

ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ

UDC 94 (47)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24195/spj1561-1264.2023.2.10>

Aliyev Araz Yunus

Doctoral Student

Baku State University

23, Z. Khalilov str., Baku, Azerbaijan

orcid.org/0000-0003-2350-9187TURKISH IDENTITY AND HISTORY AS A SUBJECT
OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN THE USA

Studies conducted on Turkish identity and history in the USA vary in terms of their coverage of historical aspects and specific periods. These studies primarily focus on historiography, treating the "Turkish" identity and history in the USA as a subject confined to a particular time and location. As a result, the process of forming the "Turkish" image in the USA is not comprehensively understood as a dynamic and unified process. The subjective and objective factors that contribute to the core characteristics of this identity are not adequately addressed, making a comprehensive assessment challenging. According to researcher Carter Findley, the majority of studies on Turks in the USA, until the 1990s, primarily focused on linguistics, with limited attention given to the historical aspects of Turks. Findley openly acknowledges that researchers in the USA have failed to recognize the history of Turks as an integral part of human history. However, it is important to note that Findley's observation primarily applies to academic-level studies on "Turkish" identity and history. The history of academic research on Turks may be relatively short, but the history of the formation of the "Turkish" identity and the various attitudes towards it within the USA's public consciousness and public opinion extend further back. Over the course of two centuries, opinions against the "Turkish" identity, stereotypes, and perspectives that emerged due to changing political realities have become ingrained in the USA as part of an Anglo-Saxon approach. This article aims to examine the development of initial ideas about Turkish identity in the USA up to the modern period. By analyzing opinions formed during different periods and from different perspectives, an attempt is made to reveal a general approach to understanding Turkish identity in the USA. The process of forming the "Turk" image in the US public consciousness is analyzed in a historical-stage manner, revealing the primary sources of this identity and categorizing them into several directions.

Key words: Turkish identity, stereotypes, missionaries, history, propaganda, travelers.

Introduction to the problem. Attitudes towards the "Turkish" identity and history in the USA's public consciousness and academic environment are multifaceted. Imaginations, stereotypes, and scientific approaches, formed based on various sources, constitute the fundamental ideas regarding the attitude towards Turkish identity and Turkish states in the modern era in the USA.

The degree of research on the problem. Research on Turkish history and culture in Azerbaijan by US scholars is reflected in the works of authors such as R. Aslanova, R. Asker, F. Alakbarli, and N. Suleymanov. It is evident that these authors do not specifically focus on research conducted in the United States but instead incorporate the ideas and approaches of Western authors.

On the other hand, it is noticeable that the topic has been more extensively studied by Turkish and American authors. Turkish authors such as C. Osman, E. Çağrı, K. Uygur, and S. Necdet have conducted studies on American missionary activities in Turkey and political relations with the United States. American authors such as B. Walker, G. Washburn, L. Scipio, E. Pears, and J. Birge approach the subject from a historical and political perspective, taking into account the Western viewpoint.

Turkish researcher Fuad Köprülü, in his research work entitled "Turkish-American Relations in History", provides information on the history of the establishment and development of bilateral relations. The author emphasizes that the initial relations were primarily political and later expanded to encompass cultural and historical aspects [6].

In another study titled "The Image of Turks in American High School Textbooks", Turkish author Ibrahim Turan notes that comprehensive information about Turkish history and culture is included in American high school textbooks. Turan suggests that this information plays a crucial role in shaping perceptions about Turks. However, it seems that the work does not delve deeply into the characteristics of the reinforced Turkish image within US public opinion and the historical processes that led to its formation.

Furthermore, researcher Robert Zens, in his work "Turkish Historiography in the United States", provides extensive information on Ottoman and Turkish history within the academic realm since 1909, including scholars specializing in this field. The author primarily focuses on historical studies and their systematization, paying less attention to historical stereotypes and perceptions about Turks [9].

