institutional infrastructure of modern societies. Therefore, modernization refers to the attempts of non-western societies to achieve the development levels of western societies and is the synonym of westernization.

The other related concept is progression. Progress in human thought refers to progression of human beings towards better and more beautiful aims. It entails that the latter phase is more primitive in contrast to the former phase in historical development process. Positive sense attributed to progression dominated the western thought in the 18th and 19th centuries. The following assumptions appear to be different formulations of the idea of modernization: Auguste Comte's three state law about humans' intellectual development, Hegel's theory about phases to achieve Tin's own conscious, Marx's dialectical process regarding development of production modes from primitive communal period to communism.⁸⁵

In sociological discussions, modernization is also related with the concepts of rational/rationalization that emerged with the 18th enlightenment period. Rationalism is very significant reference point for many sociologists such as Weber and Habermas. Weber's theory on modernization is based of the assumption of rationalism. Therefore, Weber argues that modernity and rationalism are very closely related to each other. Weber states that rationalism is very important process in emergence of the world. In this world, tradition loses its prestige/power, science gains dominance. Weber claims that the rise of rationalism in west is closely related to capitalism, Protestant moral values, bureaucracy and science. He maintains that rationalization has two meanings that are related to each other but can be differentiated analytically and sometimes conflict each other. Rationalism refers to an understanding of the world that is increasingly perfect and formal mathematical models concerning social and individual conduct are typical examples of rationalism. Weber also states that rationalism involves principles about thought in regard to distinct domains in social life. Law and moral systems are based on such principles. These different rationalism processes may complement each other but they may also be in contradiction with each other.⁸⁶ Weber argues that other societies also experience rationalism processes but the results of these process are different then those in western societies. Moreover, western societies are superior to

⁸⁵ Mehmet Akgül, *Türk Modernleşmesi ve Din*, Çizgi Publications, Konya 1999, 47-48.

⁸⁶ Kenneth H. Tucker, Jr., *Anthony Giddens and Modern Social Theory*, Sage Publications, London 1998, 128.

other societies since they had accumulated experience of both rationalization and modernization.⁸⁷

Weber argues that rationalization may produce other tensions. It creates social domains isolated from their authentic religious contexts. In modern west, the state is separated from economy and both are separated from religion and family. Weber in his book *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* shows the contribution of religion to the rise of capitalism and rational, methodological progress of life based on belief and moral values. Therefore, rationalization is based on religion as well as arts and science.⁸⁸

Parsons who developed his theory of modernization based on Weber's assumption and views about internal dynamics of modern world introduced a powerful theory of modernization to sociology literature.⁸⁹ Like Weber, Parsons deals with the results of rationalism of modern social order. However, unlike Weber, Parsons argues that modernity may produce bureaucracy eliminating moral values and "iron cage" of rationality. He regards universality as being related to differentiation processes of modernity. When society becomes modern, different social units become independent but at the same time have an autonomous pattern. Therefore, personality of individuals becomes autonomous distancing from social and cultural systems and individuals make their own decisions. Thus, individuals learn to follow moral values in different situations like schools, family and working environment. However, they should consolidate all these distinct environments in his personality.⁹⁰ This is very important for both the individual and the society in which he lives. Because if the consolidation cannot be achieved, socialization of individuals and normative and functional consolidation of society cannot be achieved either.

One of the theorists who improved Weber's concept of rationalization is Habermas. He redefined Weber's theory. Habermas argues that rationality refers to a principle used to categorize the reason as a universal subject of which origins go back to the period of Enlightenment. For him, modernity and rationality are closely related to each other and they have parallel historical development. Modernity is possible through historical and philosophical use of essential rationality that legitimizes the distance between past and present.⁹¹ Habermas believes that instrumental rationality of "system" potentially inhibits democratic, rational discourse in everyday life. The major distinction between

⁸⁷ Ahmet Çiğdem, *Bir İmkan Olarak Modernite: Weber ve Habermas*, İletişim Publications, İstanbul 1997, 78.

⁸⁸ Tucker, Jr., *Anthony Giddens and Modern Social Theory*, 128-129.

⁸⁹ *Ibid*, 127.

⁹⁰ *Ibid*, 130.

⁹¹ Çiğdem, *Bir İmkan Olarak Modernite: Weber ve Habermas*, 79.

other societies since they had accumulated experience of both rationalization and modernization.⁸⁷

Weber argues that rationalization may produce other tensions. It creates social domains isolated from their authentic religious contexts. In modern west, the state is separated from economy and both are separated from religion and family. Weber in his book *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* shows the contribution of religion to the rise of capitalism and rational, methodological progress of life based on belief and moral values. Therefore, rationalization is based on religion as well as arts and science.⁸⁸

Parsons who developed his theory of modernization based on Weber's assumption and views about internal dynamics of modern world introduced a powerful theory of modernization to sociology literature.⁸⁹ Like Weber, Parsons deals with the results of rationalism of modern social order. However, unlike Weber, Parsons argues that modernity may produce bureaucracy eliminating moral values and "iron cage" of rationality. He regards universality as being related to differentiation processes of modernity. When society becomes modern, different social units become independent but at the same time have an autonomous pattern. Therefore, personality of individuals becomes autonomous distancing from social and cultural systems and individuals make their own decisions. Thus, individuals learn to follow moral values in different situations like schools, family and working environment. However, they should consolidate all these distinct environments in his personality.⁹⁰ This is very important for both the individual and the society in which he lives. Because if the consolidation cannot be achieved, socialization of individuals and normative and functional consolidation of society cannot be achieved either.

