



Article Arrival : 03/12/2020

Published : 10.01.2021

Doi Number  <http://dx.doi.org/10.26449/sss.2943>Reference  Parlak, B. & Doğan, K.C. (2021). "A Methodological Analysis On The Restructuring Of Social Sciences In The Context Of Ombudsman Paradigm, Liberal Democracy And The Annales School" International Social Sciences Studies Journal, (e-ISSN:2587-1587) Vol:7, Issue:76; pp:40-58

A METHODOLOGICAL ANALYSIS ON THE RESTRUCTURING OF SOCIAL SCIENCES IN THE CONTEXT OF OMBUDSMAN PARADIGM, LIBERAL DEMOCRACY AND THE ANNALES SCHOOL

Ombudsman Paradigması, Liberal Demokrasi ve Annales Okulu Bağlamında Sosyal Bilimlerin Yeniden Yapılandırılması Üzerine Yöntembilimsel Bir Analiz

Prof. Dr. Bekir PARLAK

Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi, Bursa/Türkiye
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8919-6481>

Doç. Dr. Kadir Caner DOĞAN

Gümüşhane Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi, Gümüşhane/Türkiye
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3476-8865>

ABSTRACT

Social sciences were founded on the ground of the Enlightenment and modernity in the 19th century. A methodological development approach with a positivist characteristic began to be questioned after the second half of the 20th century. The discipline of history also continued its development by gaining a scientific identity in these periods. At this point, there is a significant relationship between social science discipline and history discipline. First of all, it requires having a historical thinking dimension in order to produce information and to create a method. In fact, in order to be able to produce information on social sciences, first, historical viewpoint should be put forth. In this study, with the relationship to be established here it is aimed to establish a relationship among liberal democracy, the Annales-a technique of historiography-and the understanding of the restructuring of social sciences through the concept of ombudsman. It is thought that the concept of ombudsman is greatly connected with the historical, philosophical and social methods of thinking in question. In this study, basing upon the aforementioned relationship, it is suggested that ombudsman is one of paradigm shifts in social sciences field in the 20th century. Ombudsman is a postmodern auditing paradigm and finds its true identity in this era as well. The methodology of this study is a descriptive analysis which is based on literature review. The first section of the study explains the concept of ombudsman and historical process, the second section gives information on the Annales tradition and basic qualifications, and the third section analyzes the link between these two concepts, focusing on the restructuring of social sciences and ombudsman, the Annales, in order to put forward the relationship among the concepts and the discourses in question.

Keywords: Ombudsman, Paradigm, Liberal Democracy, Annales, Social Sciences

ÖZET

Sosyal bilimler, 19. yüzyılda Aydınlanma ve modernite zemini üzerine kurulmuştur. Pozitivist karakterli bu metodolojik gelişme yaklaşımı, 20. yüzyılın ikinci yarısından sonra sorgulanmıştır. Tarih disiplini de bu dönemlerde bilimsel bir hüviyet kazanarak gelişimini sürdürmüştür. Bu noktada sosyal bilimlerle tarih disiplini arasında önemli bir ilişki vardır. Bir noktada bilgi üretebilmek ve yöntem oluşturabilmek için her şeyden önce tarihsel düşünme boyutuna sahip olmayı gerektirmektedir. Nitekim sosyal bilimlere dair bilgi üretebilmek için öncelikle tarihsel bakış tarzının ortaya konması gerekmektedir. Bu çalışmada ombudsman kavramı üzerinden liberal demokrasi, bir tarih yazma tekniği olan Annales ve sosyal bilimlerin yeniden yapılandırılması anlayışı ile bir ilişki kurulmak istenmektedir. Buradan kurulacak ilişki ile ombudsmanın sözü edilen tarihsel, felsefi ve sosyolojik düşünme yöntemleriyle büyük bir bağı olduğu düşünülmektedir. Bu çalışmada, bu sözü edilen ilişkiden ombudsmanın 20. yüzyılda sosyal bilimler alanındaki paradigma değişimlerinden biri olduğu öne sürülmektedir. Ombudsman, postmodern bir denetim paradigmasıdır ve asıl kimliğini yine bu dönemde bulmuştur. Bu çalışmanın yöntemi, literatür taramasına dayalı betimsel bir değerlendirmedir. Çalışmanın birinci bölümünde ombudsman kavramı ve tarihsel süreci ifade edilmiş, ikinci bölümde Annales geleneği ve temel nitelikleri açıklanmış ve üçüncü bölümde de sözü edilen kavramlar ve söylemler arasındaki ilişkiyi ortaya koymak için aralarındaki bağ, ombudsman, Annales ve sosyal bilimlerin yeniden yapılandırılması odaklı analize tabi tutulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ombudsman, Paradigma, Liberal Demokrasi, Annales, Sosyal Bilimler

