

Turkish Modernity and Epistemic Communities in the Social Sciences: Transfer of Intellectual Knowledge among Religion and Science?

*

Ruhi Can Alkın

Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü- Konya/
Türkiye
E-Posta: rcalkin@konya.edu.tr

Abstract

In this study, transformation process of epistemic communities in modern Turkey, which helps us understanding the imagined conflict among science and religion, will be issued and the problematic regarding an assumed competition among religion and science will be focused on. In doing so, it is proposed to illustrate the unique model of religious intellectual manner in Turkey, which both embraces religion and science without problematizing them as the conflict areas. At the end of the study, it is proposed to clarify the relationship among modernity, religion, intellectual knowledge and scientific language in specific to modern Turkish history.

Keywords: Religion, Science, Epistemic Communities, Intellectual Knowledge.

Türk Modernleşmesi ve Sosyal Bilimlerde Epistemik Cemaatler: Entelektüel Bilginin Bilim ve Din Ara- sında Transferi mi?

*

Öz

Bu çalışmada, Türkiye’de bilim ve din arasında var olduđu düşünölen çatışmayı anlamaya yardımcı olacak olan epistemik cemaatler arasındaki geçiş süreci konu edilecek ve bilimle din arasında yaşandıđı varsayılan çatışma üzerinde odaklanılacaktır. Bu yolla, Türkiye’de entelektüel çabanın kendine has bir durumu olarak hem dini hem de bilimi, bu iki olguyu bir çatışma perspektifinden görmeyerek kucaklayan tavır ortaya konulmuş olacaktır. Çalışmanın sonunda, modern Türk tarihi özelinde din, modernite, entelektüel bilgi ve bilimsel dil arasındaki ilişkiye dair açılımlar getirilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Din, Bilim, Epistemik Topluluklar, Entelektüel bilgi.*

Introduction

After the appearance of secular interpretation of individual, social, and political life in the 19th Century; the relationship among science and religion were recognized as one of the conflict areas. Like many other antagonisms formed by modernist interpretation, this process encouraged social scientists to recognize social life in terms of either “scientific knowledge” or “religious values”. Especially, positivism-oriented perception of science in the 19th century prepared an understanding of scientific endeavour, which is based heavily on a strong opposition against “religious dogmas”. For example, Auguste Comte, who is one of the well-known representatives of positivism in the social sciences, announced “scientific stage” in his scale as the consequence of advanced level of human mind, which is independent from sacred and invisible powers. At this point, when dealing with the “knowledge”, science plays the major role and the ways that help obtaining knowledge are expected to include (positive) scientific concreteness and exclude religious-metaphysic background.

Interestingly, this expectation initially makes itself visible in academia although philosophers, physicians, astronomers, mathematicians, etc. of the pre-modern period were also known with their theologian background. As if there was not any scientist who is also a believer, modern intellectual manner theoretically requires “a scientist profile independent from religion and religiosity”. Beside the situation in academia in Western European countries, non-Western societies modernized by the actors of enlightenment, industrial revolution and secularism witness the sterilization of intellectual knowledge from religious-traditional themes.

Turkey, as a country rose from the ashes of Islamic Ottoman Empire and modernized by political and military power elites, has been experiencing the same process since it has been established in the 1920’s. The imagined struggle among science and religion could be observed in the studies and the position of Turkish intelligentsia towards religion. The

reason behind this bifurcation could be found by looking at the transmission of the social sciences into the Turkish universities at the end of 19th Century.

In brief, meeting the social sciences in Turkey came across with the fall of Ottoman Empire. Intellectuals of the period try to utilize social sciences –especially sociology- to understand the backwardness in economy, politics, technology and military in Ottoman Empire. According to early-period intelligentsia of Turkey, who also share the same position with their forerunners in the 20th Century, religion is accused as being 1) the main factor for the forthcoming fall of the empire and 2) an obstacle to development as in the Western countries. By such a perception, people who take the position inside or outside of this idea were recognized in different epistemic communities. As Hüsammettin Arslan detailed in his inspirational PhD thesis published in 1992, supporters of positivistic/secular manner in the social sciences were named “modern epistemic community” and traditionalist manner was recognized as “classical epistemic community”. As a very normal consequence, after the establishment of Turkish Republic in 1923, modern epistemic community took the power and kept the majority. It held some secular interpretations of social and political life such as Marxist, evolutionary, rationalist, etc. and maintained its power until the 2000’s.