Authors such as J. McCarthy, P. Golden, and C. Findley, whose works are cited in the article, have conducted studies directly related to the topic and provide comprehensive information on the subject matter explored in their works.

The points mentioned, the limited research framework on the topic, and the research directions indicate a significant need to explore the historical and cultural characteristics of the Turkish image in the public consciousness of the United States and to thoroughly assess stereotypes and perceptions.

The purpose of this study. The article examines historical perceptions, stereotypes, and modern scientific approaches related to the "Turkish" identity and history in the USA public consciousness. For this purpose, historical and comparative analysis methods were utilized.

Main content. Introduction. The concept of "identity" is among the main concepts widely discussed in the sphere of philosophy, cultural studies, and politics, as well as in different fields of science. "Identity," as defined in the scientific literature, is more about who we are and how we are known than what we choose or agree to. "Identity" is also a social concept that needs differences to exist and alienates differences in order to ensure its own existence [2, pp. 92–93].

On the other hand, "identity" has been considered in the social sciences as a concept used to express the relationship between the individual and society since the middle of the 20th century [5, p. 194].

Zygmunt Bauman defines the concept of "identity" as a person's attempt to escape from uncertainty. He notes that when a person begins to doubt their belonging, they start contemplating their "identity." When a person cannot find their place among the patterns and forms of behavior that exist in society, they find themselves in an uncertain situation where they are unsure if others will accept their behavior and position. According to Bauman, "identity" is a means of naming oneself in order to overcome this incompleteness. People try to name themselves through "identity" and become a part of the whole by adopting certain patterns and forms of behavior [1, p. 112].

When explaining the essence of the concept of "identity," two types of approaches are mainly used. Firstly, the traditional approach to the concept of "identity" prioritizes it over the more static structures of gender, class, and other unifying structures. Secondly, another approach recognizes the concept of "identity" as a dynamic and constructed fact. According to this approach, "identity" is a malleable concept purposely constructed, especially by political authorities. From this viewpoint, "identity" is variable, formed, and developed based on the subject's power relations with "others." Since these power relations are an ongoing process, the construction of "identity" is never fully finalized and continues [15, p. 14].

The concept of "identity" discussed in this article aligns with the second approach. In particular, the article focuses on the role of studies conducted in the United States in shaping the Turkish "identity" in American public consciousness.

However, the intended concept of "identity" here goes beyond self-naming and self-attribution of the Turks; it explores the "image" being created in the public opinion of the United States and the set of ideas related to the "Turkish" identity in the American public consciousness.

Religious approach and missionary work as the main sources of the "Turkish" image. Justin McCarthy is the author of fundamental research on the "Turkish" identity in the USA. In his work *"The Turks in America"* (2010), he examines the development process of the "Turkish" identity in the USA, from its initial ideas to its mature form in the modern era.

McCarthy observes that early notions of "Turkish" identity in the USA were established by Calvinist missionaries who were sent by churches to the Middle East and the Balkans. These missionaries adeptly capitalized on the deep-rooted prejudice against Turks and Muslims in the Western world, amplified it, and disseminated it to the American public. Specifically, the religious inclinations of these missionaries, who were devout Christians, shaped their perception of the Turks.

The missionaries regarded the East as the birthplace of Jesus Christ, upheld Christianity as the sole religion, and believed that all other peoples, including Jews, would gather in Palestine and embrace Christianity. In their eyes, the Turks were the only obstacle to this process and the ultimate triumph of Christianity [11, p. 2].

According to McCarthy, the initial perceptions of the first missionaries regarding the Turks were deeply flawed, yet religious individuals in the United States placed trust in and embraced these ideas. McCarthy points out that early Americans had limited knowledge about Turks and Muslims. Their understanding was largely shaped by what they heard in church, learned in school, or occasionally read in newspapers. Despite the secular nature of the U.S. Constitution, the newly formed United States was significantly influenced by Christianity. Apart from being perceived as adversaries of Christianity, very little was known about Islam, and the identity of being a "Turk" was often equated with the Islamic religion.