1. INTRODUCTION

Ombudsman is a public institution which tries to resolve complaints of citizens against public administration as a complaint-handing authority in a particular state. Historically, this institution first appeared in Sweden in the 18th century and spread all over the world starting from the World War II. Today, we see this institution in many countries, operating at different levels.

Liberalism, which is one of prominent ideologies in Western Europe, arose along with modernity. Having said that, especially the occurrence of industrial revolution, which strengthened capitalism, in England, the event of great revolution in France and the struggle for independence in the USA increased the level of acceptability of liberalism. A liberalism integrated with democracy, i.e. liberal democracy, became the dominant organizational ideal and form of that period with its discourses on matters such as equality, freedom, brotherhood and with the contribution of some philosophers. In addition to these, the Enlightenment Age in Western Europe became influential until the 18th century, by being influenced by the heritage of Ancient Greece and Roma and the ideas of the Renaissance Period. The Enlightenment philosophy can be seen as an intellectual formation which emphasizes that the reason should play a crucial role in science, culture, politics and economy. In the same period, in Northern Europe, in Sweden, the revolution made by the Enlightenment Age became influential. In the transition stage from monarchy to constitutional monarchy in this period in Sweden, liberalism emanated by the Enlightenment philosophy put forward some concepts like rule of law and limited government. Thus, the foundations of strong parliamentary tradition were laid in Sweden.

While Western Europe were transforming in that way, we can see that modern social sciences arose in scientific sense. Sociology, which is one of these social sciences and means the analysis of social events and social relations, was formed in France. This science was formed by a positivist methodology in harmony with social sciences and modernity and within the boundary of natural sciences. However, criticisms for it arose especially in German idealism tradition shortly after the rise of this science. It was stated that facts and values of social sciences had an integrity. On the other hand, criticisms for the pursuit by social sciences for a more serious and more novel scientific methodology appeared in the second quarter of the 20th century. As a response to crises in social sciences, in-depth sociological, cultural and philosophical discussions were made on the restructuring of social sciences.

Another important issue for the study is the information production process based on historical thinking method or history methodology. For this study, within historiography tradition that is in harmony with the restructuring of social sciences, the Annales School comes to the forefront.

This study aims to establish a historical, sociological and philosophical relationship among ombudsman, the Annales School and the restructuring of social sciences. The basic hypothesis of the study is that the institution of ombudsman, as a paradigm shift which arose in social sciences in 20th century, makes progress with conjunctures, directed by intellectual discussions on the current development of Annales, liberal democracy tradition and social sciences. And, the methodology of the study is a descriptive qualitative analysis based literature review.

The study consists of three main sections within the framework of its aim, hypothesis and methodology. In the first section, the concept of ombudsman and its liberal ground are explained. In the second section, Annales historiography tradition and its influence on social studies are studied. In the third section, social sciences, modernity, the restructuring of social sciences, ombudsman paradigm and Annales influence are analyzed on a holistic level.

2. THE CONCEPT OF OMBUDSMAN, LIBERALISM AND DEMOCRACY

2.1. The Conceptual Framework of Ombudsman And Its Characteristics

Ombudsman is originally a Swedish word (Seneviratne, 2002: 1) and can be defined as “the guardian of citizens” with its guarantor position in resolving public administration disputes and ill-management practices in the context of increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of public administration (Gammeltoft-Hansen, 1995: 105). Hence, ombudsman can be seen as a justice mechanism which tries to limit bureaucracy against unjust practices and conducts of public administration (Caiden et al., 1983: 3; Hossain et al., 2000). Besides ombudsman corrects the failures of bureaucratic systems in both public and private sectors (Hertogh and Kirkham, 2018: 3).