One of the theorists who improved Weber's concept of rationalization is Habermas. He redefined Weber's theory. Habermas argues that rationality refers to a principle used to categorize the reason as a universal subject of which origins go back to the period of Enlightenment. For him, modernity and rationality are closely related to each other and they have parallel historical development. Modernity is possible through historical and philosophical use of essential rationality that legitimizes the distance between past and present.⁹¹ Habermas believes that instrumental rationality of "system" potentially inhibits democratic, rational discourse in everyday life. The major distinction between

⁸⁷ Ahmet Çiğdem, *Bir İmkan Olarak Modernite: Weber ve Habermas*, İletişim Publications, İstanbul 1997, 78.

⁸⁸ Tucker, Jr., *Anthony Giddens and Modern Social Theory*, 128-129.

⁸⁹ *Ibid*, 127.

⁹⁰ *Ibid*, 130.

⁹¹ Çiğdem, *Bir İmkan Olarak Modernite: Weber ve Habermas*, 79.

Habermas and Weber in terms of interpretation of rationality is as follows: Weber regards rationality as inevitable fate that eliminates modern society while Habermas considers it as the ideology of *Gesellschaft*.⁹²

In addition to rationalization, individualism is another basic concept that is one of the characteristics of modern world. Through transition to modern society, people began to search for the ways to become freer escaping from limitations of traditional societal patterns. For this reason, individualism is based on modern society's own new moral values and principles.⁹³ The concept of individualism that began to be shaped with the reformation process of the 16th century and that was systematically analyzed as a result of the impacts of the 18th century enlightenment assumption⁹⁴ became one of the symbols of reactions against innovation in the 19th century. Individualism beginning from its emergence has been used both positively and negatively. For instance, Luckmann who argues that the relationship between individual and social order leads to a radical transformation in modern society states that this transformation has produced a basic distortion in individual's position in the society.⁹⁵ More detailed analysis of individual's existence in social positioning can be found in Emile Durkheim's work.

Durkheim argues that modern society seems to have qualities that have serious impacts on individuals. For him religious symbols are the basics of *collective conscious*. The existence of religion as a social fact that has a character transcending the individual is the basic condition for social integration and sustained of social order. Durkheim mentions about the necessity of individualism based on social because of humans' quality of *homo duplex*.⁹⁶

⁹² *Ibid*, 81.

⁹³ Peter Kivisto, *Key Ideas in Sociology*, 2nd Edition, Pine Forge Press, 2004, 83.

⁹⁴ Mehmet Süheyl Ünal, *Modern Toplumda Dinsel Bireycilik*, (Unpublished PhD. Dissertation), Social Sciences Institute of Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir 2007, 4.

⁹⁵ Thomas Luckmann, *Görünmeyen Din: Modern Toplumda Din Problemi*, translated by Ali Coşkun, Fuat Aydın, Rağbet Publications, İstanbul 2003, 11.

⁹⁶ Durkheim thinks that each person has two dimensions: social dimension and non-social dimension. People are divided into these two dimensions, therefore, *homo duplex* creatures. This distinction reflects his view on human nature. For the discussion of *Homo duplex* in regard to the relationship between holyness and modernity please see Philip A. Mellor and Chris Shilling, "Lorsque l'on jette de l'huile sur le feu ardent: sécularisation, homo duplex et retour du sacré", *Social Compass*, 1998, (45) 2: 297-320; Furthermore, for discussions on the concepts from different perspectives and for more detailed information about the concept, please see the followings: Emile Durkheim, "The Dualism of Human nature and Its Social Conditions", *Émile Durkheim on Morality and Society*, 146-163, ed. Robert N. Bellah, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973; Jacques Berlinerblau, "Free Will and Determinism in First Isaiah: Secular Hermeneutics, the Poetics of Contingency, and Émile Durkheim's *Homo Duplex*", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 2003 71 (4): 767-791; Eugene Hynes, "Suicide and Homo Duplex: An Interpretation of Durkheim's Typology of Suicide", *Sociological Quarterly* 1975 16 (1): 87-104.