Interestingly, as a unique situation to Turkey, members of the classical epistemic community were not identifying themselves as being oppose to science and scientific values despite the tendency of the members of modern epistemic community on excluding religion in scientific studies. They were trying to understand the sociological, legal, and political transformation in the light of religious background of Turkish society, instead.

After the 2000’s in Turkey, the second imagined transformation among epistemic communities has been witnessed. Islamist approaches made themselves more visible in academic platforms and dominance of non-religious social scientific endeavour (or at least demand for it) started to be broken. This was also due to the general transformation of the social sciences in the World in favour of interpretivist perspectives in theory and methodology. By this way, positivistic approach, which tends to ignore invisible powers of intangible processes in scientific endeavour, started to be abandoned. Now, “Islamisation of intellectual knowledge” (Birekul,

2012) is one of the most popular study areas among Turkish intellectuals perhaps as the consequence of recent developments in Turkish academia.

In this current paper, this long process, which helps us understanding the imagined conflict among science and religion, will be detailed and the problematic regarding this competition through the transformation of intellectual knowledge among epistemic communities in Turkey will be discovered. In doing so, it is proposed to illustrate the unique model of religious intellectual manner in Turkey, which both embraces religion and science without problematizing them as the conflict areas.

1. Discovering 'Epistemic Community'

In order to understand the ongoing conflict and struggle among intellectual communities in Turkey and the effect of modernity in this process, an explanation and clarification on epistemic communities should firstly be done. In a theoretical base, epistemic community is a community of knowing, knowledge, realization and it means the community that constructs and develops the information and transfers it to the next generations (Arslan, 2007). Epistemic community has also different conceptualizations such as 'invisible college', 'scientific community', 'research community', 'network', etc. (Nelson, 1992). The main reason that makes these people 'community' is the collaboration of the members of an intellectual group on the study areas, subjects, assumptions, problems, and more importantly, their consensus on norms, beliefs, common values, interests, and of course benefits. As Rai (2012, p.561) indicates, "[F]ormation of an epistemic community necessarily leads to generation of a method of knowledge evaluation, production and dissemination".

An epistemic community, as it could be guessed by the statements above, is a platform that deals with 'knowledge' by many dimensions. For the first dimension, epistemic community is a source where the information is provided. Unless a statement is approved by an epistemic community, it is not accepted by the circle and members of that epistemic community as knowledge or truth. In this respect, epistemic communities could be understood as the first channel for an acceptable knowledge. Sec-

ondly, epistemic communities survive by keeping the knowledge and using it as a tool for their theoretical position, intellectual status. That is why, epistemic communities are subjected to 'struggle' or 'conflict' - as it is illustrated in this study. In order to support the position of a specific epistemic community, members contribute to main study areas of it and repeat the methodological and intellectual preferences of epistemic community. This dimension, indeed, is based heavily on the practices and successes of the members. For example, studying on the relevant subjects that epistemic community focuses on, participating national or international conferences and giving voice to those special interest areas and of course reflecting the position of the community, publishing edition books together with some members of the epistemic community, determining the curriculums of the departments in a university where a specific epistemic community keeps the majority, etc. are some of the examples for the individual or collective practices of epistemic communities. Throughout and/or at the end of these practices, both members and community get stronger. That is why; ignoring the main subject areas of the epistemic community might be punished by group (Bruner, 2013). This process again proves the rightfulness of the assertion "the epistemic community is identified by its shared theoretical rationale and its shared set of causal beliefs and notions of validity" (Brine, 2000,p.267).