Another definition of ombudsman is that it is a public official who acts independently from public agencies and institutions and investigates and resolves complaints from citizens within certain procedures and rules (Seneviratne, 2002: 2).

According to Hill (1976: 12-13; 1974: 1077), these are the main characteristics of ombudsman:

- ✓ Ombudsman is an institution which externally audits public administration,
- ✓ Ombudsman is an independent and self-governing institution,
- ✓ Ombudsman is an institution which takes action in accordance with the complaints of citizens,
- ✓ Ombudsman submits the conclusions it reaches as a result of its audits and investigations to the Parliament. In this regard, it acts on the behalf of the Parliament,
- ✓ Ombudsman's findings and its recommendations based on these findings do not have a characteristic of sanction on public administration,
- ✓ Ombudsman is a warning mechanism which tries to attract public and parliament's attention towards a particular direction with the reports it publishes.

As a conclusion from these definitions and characteristics, the minimum qualities of ombudsman can be summarized like that (Gottehrer and Hostina, 2000: 403):

- ✓ Independence,
- ✓ Impartiality and Fairness,
- ✓ Credible Review Process,
- ✓ Confidentiality.

2.2. Historical Development of Ombudsman and its Present State in the 21st Century

Ombudsman originates from the institution of "Yuan Control" in the Han Dynasty in China (206 B.C.-220 A.D.), "Public Tribunes" in the period of Roman Empire and the institution of "Censors" in American colonies in the 17th century (Gellhorn, 1967: 194). In addition, there is an allegation about the origin of ombudsman that Swedish King Charles XII had to live for some time in Turkish land where he was taken captured in the 18th century. During this time, the King was impressed by public institutions operating on Islamic principles which were based on justice. As a result of this, he appointed an official as a representative-ombudsman against possible unfairness and malpractices in the absence of him (Caiden et al., 1983: 9).

The institution of ombudsman in modern sense first arose in the Scandinavian Region, in Sweden, and spread at a fast pace all other states in the world starting from after the second half of the 20th century (Kahana, 1994: 2). The volume of bureaucracy increased as well with the growth of the welfare state after the second half of the 20th century (Rowat, 1973: vii). The appearance of bureaucracy in every field of public administration and the increase on its volume were one of the reasons causing the rise of ombudsman (Reif, 2004: 1). On the other hand, after the World War II, adoption of ombudsman institution became widespread with the development of educational level of states, their understanding of human rights, their aspiration for democracy and their social conditions (Rowat, 1973: 119).

Especially after Denmark established ombudsman system in 1940s, in a short time, this institution attracted the attention of the Western world (Gellhorn, 1967: 5). Along with this, Prof. Stephan Hurwitz made a great contribution to the adoption of ombudsman in Denmark. Hurwitz, in his famous statement in 1949, stated that Denmark had to examine Swedish ombudsman which can align with its traditions (Stacey, 1978: 18). On the other hand, after the World War II, the activities and duties of the Swedish ombudsman expanded (Rowat, 1973: 2; Stacey, 1978: 1). Political, economical and cultural factors which arose after the War had effects on the expansion and the increase on activities in this period (Doğan, 2019).

Today, approximately 200 states apply the ombudsman system with different levels and models. You can see ombudsman in all continents from Europe to America and from America to Asia, Africa and Oceania (Kucsko-Stadlmayer, 2009). The establishment of ombudsman system in that way in different states with different systems and ideological tendencies shows that it has such a flexible structure. The system will continue to spread over the democratic world (Rowat, 1973: 145-148). The political regime to which this system adapts the most easily is undeniably democracy. In fact, ombudsman strengthens democracy. States managed under liberal democracy enjoy most components of democratic governance. And, ombudsman is one of these components. In other words, in a state where democratic governance is not applied properly, it

is difficult for ombudsman to become established (Reif, 2004: 55-58). In conclusion, it can be said that ombudsman is the main characteristic of the modern life (Seneviratne, 2002: 29).