Americans took pride in their newfound democracy, while viewing the Turks through a lens of democracy. Despite their limited information, Americans considered the Turks as the embodiment of despotism. Similar to Europeans of that era, Americans adhered to the classical traditions of their ancestors, the founders of democracy, namely Ancient Greece and Rome. During the early 19th century, the public consciousness of Americans viewed the Turks as adversaries to both religious and secular benevolence. As non-Christians, they were regarded as *"infidels who defeated the armies of Christendom and ruled the holy lands."* The Turks were seen as the natural enemy of Christianity, the *"greatest obstacle to the spread of the Gospel"* [14, p. 16].

The points indicate that the religious perspective holds a significant position in shaping the approach towards the "Turkish" identity in the USA. Due to this influence, coupled with historical stereotypes in the Western world, the Turks are often regarded as enemies of Christianity and portrayed in a barbaric and terrifying manner. During this period, when ignorance about Turks was prevalent in the USA, it became evident that the perception of the "Turk" was formed predominantly from a single source, influenced by religious figures and missionaries. Harvey Newcomb's *"The False Prophet"* which is notable among the few sources available from that period, contained highly negative ideas about Turks and Muslims, as well as their religious beliefs and saints [13].

These points emphasize that the clergy constituted the most educated class in the colonies and early American history. They naturally became the authors of inspirational and enlightening books, which found their way into schools and educated households. Consequently, these books, along with the opinions of the clergy, served as the primary source for the prevailing strong negative opinions against the Turks.

English influence in the formation of "Turkish" identity. In parallel, it is observed that the strong connection between the American public consciousness and the English system of thought contributed to the projection of the pre-existing European image across the ocean, further reinforcing historical stereotypes. In particular, the notion of promoting classical heritage and its supposed destruction by the *"barbaric Turks"* was developed. Early geography and history texts in the USA, such as Jedidiah Morse's *"The American Universal Geography,"* provided limited information about

the Ottoman Empire, Turks, or Islam, except for a few pages of insults and dubious details. These brief descriptions, mostly negative in nature, emphasized the Christian and classical Greek/Roman heritage of the Middle East and the Balkans, referencing regions, rivers, and mountains by their ancient names [12, p. 387].

Influenced by British thought, there was an emphasis on the honesty, hospitality, and cleanliness of the Turks, but they were heavily criticized in many other aspects. Early Americans, in their quest to learn about foreign cultures, naturally relied on English books, which were expensive and difficult to acquire. Consequently, the first public descriptions of Turks and Muslims in America were found in geographical works, followed by short historical summaries written by religious figures. The religious orientation and level of belief of these authors greatly influenced the portrayal of Middle Easterners in their works, reflecting a general lack of knowledge about the region.

Two dominant themes were clearly evident in early American publications: the exotic nature of the Turks and their perceived savagery. USA geographers described the Turks as lazy and particularly cruel to Christians. The Turks were depicted as exotic, donning peculiar clothing, exhibiting strange social customs, and being excessively sensual and immoral. The notion that Turks were lazy, cruel, and ignorant laid the foundation for the "Turkish" identity in the USA, and these legends would become deeply ingrained in the American public consciousness in the years to come [11, p. 12].

Anti-Turkish propaganda against the background of the interests of missionary organizations. The points mentioned in the works of this period suggest that the negative attitude towards the Turks was deliberately formed and perpetuated by religious groups. Additionally, throughout the 19th century, Turkish art, literature, and architecture were largely absent from books and the press, which led many to argue that the Turks did not possess a distinct "*civilization*". William Tisdall's "*The Religion of the Crescent*" goes further and argues that no civilization, philosophy, or school of science emerged in the Muslim ground. Tisdall held the belief that all religions, except Christianity, led to the degradation of humanity. According to his perspective, Christianity was the sole path that could bring about spiritual "progress" and eventually lead to social and economic advancement [16, p. 101, 201].