Besides many ways or methodology on strengthening the ties among member and community, the main attempt for making epistemic community alive and maintaining communal relationships is publishing a journal and reciprocal 'referencing'. Almost every serious and widely-known journal that publishes specific papers is an output of an epistemic community. That is why; it is not a coincidence that the introduction/preface parts of the first issue of a journal declare a belonging to a tradition in relevant scientific endeavour. Even if it is not indicated in the first issue; in time, it is observed that the journal positions itself beside a tradition. In relation to this, authors are determined by considering the main discourse of the journal that serves the epistemic community. "Editors", says Crane (1967, p.195), "are the gatekeepers of an epistemic community". They decide what to publish or not to publish in consideration of the main interests, values, expectations and benefits of an epistemic community.

In addition to a specific journal, referencing is another methodology that supports an epistemic community and the unity among members. Referencing not only feeds the intellectual capacity of a group qualitatively or quantitatively, but also becomes a platform where the members of the community demonstrate their loyalty to community. By citing one or some of the statements or assumptions of a community member, members renew their relationship with group. "Citation is an institution in which the members of the community assist each other. Obviously, it is an argument that arises from the authority" (Arslan, 2007, p.132). On the other hand, being referenced by a colleague is a kind of awarding for another member. Such an attempt proves the rightfulness of cited member. Eventually, the relationship among "citer" and "cited" contributes to validity and plausibility of the main discourse(s) of the epistemic community. At this point, the process of joining an epistemic community could be remembered. To follow Arslan's (2007, p.113) arguments again, "scientific manner and positioning is not a natal virtue of the member of an epistemic community, but is a manner imposed by the community to the member. All of the information, ability and equipment of an individual are put the service of community". Until an individual is fully recognized as the member of an epistemic community, she/he experiences an apprenticeship process. "Long apprenticeships", in this way "socialize members of any particular epistemic community" (Miller & Fox, 2001, p.683). During this 'task', candidates should prove their willingness to join to community by "not only learning the language, theories and notions of the community, but also learning how these serve the purpose of community" (Arslan, 2007, p.106). After satisfying the conditions of the community and associating her/his own language with community's language, member of epistemic community should keep this situation and attribute her/his studies to the aims and norms of community during her/his intellectual life.

Since the scientific studies have been maintained and intellectual gatherings have been organized, epistemic communities are formed by their members. That is why, "[A]lthough epistemic community is a new concept, it have existed for centuries" (Dever, 2012, p.201). In other words, "all hitherto scientific disciplines and research areas was born from an invisible college in the beginning" (Arslan, 2007, p.71). This point actually

shows the philosophical and humane background of epistemic communities as much as power relations and conflict among intellectual groups.

The status of knowledge, language and their relationship with human mind is the other dimension that may help to clarify epistemic communities. As one of the perspectives of epistemology, knowledge can only be constructed collectively, so it cannot be evaluated individual-based (Kukla, 2000). The control or dominance of the collective over individual provides the collectiveness of knowledge. Whatever we know, according to this perspective, is gained through social relationship(s) with other(s). From the natural events to very deep philosophical investigations, there is a conceptual frame, which provides us a point of view regarding the questions of 'what' and 'how'. As Lynch stated (2001, p.102), "[T]ruth is defined in terms of what we might call our epistemic point of view: for a proposition or belief to be true is for it to be known, justified, or warranted in some sense. This point of view could be resulted by a habit obtained during social relationships, a religion, an ideology, etc. In this respect, "knowledge is a matter of the perspective of the knower within a community of other knowers" (Miller & Fox, 2001, p.675). The thing that makes this context stronger and consistent is the 'language'. The limits of our knowledge are kept in the language we have and use.¹That is why; "language" could be understood as "an intellectual micro-institution" (Toulmin, 1972, p.166), which guides people on their actions and discourse.