2.3. Liberalism, Democracy and the Institution of Ombudsman: the Liberal Ground for Ombudsman

Liberalism is based on the assumption that the individual is sovereign and serves for a purpose which enables an individual to achieve its interests without harming others' needs and interests (Dural, 2013: 45). On the other hand, democracy, as a concept and ideal which has developed in different dimensions from Ancient Greece to today, can be defined a system where citizens regard themselves politically equal with their rights and obligations about obeying the rules which they form themselves (Parlak and Ökmen, 2015: 45). The origins of liberal thought can also be dated back to Ancient Greece. However, it is possible to say in general terms that this thought came to life with John Locke's works and completed its development in the 18th and 19th centuries. The word of liberalism found its place in the literature in the 19th century, starting from the second half of the 19th century, it is observed that the ideals of liberalism and democracy were interlocked (Akıncı, 2011: 11-13). It should also be noted that the Enlightenment in Western Europe and other socio-cultural developments played role in the emergence of this relationship.

We can mention many stages and forms of democracy throughout historical process. We can express them as direct, classic/liberal, participatory, deliberative, modern, Marxist and radical democracy (Tunç, 2008). The modern democracy, which is the common name of today's democracies, came into existence on the religious-cultural and economic tradition ground. State governments of the new age in Europe and Northern America, whose cultural fortune is the citizenship based on Roman and German law, the religion of Christianity, the respect for the individual and social contract, take their places on this ground (Schmidt, 2002: 320).

Liberal democracy is, basically, a political system where (a) the public takes or is authorized to take, positively or negatively, critical decisions related to crucial political matters and (b) in the case where the scope of legitimate authority for the public is limited, the public takes, or is merely authorized to take, these decisions with a limited authority (Şahin, 2009: 35). Accordingly, among the basic principles of liberal democracy, the concepts of freedom and equality come to the forefront (Durutürk, 2018: 1427). These are followed by the concepts of representation and participation. English philosopher John Stuart Mill is the most prominent representative of classical-liberal democracy theory (Schmidt, 2002: 24). In Mill's understanding of freedom, the emphasis on individual freedom including negative freedom is dominant in general. The assumption that individuals know their interests best, which is one of basic principles of negative understanding of freedom, is the core of his understanding of freedom (Bayram, 2014: 4).

Capitalism is an economic system where individuals own, individually or collectively, private property of productive resources and use them as they wish (Çelik and Dağ, 2017: 51-52). The Middle Age sources reveal the existence of capitalism in the 12th century (Pirenne, 2014: 182). Until the 15th century and through this century, centers of commerce and industry were only cities. There was a sharp division of labor between villagers and urbanites. Villagers were occupied with agriculture, and urbanites with commerce and handcrafts (Pirenne, 2014: 189). At the same time, these developing cities were determinant in the formation of a European idea (Delanty, 2004: 67). In the late Middle Age, the power and rise of capitalism were obvious (Pirenne, 2014: 237). Capitalism spread from England, where the Industry Revolution broke out, to other regions and parts of the world. The English Government was by no means the rival of land owning classes; however, this was not exactly the case in France or German. The English Government seemed to allow for more the capitalist transformation of civil society (Mooers, 1997: 198). From the beginning, the bourgeoisie, as a merchant and craftsman class, has been the driving force in the growing up of capitalism (Pirenne, 2014: 93). Many contemporary writers state that the key factors in the rise of capitalism are the rise of commerce and the prevalence of monetary relations and exchanges (Mooers, 1997: 15).

In Sweden, where the institution of ombudsman developed, the period from 1719 to 1772 is called as "The Age of Liberty" (Roberts, 1986; Anderson, 1973: 421). The Swedish King Charles XII renounced the conquest of new regions after a couple of defeats and died in 1718. In 1721, domestic tranquility and peace were re-established in Sweden, and the period during which the country was a great power over The Baltic ended. The end of the period during which Sweden was a great power and the death of the king initiated a new style of governance. Power was distributed to the society, which was the beginning of more freedom period. Therefore, this period is called the age of freedom (<https://www.informationsverige.se/en/>).