McCarthy asserts that attacks against Turks had become a common occurrence in the religious, cultural, and political life of Americans. Despite Americans' lack of interest in foreign cultures and non-Christian religions, they were constantly exposed to anti-Turkish propaganda. Churches, schools, public and commercial buildings, including sermons, were venues where anti-Turkish propaganda was disseminated. Newspapers and magazines ensured that this message was never forgotten [11, p. 158].

According to McCarthy, the purpose of this targeted anti-propaganda campaign was to secure funds for pious missionaries to alleviate the oppression of Christians in the Ottoman Empire. To achieve this, they naturally publicized painful and often true, but one-sided, stories about the suffering of Christians. Only innocent women and children who perished from starvation were depicted among Christians residing in Ottoman territories. However, there were other aspects to their advertisements. Simply supporting the starving orphans was not enough; it was also essential to denigrate the Turks. To increase aid, the portrayal of *victims* (Ottoman Christians), *heroes* (missionaries), and *oppressors* (Turks) was necessary. Thus, Turks and Kurds were portrayed as the sole causes of the suffering endured by Christians [11, p. 171].

The American public, conditioned by centuries of propaganda and prejudice to hold negative opinions of Turks and other Muslims, heard nothing to challenge their preconceived notions. The missionaries, playing to the fanaticism of Americans, were almost the sole source of information regarding the conflict between Armenians and Turks to further their cause. With very few Turks living in America and no alternative perspectives, anything said against Turks was blindly accepted. Politicians who spoke against them were not accused of bias but rather praised for their compassion towards Armenians. Whether or not politicians, editors, or even missionaries genuinely believed everything they said and wrote, the missionaries conveniently ignored the suffering of Turks, distorting the truth. Grace H. Knapp's "*The Tragedy of Bitlis*" considered one of the typical examples of missionary

works, dedicates significant attention to the uprisings and massacres that occurred in Eastern Anatolia. However, it is notable that not a single word is mentioned about the Muslims who lost their lives during these events [9, p. 30].

Missionaries intention was to tell stories that would provoke the strongest anger against the Turks and therefore generate the most financial support for their cause. Missionary organizations had no interest in presenting a balanced account of the situation. They couldn't be relied upon to provide truthful information about the Middle East. Consequently, a message like "*Armenians and Muslims are involved in a brutal civil war with both sides committing horrific atrocities. Please donate to aid Christians*" would not have been effective in raising funds [11, pp. 201–202].

The result of anti-Turkish propaganda and today's reality. The victories of the Turkish nationalists in Anatolia led to the permanent defeat of the political aspirations of the missionaries, and the leaders of the missionary organizations realized that they had already lost. As a result of this struggle, there were radical changes in the writings and speeches of the missionaries in the Middle East. It became clear that attacking the Turks was no longer an appropriate tactic for the missionaries since the Turks already held power in Anatolia and determined the future of missionary activity.

McCarthy points out that it is questionable whether any other nation besides the Jews has been defamed as consistently and persistently as the Turks for nearly a thousand years. While it is understandable that Americans of the late 19th and early 20th centuries accepted what was said about the Turks, he finds it surprising that prejudice against the Turks still persists in the 21st century, both in popular culture and in historical works and textbooks [11, p. 282, 287].

The points are corroborated in the work "*Among the Turks*" written by Cyrus Hamlin, who was engaged in missionary activities in Istanbul between 1836 and 1876. In Hamlin's work, the Turks are predominantly portrayed in a negative light. He asserts that there was no innovation in their beliefs and culture even before they established a state, and that they were not superior to other peoples in arts and weaponry [7, p. 15].