In epistemic communities, the importance of language and the methods on gaining knowledge are more observable. As a scientific and intellectual 'world' that provides the main aspects to its members, epistemic community is based on a language unique to itself, so "the languages of different epistemic communities talk about different worlds" (Arslan, 2007, p.103). In other words, language both determines the limits and position of an epistemic community and becomes a channel for the theoretical outputs of it. This point is very crucial to understand the status of knowledge. Accordingly, if any statement is named 'knowledge', it is be-

¹ What is more, there is a Wittgensteinian perspective that asserts an absolute parallelism among our language and our world: "The limits of my language are the limits of my world" (Wittgenstein, 2001, p.68).

cause that statement is recognized as knowledge or approved by an epistemic group. This could be a scientific committee, a group, a methodological community, a school, etc. As the first step for scientific or intellectual endeavour, determining the knowledge brings other in-group dynamics for an epistemic community. Referencing, publishing, and the other processes mentioned above are directly referred to these dynamics. At the end of (or during) this 'scene', values and norms as well as the language of epistemic community are re-produced. As Arslan very importantly states, "there is no universal scientific norms but there are norms that vary among epistemic communities and contexts" (2007, p.100). This point actually reminds Kuhn's theory of paradigm, which is one of the crucial arguments of epistemic communities. According to paradigm theory, a scientific activity is based heavily on a major paradigm in its period. This paradigm provides main perspectives, methodological preferences, language, scientific ethics, etc. for scientist (Kuhn, 1996). In this respect, it could be said that epistemic communities survive thanks to paradigms. Both new and old members of the community pay maximum attention in order to support a specific paradigm and attribute their arguments to the same paradigm. As Kuhn indicates, "[B]y shifting emphasis from the cognitive to the normative functions of paradigms, the preceding examples enlarge our understanding of the ways in which paradigms give form to the scientific life" (1996, p.109). Such a shift or frame, as you shall guess, contributes to the language of epistemic community. To sum up, "paradigms are the dominant means by which research is conducted and organized in science and social sciences, and the supreme example of the intertwining of methodology, epistemology, and norms" (Bloodgood, 2008, p.6).

As it will be seen in the next sections, tensions and transmissions among epistemic communities are maintained through paradigmatic changes on the relevant scientific areas. Abandoning an epistemic community means also abandoning a paradigm or vice versa. That is why; there has always been a consistency among paradigms and epistemic communities in addition to their subsidiary relationship.

2. Investigating Assumed Conflict among Religion and Science through Modernity and Epistemic Communities

Since Enlightenment has been defined by Kant², religion and science has been illustrated as enemy brothers. This assumed conflict among religion and science became so much visible in the 19th Century, when 'positive' sciences started to be established and secularism got matured.

At the end of the 19th Century, the World –in terms of a Western point of view- appeared as a place where the sacred/religious elements were sterilized from socio-political and even individual life. Perhaps, the classification of 'religion and/or science' has been firstly mentioned or intensively discussed in this century. Consequence of intellectual, political, economic revolutions in Western Europe, which could be named modernity, prepared such a perception and distinction among these two areas.

A simple investigation on the ideas of the founders of sociology on religion may help us understanding the philosophical background of the distinction among science and religion. For example, Comte's three stages on the history of human and society would give some clues. Accordingly, developments in the 19th Century claims that humanity experiences a new level, which is slightly different from the previous levels –metaphysic and religious-, that could be named 'scientific' or 'positive' stage. On the other hand, Weber's arguments on rationalization and classification of authority provide other evidences for the retreat of religion from political and economic life. To sum up, religion becomes one of the 'choices' among many choices in a person's life and organization of modern societies are no more based on religious/sacred preferences. At such an atmosphere, of course, scientific and intellectual studies are supposed to be maintained in favour of 'positive science' rather than being applied under the canopy of religion. This attempt is the first step for the ongoing conflict among religion and science.