Eventually, this period experienced a transition from absolutism to parliamentary government (<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Charles-XII>). In this context, with the fall of monarchy, representative democracy took a step in Sweden (Gellhorn, 1967: 195).

The Age of Liberty mentioned above in Sweden is connected with the Enlightenment century experienced in Western Europe. Furthermore, the Enlightenment Age in Western Europe is the product of historical and intellectual accumulation of Ancient Greek and Roman Period, which lasted from 8th century B.C. to the 5th century A.D., Renaissance between 14th and 17th centuries and, later, The New Age, the Enlightenment Age is made up of universal principals addressing all humanity. The intellectual origins of the 1789 Great French Revolution are also rooted in this period (Topses, 2010: 2). Beginning from the 17th century, ever-increasing financial power of Europe was coupled with the rise in intellectual field. When it became 18th century, the Enlightenment philosophy was manifest in most fields (Ateş, 2013: 116). In this sense, the age expressed as Enlightenment encompasses the process from the second of half of 17th century to the beginning of the 19th century, when religious dogmatism ever-increasingly vanishes from the human mind, and the new style of thought which is based on the reason manifests itself (Demir, 2019: 92). Hence, the Enlightenment process can be understood as a period when the West establishes the links with its past, and its social and institutional structure transforms (Köroğlu and Köroğlu, 2016: 4).

When we look back Sweden again, Gustav III Adolph became the Sweden King in 1771. When different political parties started to compete each other, he staged a coup in 1772. He tried to gather as much power as possible to rule the country, which ended The Age of Liberty. Gustav IV Adolph was the Swedish King between 1796 and 1809. During his reign, Sweden was at war with Russia. Gustav IV Adolph lost the war, and Sweden had to surrender Finland to Russia. Since 1815, the state of peace has been continuing in Sweden. Charles XIII, the uncle of Gustav IV Adolph who were discontent with his nephew's management and unsuccessful military policy, came to the throne. At the same time, the Parliament (Riksdag) prepared a constitutional law consisting of four basic laws, including a governmental instrument which diminished the power of the king (<https://www.informationverige.se/en/>). The institution of ombudsman, which is one of the most important step in Swedish Enlightenment and the Age of Liberty, was legislated with the 1809 Constitutional Law (Kirchheiner, 1983: 23). Eventually, strengthening legal and political foundations of ombudsman by making it a constitutional institution reveals strong foundations and grounds of liberalism over ombudsman.

3. ANNALES SCHOOL: A DIFFERENT APPROACH TO HISTORIOGRAPHY AND SOCIOLOGY

3.1. Historiography before the Annales School

History which was identified with mythology in the Antiquity first came to acquire a factual quality with Herodotus (Yapıcı, 2015: 89). The word of history was used with the meaning of “the knowledge that arises through recording events that have happened to human communities” by Herodotus for the first time. The biggest contribution to the history perception of the period, which was as in the form of journalism, was by Thucydides (Şimşek and Pamuk, 2014: 22). Since Herodotus and Thucydides age, history has been written in various genres-monastery chronicles, political journals, old epistles etc.- (Burke, 2017: 29). Historiography starting with Herodotus and Thucydides came into a state as expressed as a science, pioneered by Leopold von Ranke in the 19th century (Malhut, 2011: 205; Van den Braembussche, 1979: 297).

Since Herodotus and Thucydides, the understanding of historiography had been the narration of “great deeds, political and military events by great people” (Delice, 2011: 102-103). This history being recorded around the centralized power did not mention the general structure of either the human or the society. This understanding and writing of history was protested in the Enlightenment for the first time, and a new understanding of history called social history, which mentioned commerce, laws and morals other than 18th century political and military structure, arose. Pioneers of the new understanding of history like Edward Gibson emerged. However, the 18th century understanding of history which was introduced by Ranke lost its power because of attaching to much importance by Ranke to the archive work (Akgün, 2015: 20).