It is also noticeable in the work that Hamlin's Christian fanaticism is very high, and this factor seriously affects his interpretation of events and pushes the author towards subjectivism. He first notes that Byzantium was weak and its political institutions were gradually destroyed; otherwise, the Turks would never have been able to occupy it. He says that every traveler who visits Turkey will clearly see how things change when they move from Turkish villages to Christian villages. Although there are few signs of civilization here, he writes that Christian villages experience an unprecedented level of prosperity compared to the Muslims. According to him, even in such a difficult situation, Christianity is in a better position than Islam, and the main reason for this is that some irresistible forces have adjusted the balance of power between Turks and Christians in this way [7, pp. 20–23].

It can be observed that Hamlin thought in many ways in accordance with the negative "Turkish" image that was widespread in the Anglo-Saxon world in his time and relied on already established stereotypes. He accuses the Turks of being complacent and lazy, which is why infectious diseases are widespread among them, and claims that the Christian subjects of the empire are wiser and more progressive than the Muslims. He argues that the Christian subjects, who endure all the oppressions, demonstrate that distorted and oppressed Christianity is better than Islam [7, pp. 25–26].

Examining the reasons why Turks lag behind compared to the West, Hamlin focuses on the Turks' attitude towards technological innovations. He refers to the Ottoman Empire, which dominated the fronts of art and war four centuries ago but now receives its cannons from the Krupp factory in Germany, Martini-Henry rifles from Providence, Rhode Island, and other ammunition from New Haven, Connecticut. According to him, the Turks are still realizing that printing is more powerful and effective than martial arts. Hamlin notes that the Turkish empire is experiencing a period of decline, and this empire, which has been a great threat to the Christian world for three centuries since its birth, is losing its power or, rather, counting its days [7, pp. 27–28].

Noting that Turks consider new machines to be the devil's invention, Hamlin, along with the aforementioned ideas, tries to further strengthen the image of the "*ignorant Turk*" prevalent in the Anglo-Saxon worldview [7, p. 49].

In this regard, Hamlin's work contributed to the negative image of the "Turkish" identity formed in the American worldview for many years, deepened it in the public consciousness, and also confirmed Justin McCarthy's approach.

The place of research on the Turks in the USA in the modern era. The activities of US missionaries in the Middle East and the formation of the "Turkish" identity in the American public consciousness continue to have various implications today. However, it is notable that there has been a significant change in the prevailing attitude towards the Turks after the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, and research on the Turks has expanded towards the end of the century. These studies, which were initially focused on the Republic of Turkey, have gradually extended to a broader geographical scope following the collapse of the USSR, encompassing other Turkic-speaking peoples as well. However, it is evident that even during the period when the USSR was asserting its dominance, American researchers displayed an inclination towards studying the Turkic peoples, albeit with limited sources.

Alan Fisher's 1978 publication "*The Crimean Tatars*" serves as a suitable example of this approach. The majority of the literature cited in the work being of Russian origin, indicating that researchers of that period faced significant challenges in accessing information and adapted their studies to fit the political circumstances of the time [4].

Research conducted in the USA since the 1990s indicates that the investigation of the "Turkish" identity has primarily been approached from a historical standpoint. Most of these studies focus on specific periods of Turkish history and significant historical events. The American approach based on historical methodology can be broadly categorized into two main groups. Researchers belonging to the first group primarily concentrate on studying a particular stage of Turkish history or specific historical events. Their works tend to adopt a specialized historical approach, rather than providing a comprehensive perspective on Turkish history and identity. On the other hand, researchers in the second group stand out for their comprehensive approach to Turkish history, evaluating Turkish identity not within a specific historical period but in a broader context, spanning from its origins to the modern era. Therefore, a more distinct and overarching image of Turkish identity emerges in the works of researchers belonging to the second group, which can be referred to as the "*complex historical*" approach.

The best example of this approach can be found in Jane Hathaway's "*Arab Lands under Ottoman Rule: 1516–1800*" (2008). In her work, the author notes that the Turks migrated westward under the influence of China and did not have a significant influence in the Middle East until the 9th century. She states that until the 19th century, the concept of "Turk" was used as a local and more negative expression, similar to the "Arab" identity. She also mentions the concept of "Turk" used to refer to the ruling class in Arab lands as foreign, invading, and imperialist [8, p. 36, 102].