²"Enlightenment is man's emergence from his self-imposed immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to use one's understanding without guidance from another. This immaturity is self-imposed when its cause lies not in lack of reason, but in lack of resolve and courage to use it without guidance from another. *Sapere Aude!* 'Have courage to use your own understanding!'-that is the motto of enlightenment" (Kant, 2010 [1784], p.1).

By asserting independency from religion, positivist scientists create 'modern epistemic community'. People who preserve their religious identity and use the references of religion in their scientific or intellectual studies are also named 'classical epistemic community' (Arslan, 2007). In Western Europe, thanks to 'victory' of secularism and positivism towards traditional life and traditionalist intellectual manner, modern epistemic communities become the centres in scientific production. People who would like to be engaged in science must get used to the language of positivism. Methodological considerations of a candidate scientist and expectations of positivist science should cohere. For a modern epistemic community, on the other hand, religious dogmas or texts are definitely undermined. In order to deal with the nature, social relationships, politics, etc. in a scientific way, religion and religious information should not be referred and even remembered.

As you shall see, modern epistemic community is an output of modernist understanding of life. Language, epistemological position, secular perceptions, etc. of modernity sets up a new scientific circle and paradigm that is opposed to pre-modern time's intellectual life, which is based on tradition and religion. In other words, such a paradigmatic transmission positions itself oppose to 'unknown', invisible, and transcendental powers and relationships. Even though this distinction and separation is occurred in Western Europe, scientific studies in non-Western countries are also expected to obey scientific position of modern epistemic communities. This expectation is actually parallel to expectation of West from non-Western countries, which is being similar to West and following the progressive scheme of the history created by West.

3. Turkish Modernity and Appearance of Modern Epistemic Communities: Dichotomy of Science and Religion?

Modernity as the multi-level political, epistemological and social transformation process has effected both the European geography and its periphery, which means non-Western societies. Even though the actors of modernity are the members of Western societies, some of the elements regarding modern change have been 'dictated' to other societies on the Earth. In this respect, besides being sets of values or practices, modernity

diffuses itself as the set of 'ideals' to be followed. The story of non-Western societies with modernity generally illustrates such a picture. As the minimum common point, countries that have not experienced some of the reasons and consequences of modernity are forced to be modernized by means of some processes.

Turkey, as one of the non-Western country, which has not experienced some of the crucial modern changes in Europe such as Enlightenment, Industrial Revolution, Secularism, etc., could be evaluated as a passive receiver of modern values and practices since the 19th Century. Imperial Edict of Reorganization (*Tanzimat Fermanı*) in 1839, Imperial Edict of Reform (*Islahat Fermanı*) in 1856, The First and Second Constitutionalist Periods (*1. ve 2. Meşrutiyet*) in 1876 and 1908, and lastly foundation of Republic in 1923 are some of the legal regulations and arrangements of modernist construction of Turkish society. These reforms or legislations are actually not dependent on the internal demands of Turkish people or public, but are the consequence of the endeavours of ruling elites in Istanbul and Ankara, who want to save the Ottoman Empire from being destroyed or developing new Turkish state (Mardin, 2006). To succeed such a target, ruling elites, who were represented by judicial and military bureaucracy, were trying to follow the recent developments in modern World.

Scientific developments, which are one of the crucial processes in Western World, have also been benefited by Turkish modernizers. Especially positivist methodology and social scientific studies maintained in the light of this methodological preference are remarkable in the beginning of the 20th Century. Ziya Gökalp, for example, who is one of the most important ideologists and sociologists of modern Turkish Republic, is famous with his 'admiration' to Emile Durkheim (Parla, 1985, p.21). As you guess, Gökalp is one of the followers of positivist methodology. In the governing of the country, Gökalp's suggestions always remind Durkheimian perspective, which is slightly different from traditional methods or understandings.

Actually, Gökalp's position summarizes the way of thinking and producing intellectual knowledge in modern Turkey. Because of the secular background of the founders of Republic, following Western values and practices as a government policy and establishing the nation-state dis-

course in contrast to Islamic Ottoman Empire's discourse prepare the general structure of Turkish society and expectations form individuals in terms of their life-styles. At this point, it could be said that formation of intellectual knowledge is based heavily on the encouragement and pressure of nation-state. Perhaps, as a consequence of such a relationship among state and knowledge, modern epistemic community secures its position in Turkish academia since the 2000's.