History is divided into two parts as speculative and methodological as a philosophical field (Yılmaz, 2009: 223). In connection with this, some thinkers formed different historical designs, depending on their own thinking and information producing methods. For example, while Aristo, Ibn Khaldun and Machiavelli

were within the boundaries of cyclical history tradition, Hegel's historical philosophy was based on progressive history theory (Öztürk, 2020: 11). Teleological-progressive historiography, with the rise of Enlightenment historiography in the 18th century and the development of academic historiography in the 19th century, defined historiography in a definite way (Durgun, 2013: 286; Berger, 2007: 33). With the influence of Hegel, the philosophical critique of history prevented historiography from being merely a historical text and turned it into a philosophical design. However, the historiography of late 19th century adopted almost an anti-philosophical attitude with the influence of positivism (Delice, 2011: 102). In the pre-modern period, the history perception, in fact, was compromised with the rise of positivism. Thus, circular view of history became definite, uniting with the progressive paradigm (Şimşek and Pamuk, 2014: 22). In the 18th century, the field of history was defined as a field within literature and rhetoric, not a yet different discipline (Çaykent, 2017: 91). The approximation of history to natural sciences in terms of epistemology and with its principles and methods was brought into question with the prominence of the objectivity of history in the 19th century (Oppermann, 2006: 35). Thus, beginning from 19th century, the word of "scientific" could be said for history (Güçlüer, 2012: 80). With the influence of Enlightenment, history definitions and history theories developed on these entered into topics dealt by scientists (Demir, 2019: 94). We can conclude a judgement from this that social historians or Enlightenment historians observed depths of lower layers of the society, and historians with a positivist character studied on general topics/documentary works (Darnton, 1971: 113).

With Ranke, who acted with positivist science understanding, history meant "redefinition and narration of the past as it is" in a clear and plain way (Şimşek and Pamuk, 2014: 23). The new history understanding brought by Ranke did not reveal the laws of how history worked, as it is alleged. Consequently, the first call for struggle against the theory that facts prevail in history and they are autonomous was made by Dilthey in Germany in 1880 and 1890, by Croce in Italy, and after that by Collingwood in England. These historians who were defined as historicist and idealist asserted that history was a distinct science from natural sciences and had to own methods peculiar to it (Yapıcı, 2015: 92).

There are two prominent critiques for the view that the past should be re-constructed by the historian as it is. These are the Hermeneutic tradition represented by German school and the Annales School represented by French school (Şimşek and Pamuk, 2014: 24).

3.2. The Annales School Historiography

3.2.1. The Rise of the School and its Main Characteristics

The Annales, which was established by March Bloch and Lucien Febvre in French in 1929 (Harsgor, 1978: 2) and was the name of a journal, became a school for both the new understanding of historiography and French historiography (Yeğen, 2016: 23). With the Annales, the event-oriented quality of 19th century professional historiography, which was based on narration, transformed into social sciences-oriented historical research and writing methods (Malhut, 2011: 205; Hobsbawm, 2009: 219).

The historians of the Annales school represent the most important transformations in the historical thought of the 20th century (Iggers, 2011: 58; Yasin Coşkun, 2018: 322). The historians of the Annales school aims to deal with the human fact in a holistic way by rejecting limited nature of event-oriented political and diplomatic history (Taştan, 2016: 117). Accordingly, in the Annales, contrary to the traditional narration focusing on the history of politics, diplomacy and wars, it is believed that the discipline of history, which investigates long-term historical structures behind events and which is human activities-oriented, should be in collaboration with other disciplines of social sciences-sociology, geography, economy, psychology, anthropology, linguistics (Özgören-Kınlı, 2015: 503).

The prominent underlying thoughts of the Annales can be summarized as follows (Burke, 2017: 23; Trevor-Roper, 1972: 470-471):

- ✓ Instead of traditional event narration, it enjoys problem-oriented analytical history understanding,
- ✓ The history made of major political events is replaced by a history encompassing whole human activities,
- ✓ To attain the objectives above, it collaborates with other disciplines-geography, sociology, psychology, economy, linguistics, anthropology etc.-.

The Annales School is divided into three periods. The first period is 1920-1945, in which it is a radical and destructive movement against traditional political history and events history. It is followed by the second period, in which it can be regarded as a full “school” which has reached its most important position under the leadership of Fernand Braudel in 1950s and 1960s with its own peculiar concepts like “structure”, “conjuncture” and “serial history” methods of the change. The third period is the period of the last generation in 1968s, in which it produces a great effect in France despite fragmentations and program shifts within the group and is perceived as a “united school” (Delice, 2011: 106).