Durkheim deals with suicide events⁹⁷ and concludes that humans act according to unsatisfied motives that should be limited by society. Moreover, he points out that there should be a balance between satisfaction of individual needs and desires and meeting the social responsibility and requirements. The source for this desired balance between individual and society is the social moral understanding that involves desired values. When contradictions occur between individual's ego and societal values, trends towards suicide cases increase. Whitney Pope comments on Durkheim's assumption as follows:

Lower rates of social interaction produces poor collective sense; poorer collective sense leads to poorer social integration; poorer social integration leads to less volunteer individual attempts for the purpose of social benefit; and less volunteer individual attempts for the purpose of social benefit produces less meaningful life and higher rates of suicide.⁹⁸

Durkheim regards extreme individualism as the reason for suicide cases and as a social danger. Although he indicates that modern individualism may produce some problems, he also emphasizes the positive dimension of individualism. Durkheim states that when it is properly channeled it may contribute to organic solidarity among the members of the society.⁹⁹ Durkheim's views on changing and dynamic relationship between individual and society are used by Robert K. Merton, David Reisman, Robert N. Bellah and Erving Goffman in their formulation the conceptualization on individualism. In this regard Merton¹⁰⁰ is concerned with the tension in the relationship between individual and society. Reisman¹⁰¹ deals with the thread caused by mass society conformities for individualism. Bellah et. al.¹⁰² regard the concept of individualism as a problem for the society's base. Goffman¹⁰³ argues that conducts advised or not advised to individuals by social pattern have significant effects on the process of acquiring personal.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁷ Emile Durkheim, *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1951.

⁹⁸ Whitney Pope, *Durkheim's Suicide: A Classic Analyzed*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976, cited by Kivisto, *Key Ideas in Sociology*, 100.

⁹⁹ *Ibid*, 92-102.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, 105-108.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*, 108-112.

¹⁰² *Ibid*, 113-116.

¹⁰³ *Ibid*, 116-119.

¹⁰⁴ For more detailed discussions on the subject please see the following works: For Robert K. Merton "Social Structure and Anomie", *American Sociological Review* 1938 3 (3): 672-82; *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press, 1968; *Sociological Ambivalence and Other Essays*. New York: Free Press, 1976; "A Life of Learning." American Council of Learned Societies Occasional Paper, No. 25. New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 1994. For David Riesman, *Thorstein Veblen: A*

4. Conclusion

In the western world, modernization emerged based on a principle that argues for the establishment of a social and political order dominated by the reason. In this sense, modernization refers to cultural, intellectual and social transformations beginning with renaissance and reform continuing with enlightenment movements during 17th and 20th centuries. As mentioned previously, modernization refers to gaining information without being attached to the past and involves ideas and actions about future rather than past.

Modernization that emerged as a process of change, development and differentiation in political, economic and social domains takes the individual as the basis and determines the quality of society, the level of technological development, economic relations, cultural patterns and society's differentiation domains. As stated by Safi,¹⁰⁵ modernization in this way deconstructs the traditional structure and aims at individual's modification and development through the introduction of the concepts of freedom and equality. One of the theories on modernization structural-functional approach states that characteristic qualities of contemporary western society, namely rationalism, secularism, democracy, free initiative and individualism should be exactly followed if industrialization is to be achieved. In this regard, although in Turkey and other eastern societies there is no western-like modernization process, there is also a process of modernization resulting from the attempts of thinkers who trained in western countries. Despite there is no exact correspondence between processes experienced in western countries and eastern

Critical Interpretation. New York: Scribner, 1953; "Becoming an Academic Man", 22-74, *Authors of Their Own Lives: Intellectual Autobiographies by Twenty American Sociologists*, edited by B. M. Berger. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990 and especially see *Individualism Reconsidered*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1954; Nathan Glazer and Reuel Denney. *The Lonely Crowd*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1950. For Robert N. Bellah, the book written by him and Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler and Steven M. Tipton *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985 and also, please see *The Good Society*. New York: Knopf, 1991; "Individualism and the Crisis of Civic Membership." *Christian Century*, 1996, May 8, 510-15. For Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1959; *Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961a; *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961b; *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1963; *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967; *Relations in Public: Micro Studies of the Public Order*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971; *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

¹⁰⁵ İsmail Safi, *Türkiye'de Muhafazakar Siyaset ve Yeni Arayışlar*, 2nd Edition, Lotus Publications, Ankara 2007, 76-78.

countries, they have common points and are felt strongly in the political and social domains.

In non-western societies there is a gap and inconsistency between traditionalism and modernity. Contrary to expectations, these societies seem to be distancing from traditional patterns. As seen in Turkey and China, volunteer and authorizer modernization projects are influential and they are more radical than imperialist modernization attempts (such as India). India embraced its relationship with the tradition and used it as a resistance to imperialism. In Turkey and China, however, radical rejection of the tradition became the basis of “innovative” ideology. Traditions were either ignored or disappeared themselves or forbidden regarded as barriers for being modern. Therefore, the effects of modernity on tradition were not transformative. If there are still traditions living, it is a result of the fact that such traditions stayed at the periphery of the system. As stated by Göle,¹⁰⁶ in non-western environments traditions and modernity appear to be inconsistent parts that do not have an exact equality.

¹⁰⁶ Nîlûfer Göle, “Batı Dışı Modernlik: Kavram Üzerine”, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasî Düşünce - Modernleşme ve Batıcılık*, ed. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu, İletişim Publications, İstanbul 2002 (3): 65.