There are many areas and groups that could be named modern epistemic community in Turkey. Especially, in the social sciences, the position of modern epistemic community becomes more visible. Interpreting society, political changes, etc. give rise to modern expectations and values in scientific knowledge. This epistemic community also survives by opposing to classical-religious epistemic community in Turkey. However, it is almost impossible to say that modern epistemic community abandons the dogmas, which seems to belong to religious epistemic community. In Turkey, there are many dogmas and 'totems' belong to modern epistemic communities, as well. For example, traditions in sociology in the early period of Turkish Republic are generally fed by some specific subjects and sub-areas such as 'culture and civilization' (in the 1920's), 'rural sociology' (in the 1940's and 1950's), 'underdevelopment' (in the 1960's), etc. (Tuna, 2014, pp.10-11). Even though these subject are dealt with from Durkheimian or Marxist perspectives, excluding positivist understanding or positivistic practice was almost impossible. Until the 1980's, as Tuna (2014, p.11) indicates, Weberian interpretivism that opposes to pure positivistic mentality has been ignored by modern epistemic community in sociological studies. Of course, the political background of the major subjects discovered by modern epistemic community is highly connected with the general political trends for each period in Turkey. Because of secular interpretation of social and individual life, as it has been already indicated, dealing with the science, even if these were social sciences investigate human interactions, cannot reflect the traditional values, expectations, religious preferences of people. That is why; the consequences of these studies in Turkey never refer or mention religion or religious values. What is more, religion is not examined in terms of its unique structure that includes faith, spirituality, etc. The major tendency in the early period of Turkish sociology in terms of religion is to picture this notion according to its function

in social life. On the other hand, the majority of quantitative field works are another proofs for the modern dogmas belongs to modern epistemic community. Popularity of questionnaires that seeks cause and effect relationships and expectation of certainty in social and individual relationships all reflect the consequences of modern-central epistemic community in Turkish society. As the passive receiver of the central epistemic community in West, modern epistemic community in Turkey followed such a progress. Although the language and methodological preferences among modern epistemic community and traditional intellectual studies are slightly different, it is obvious that modern epistemic communities are also supported by new dogmas of modern society. Consequently, these dogmas become the mediators (remembering the theory of paradigms) of intellectual knowledge for a long time in Turkey.

4. Religious or Neo Classical Epistemic Community in Turkey: A New Perspective for Assumed Conflict?

After the 1980's, by the liberal perspective on both economic and social life, main focus point for intellectual knowledge in Turkish academia is diversified. When positivist approach was one and only accepted perspective for scientific studies, interpretive tradition becomes more visible in post-1980 period. This period actually welcomes the counter readings and discussions on modern epistemic community. At this point, religious references come into practice especially in the social sciences. Even though the 1990's demonstrate the oppression on religious-traditional groups and considerable amount of academicians were expelled from academia because of their religious background (Burak, 2011), the power of religious epistemic community in Turkey was set up in the same 1990's period in addition to historical background.

When coming to 2000's, the relationship among political power and formation of epistemic communities could be observed more clearly. To remember shortly, after the elections in the 2002, AKP government, which has both conservative/religious and liberal references, becomes the ruling party in Turkey. This background of the ruling party automatically provides a more diverse epistemic area to different epistemic communities.

In this way, intellectual conflicts among different epistemic communities become more visible and maintained in academic area.³

Such a conflict among ruling party and bureaucracy and consistent 'manner' showed by AKP government encourage not only politicians, but also academicians in Turkey to act and speak according to their position in a more flexible way. When their religious or anti-positivistic background was one of the threats for their future in academia, by the AKP governments, academicians start to come together in a more organized way. In addition to some of the journals and edition books published by classical epistemic community in the 1990's, the amount of the publications that were produced by the members of "neo-classical" epistemic community dramatically goes up in the 2000's.