Peter Golden, who is considered one of the most important specialists in the field of Turkology in the USA, notes in his work "*An introduction to the history of the Turkic peoples*" (1992) that the Turks have played an important and vital role in the history of Euroasia. Golden raises the question of why the Ottomans and the Yakuts are both referred to as Turks. He does not consider the genetic factor as a determining factor and emphasizes that Turks across the Pacific to Europe carry different genetic characteristics. In his response, he states that the main factor that unites different ethnic groups across such a wide geography is common historical factors, along with language similarity. These peoples were historically part of the great Turkish empires in Central Asia and emerged within this political union. In addition to language and origin, he emphasizes political and cultural bonds as the basis of the relationship among the Turkic peoples [6, p. 16].

In addition to these factors, Golden specifically mentions the role of religion in the formation of Turkish ethnic unity. He argues that this factor is often overlooked by many researchers, especially when assessing the political and social consciousness before the adoption of Islam. He mentions that the shamanism religion, which forms the belief system of Turkic peoples, is another source of identity formation. He also notes that the Tengri belief is widespread among Turks and forms the basis and support for the Khaganate political system, with political motives of its own [6, pp. 1–2].

Golden further states that Turks outside of Turkey, Azerbaijan, Volga, and Turkestan have maintained their tribal structures stemming from their nomadic nature, and tribal elements still exist in the Turkish worldview today. He emphasizes the main role of political solidarity and suggests that language and cultural unity are not of utmost importance. He points out that Turks live together with ethnic groups of different cultures and languages without assimilating them, fostering close cooperation instead [6, p. 3].

Golden explains that the Turks carried out significant Turkification in the Middle East and other regions they dominated. However, the Turkification mentioned is not a state policy or targeted assimilation, but rather a result of the linguistic and cultural influence of the Turks. He highlights the disappearance of the Indo-European nomads, who dominated Central Asia for a thousand years before the Turks, with the emergence of the Turks [6, p. 454].

Carter Findley, one of the most important Turkologists in modern US history, attempts to investigate the origin of the Turks in his book *"Turks in World History"* (2004). He considers the Turks as a group of peoples united by common features in language, culture, and history, but with surprisingly different characteristics beyond that. Noting that Turks are often not perceived as civilized by other nations, Findley explains that this is primarily due to their preference for a nomadic lifestyle. He writes that as the Turks migrated in Eurasia, they not only moved geographically but also across different cultures, always maintaining their identity, sometimes adopting a culture and contributing to its development [3, p. 14].

Acknowledging the existence of a distinct Turkish culture, Findley points out that Turks carried their own culture with them as they traveled across Eurasia. According to him, the main characteristic of this mixed cultural structure belonging to the Turks is its ability to accept both permanent and foreign elements and adapt itself. The cultural structure also includes both dominant and subordinate motifs, which can shift from the background to the foreground depending on different time and space conditions, indicating the presence of other elements. Findley states that Turkish culture is always progressing and never regressing to its original point of emergence [3, p. 16].

To illustrate the concept of *"Turkishness"* in the most figurative way, Findley uses metaphors such as a *"trans-Eurasian bus"*, *"caravan"* or *"carpet"*. He compares the Turks to a bus or caravan traveling from Central Asia to Europe, where passengers get on and off. Additionally, the example of a carpet where different cultures converge in a single geography and each culture contributes its own motifs is another metaphor used to convey the author's concept of Turkishness. Findley emphasizes that there are more differences than similarities among the Turks, and while language is widely accepted as the main factor uniting them, other factors such as heroic stories and traditions also form the basis of this unity [3, pp. 26–27].