Such an increase brings an expected discussion to Turkish academic circles. Especially, representatives of modern epistemic community, which was the dominant actor of intellectual knowledge during the Republic Period, start to accuse religious epistemic community as not being 'scientific'. This manner let positivists to position them against newly developing epistemic community and the information produced by new academic circles is generally undermined by old social scientists in Turkey. The basic motivation behind this accusation or omitting process consists of many reasons but nothing is more effective than the understanding of religion by positivists. As a very parallel reflex to secularism on the governing of the countries, modern epistemic community in Turkey does not want to see religious themes or items in Turkish academia. For them, as it has already been mentioned, a scientific discipline cannot include any sacred beliefs, values, motivations, considerations, etc.

At such an assumed conflict, it is expected from the members of religious epistemic community to accuse the members of positivist epistemic community as not being "scientific" according to historical struggle among epistemic communities set up so far. However, as a very original process or result to Turkish academia, followers of neo-classical epistemic

³ This political background is actually widely discussed in Turkish politics and it mainly belongs to the academic circle of political sciences. On the other hand, it was necessary to mention this conflict here in order to picture the relationship among politics and academics in Turkish history and current debates.

community do not completely deny the tools or mentality of modern epistemic community. Rather, especially social scientists belong to religious epistemic community agree on benefitting from the outputs and intellectual background of modern epistemic community by not denying historical and religious background of Turkish society. This consideration that emphasizes internal dynamics of the society, which was examined sociologically and politically, brings actually a new perspective to the social sciences in Turkey. In doing so, pure positivist perspective, which relies on absolute numerical data and sterilized perspective from the values or expectations of Turkish society, would be abandoned.

To abandon such an outsider perspective, the other step taken by religious epistemic community is to set up a new scientific language. To remember the importance of language and referencing circle in an epistemic community, religious academic circles in Turkey start to use the traditional words or religious terminology in their scientific studies. Thanks to this, by looking at the 'contents' of a book today, it could easily be identified which epistemic community effects the author of that book. Beside these, congresses, panels, conferences, etc. organized by religious epistemic communities are more visible in Turkey. Participation to these events again strengthens the power of religious epistemic community and let them again identify themselves.

Conclusion

In the light of the arguments given above, it could be claimed that the separation among religion and science is one of the major consequences of modernity. After the modern period and due to secularization process, which is one of the main elements of modernity, rational and positivistic way of knowing is positioned against theological infrastructure, which was highly effective on people's individual and social life in pre-modern period.

Such an assumed separation among theological background and newly-born scientific disciplines automatically identified epistemic communities. Classical epistemic community appeared as a former intellectual centre while modern epistemic community, which is based on rational

and positivistic considerations, become more visible and dominant in scientific area. Like the general structure of different epistemic communities, the language and terminological considerations are also altered in modern period scientific disciplines. A new language that helps to construct ontological and epistemological boundaries within intellectual area is formed by modernist thinkers.

Turkey as one of the modernized country has been dealing with the modern institutions and processes for almost 200 years. Of course, observing the similar conflict among theological and scientific environments would be very normal. Especially, after the establishment of modern Turkish Republic in 1923, the consequences of the secularization and positive sciences in Turkish academia could be witnessed. These consequences demonstrate a parallel vision to general conflict among religion and science, in other words, theology and positivism. Detecting the differences among religious and scientific epistemic communities via languages, journals, universities, etc. is not so hard for someone who studies the history of modern Turkish Republic.

Beside many similar points; however, there is a very original situation belongs to assumed conflict among religion and science in Turkey. When these two areas are recognized as the opposite poles on reaching intellectual knowledge, religious epistemic community in Turkey does not seem to ignore the importance of modern science in intellectual development. They rather oppose to materialistic reductionism in Turkish academia, which generally makes scientist alienated to their own society and culture. The basic demand of religious epistemic community in Turkey, at this point, is to direct the attention also to culture, values, faith, tradition, etc. instead of recognizing these elements in terms of a Durkheimian perspective⁴. Of course, there is a unique language belongs to religious epistemic community, which is slightly different from modern epistemic community's language in Turkey and of course there are some academic environments that is based on the studies deal with sociology of religion. However, this does not mean that these communities directly ignore the studies

⁴ Durkheim's one of the well-known arguments is based on the idea of "consider[ing] social facts as things" (1982, p.60). This perspective is actually the most important argument of positivism and it expects social scientists to degrade abstract notions to material.

or outputs of modern epistemic community. Even though modern epistemic community still keeps the majority in some metropolises such as İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir; the rise of Anatolian universities directly or indirectly help religious epistemic community to renew itself and become more visible on production and use of intellectual knowledge in Turkey.

References

- Arslan, H. (2007), *Epistemik Cemaat: Bir Bilim Sosyolojisi Denemesi* (İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları).
- Birekul, M. (2012), Bilginin Toplumsal İnşası: Bir Sosyal Gerçeklik Olarak Bilginin İslamleştirilmesi Sorunu, *Milel ve Nihal Dergisi*, 9 (3), 49-74.
- Bloodgood, E. (2008). Epistemic Communities, Norms and Knowledge. *International Studies Association Annual Conference*, San Francisco, CA, March 26-29.
- Burak, B. (2011). The Role of the Military in Turkish Politics: To Guard Whom and to What, *European Journal of Economic and Political Studies*, 4 (1), 143-169.
- Brine, J. (2000). TSER and the epistemic community of European social researchers. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 10 (3), 267-282.
- Bruner, J. P. (2013). Policing Epistemic Communities. *Episteme*, 10, 403-416.
- Crane, D. (1967). The Gatekeepers of Science: Some Factors Effect the Selection of Articles for Scientific Journals. *The American Sociologist*, 2 (4), 195-201.
- Dever, A. (2012). Lords of the Knowledge: "Epistemic Community". *FLSF*, 13, 201-217.
- Durkheim, E. (1982). *Basic Rules of Sociological Method*. Edited with an Introduction by Steven Lukes, trans by: W. D. Halls, London: The Free Press.
- Kant, I. (1784, 2010). *An Answer to the Question: "What Is Enlightenment?"*. New York: Penguin.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Kukla, A. (2000). *Social Constructivism and the Philosophy of Science*. Routledge: New York.
- Lynch, M. P. (2001). *Truth in Context: An Essay on Pluralism and Objectivity*. MIT Press: Massachusetts.
- Mardin, Ş. (2006). *Religion, Society, and Modernity in Turkey*. Syracuse University Press: Syracuse, NY.
- Miller, H. T. & Fox, C. J. (2001). The Epistemic Community. *Administration and Society*, 32 (6), 668-685.
- Nelson, L. H. (1992). Epistemological Communities. In: *Feminist Epistemologies*, Eds: Linda Alcoff & Elizabeth Potter, Routledge: New York, 121-160.
- Parla, T. (1985). *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp: 1876-1924*. Brill: Amsterdam.
- Rai, D. (2012). Renewal of the Rights Discourse. *Social Change*, 42 (4), 559-563.
- Satana, N. (2007). Transformation of the Turkish Military and the Path to Democracy. *Armed Forces & Society*, 34, 357-388.
- Toulmin, S. (1972). *Human Understanding: The Collective Use and Evolution of Concepts*. Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- Tuna, K. (2014). Türkiye’de Sosyolojinin 100 Yılı Üzerine. *Sosyoloji Divanı*, 4, 9-23.
- Wittgenstein, L. (2001). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans by. C. K. Ogden, Routledge.

Kaynakça Bilgisi / Citation Information

Alkın, R. C. (2016). Turkish modernity and epistemic communities in the social sciences: transfer of intellectual knowledge among religion and science?. *OPUS – Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(10), 181-199.