Findley highlights that Turks have undergone two significant cultural changes and transformations throughout their history, which largely shape the concept of Turkishness today. The first is the process of Turks embracing the Islamic religion, which Findley describes as *"the Turks' entry into Islamic civilization"*. As a result, the Turks gained power in the Middle East and developed a Turkish-Islamic culture [3, p. 95].

The second transformation in Turkish history occurred with the integration into the complex global structure of modernism starting from the 19th century. While some historians have characterized this process as *"regression"*, Findley believes that it is essentially part of modernization, representing a transitional period [3, p. 118].

Conclusion. The points mentioned in the article indicate that the perception of the "Turkish" identity in the consciousness of the American public has predominantly been negative for a significant period in history. This negativity stems primarily from the association of Turks in the United States with the Islamic world and the negative attitudes towards Islam. Additionally, the construction of the "Turkish" identity in the American public consciousness has been influenced by missionaries who provided subjective and negative information about Turks, coupled with a lack of objective research until recent times.

Since the 1920s, changes in power dynamics have resulted in a shift in the essence of the "Turk" image within the American public consciousness. The new circumstances necessitated the construction of an identity based on factual information and objective research, rather than relying on historical stereotypes.

As previously mentioned, the "Turkish" identity in the American public consciousness is characterized by its dynamic and evolving nature, influenced by power relations. Consequently, gaining an understanding of the history of the formation of the "Turkish" identity in the United States can provide valuable insights into the current and future directions of identity construction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bauman, Z. Parçalanmış hayat. (tr. İ. Türkmen), İstanbul: Ayrıntı, 2001. 373 s.
2. Conolly, W. Identity/Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox, NED, 1991. 280 p.
3. Findley, C. Dünya tarihinde türkler. (tr. A. Anadol), İstanbul: Kağıt, 2005. 330 s.
4. Fishers, A. W. The Crimean Tatars, Hoover Institution Press, 1978. 278 p.
5. Gleason, P. Identifying identity, Oxford Routledge, 2006. 22 p.
6. Golden, P. Türk halkları tarihine giriş (tr. O. Kratay), Ankara: Karam, 2006. 594 s.
7. Hamlin, C. Türkler arasında. (tr. H. Yüksel), İstanbul: Meydan, 2011. 304 s.
8. Hathaway, J. Osmanlı hakimiyetinde arap toprakları. (tr. G.Güven). İstanbul: TİBKY, 2016. 398 s.
9. Knapp, G. The Tragedy of Bitlis, Franclin Classic, 2018, 170 p.
10. Köprülü, F. Tarihte Türk-Amerikan münasebetleri. Atatürk konferansları, 11 april 1986, s. 927–947.
11. McCarthy, J. The Turks in America, Utah University Press, 2010. 511 p.
12. Morse, J. The American Universal Geography, Nabu Press, 2011. 830 p.
13. Newcomb, H. The False Prophet: or an account of the rise and progress of the Mohammedan religion, Forgotten Books, 2012. 216 p.
14. Parsons, Levi, The Dereliction and Restoration of the Jews, Boston, 1819. 22 p.
15. Sarup, M. Identity and Narrative, The University of Georgia Press, 1996. 192 p.
16. Tisdall, W. The religion of crescent. University of California Press, 1910, 280 p.
17. Zens, R. ABD-de türk tarihçiliği. Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi, Cilt 8, Sayı 15, 2010, s. 179–207.

REFERENCES

1. Bauman, Z. Parçalanmış hayat [Life in fragments], (tr. İ. Türkmen), İstanbul: Ayrıntı, 2001. 373 s. (*in turkish*)
2. Conolly, W. Identity/Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox, NED, 1991, 280 p.
3. Findley, C. Dünya tarihinde türkler [The Turks in the world history], (tr. A. Anadol), İstanbul: Kağıt, 2005. 330 s. (*in turkish*)
4. Fishers, A. W. The Crimean Tatars, Hoover Institution Press, 1978. 278 p.
5. Gleason, P. Identifying identity, Oxford Routledge, 2006.
6. Golden, P. Türk halkları tarihine giriş [An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples], (tr. O. Kratay), Ankara: Karam, 2006. 594 s. (*in turkish*)
7. Hamlin, C. Türkler arasında [Among the Turks], (tr. H. Yüksel), İstanbul: Meydan, 2011. 304 s. (*in turkish*)
8. Hathaway, J. Osmanlı hakimiyetinde arap toprakları [The Arab lands under Ottoman rule], (tr. G.Güven). İstanbul: TİBKY, 2016. 398 s. (*in turkish*)
9. Knapp, G. The Tragedy of Bitlis, Franclin Classic, 2018, 170 p.
10. Köprülü, F. Tarihte Türk-Amerikan münasebetleri [Turkish-American Relations in History], Atatürk konferansları, 11 april 1986, s. 927–947. (*in turkish*)
11. McCarthy, J. The Turks in America, Utah University Press, 2010. 511 p.
12. Morse, J. The American Universal Geography, Nabu Press, 2011. 830 p.
13. Newcomb, H. The False Prophet: or an account of the rise and progress of the Mohammedan religion, Forgotten Books, 2012. 216 p.

14. Parsons, Levi, *The Dereliction and Restoration of the Jews*, Boston, 1819. 22 p.
15. Sarup, M. *Identity and Narrative*, The University of Georgia Press, 1996. 192 p.
16. Tisdall, W. *The religion of crescent*. University of California Press, 1910. 280 p.
17. Zens, R. ABD-de türk tarihçiliği [Turkish Historiography in the United States], *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, Cilt 8, Sayı 15, 2010, s. 179–207. (*in turkish*)

Алієв Араз Юнус

докторант

Бакинського державного університету

вул. З. Халілова, 23, Баку, Азербайджан

orcid.org/0000-0003-2350-9187

ТУРЕЦЬКА ІДЕНТИЧНІСТЬ ТА ІСТОРІЯ ЯК ПРЕДМЕТ НАУКОВОГО ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ В США

Дослідження турецької ідентичності та історії в США відрізняються за охопленням історичних аспектів та конкретних періодів. Ці дослідження зосереджені насамперед на історіографії, розглядаючи «турецьку» ідентичність та історію в США як предмет, приурочений до певного часу та місця. Як наслідок, процес формування «турецького» іміджу в США не розуміється комплексно як динамічний та єдиний процес. Суб'єктивні та об'єктивні чинники, які впливають на основні характеристики цієї ідентичності, не розглядаються належним чином, що ускладнює комплексну оцінку. За словами дослідника Картера Фіндлі, більшість досліджень турків у США до 1990-х років зосереджувалися переважно на лінгвістиці, приділяючи обмежену увагу історичним аспектам турків. Фіндлі відкрито визнає, що дослідники в США не визнали історію турків невід'ємною частиною історії людства. Однак важливо зазначити, що спостереження Фіндлі в першу чергу стосується досліджень «турецької» ідентичності та історії на академічному рівні. Історія академічних досліджень про турків може бути відносно короткою, але історія формування «турецької» ідентичності та різного ставлення до неї в суспільній свідомості та громадській думці США сягає далекого минулого. Протягом двох століть думки проти «турецької» ідентичності, стереотипи та перспективи, які виникли внаслідок зміни політичних реалій, укорінилися в США як частина англосаксонського підходу. Ця стаття має на меті вивчити розвиток початкових уявлень про турецьку ідентичність у США до сучасного періоду. Аналізуючи думки, сформовані в різні періоди та з різних точок зору, зроблено спробу виявити загальний підхід до розуміння турецької ідентичності в США. Процес формування образу «турка» у суспільній свідомості США аналізується в історико-етапному ключі, виявляючи періодджерела цієї ідентичності та класифікуючи їх за кількома напрямками.

Ключові слова: турецька ідентичність, стереотипи, місіонери, історія, пропаганда, мандрівники.