3.2.2. The Overview of the Views within the School

The primary and the most important reason why the Annales School offers a new understanding of historiography is the allegation that traditional historiography is not reliable and based on political events and figures in parallel with positivist understanding (Yeğen, 2016: 24). In addition, the Journal, i.e. the School, began its publishing life with the claim of being a leader in economic and social historical areas (Delice, 2011: 105).

The historians of the School does not only intensify on economic determinism, as different from the Marxist history understanding (Yasin Coşkun, 2018: 322). At this point, Burke says that Annales representatives does not adhere to a “determinist” history theory and, therefore, cannot be Marxist (Lennan, 2007: 210).

An understanding that history should be social-based took a broader sense and dimension with the French Annales School, which became influential in historiography and history teaching in Europe especially in the first half of 20 the century (Yapıcı, 2015: 94).

3.2.3. The Foundations Laid by the Founders: Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre

Bloch and Febvre founded Annales as they were not happy with the style of historiography in France (Burke, 2007: 19). Febvre was influenced by the works of Henri Pirenne on the Middle Age city (Burke, 2017: 39), and Bloch was substantially influenced by the sociological works of Durkheim (Burke, 2017: 41). Burke states that Annales is close to geography, sociology and anthropology. He justifies this idea by showing these examples; Febvre’s interest in geography, efforts of sociologist to re-understand history and the interest of anthropologists like Levi-Stratuss in the Annales. Burke also states that “the historians of the Annales are occupied with the history of long-term structures, use quantitative methods and assert that these methods are scientific and deny the freedom of action of the individual”. According to Burke, when looked through the general framework, even though Braudel stands out as a prominent name within the School, the greatest contribution to the Annales is, in fact, made by Bloch and Febvre (Yeğen, 2016: 30).

3.2.4. The Influence by Fernand Braudel on the Annales School

The Journal and School became known in Europe or out of Europe in the period of Braudel (Burke, 2017: 184). In this period, it is seen that he more concentrated on economic history (Clemente et al., 2016: 4).

Braudel was a historian who objected to the established history understanding in academia, strove for a new history discipline and became influential in the 1945-1968 period which is described as the golden age of capitalism. According to Braudel, the new history is the accumulation of all possible histories (Alpkaya, 2020). In order to support his views, Braudel produced works dealing with capitalism at a large scale.

Braudel describes capitalism as the highest level of three-level structure. At the lowest level, there exists the daily material life of everyman. At the upper level, there exists market economy. Capitalism are within the realms of supranational and transnational area which can constantly get rid of agents such as political power, adherence to home country, the burden of social relationships. Capitalism maintains its development with high profit margins in in this supranational location, harboring intrinsically monopolization (İnsel, 2005: 27).

3.2.5. Contributions by Jacques Le Goff, Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie and Georges Duby

In the third period of the School, Le Goff, Ladurie and Duby became prominent. In this period, no trend was formed. Historians were more interested in multicultural history (Yasin Coşkun, 2018: 325). In addition, return to political history which began to be neglected in social sciences methods in the 19th century was experienced in this period (Hobsbawm, 2009: 79).

In the third generation of the Annales, the rise became more evident ever-increasingly in consecutive years following 1968. There was a radical change on the Journal management in 1969 as a reaction to 1968 May incidents, which is probably known as student incidents in France (Burke, 2017: 122; Harsgor, 1978: 10). Just as the year of 1968 became effective in forming the third generation of the school, the year of 1989 had the same effect in forming the fourth generation (Burke, 2017: 163).

3.2.6. The Influence of the Annales School on Althusser, Foucault and Lacan: A Marxist and Postmodern Evaluation

As different from the ages and periods in the past, in the 20th century and today, there exist a wide variety of philosophical understandings and philosophical thinking methods “*ranging from positivism to existentialism, from phenomenology to structuralism, from Nihilism to the Frankfurt School, from intuitionism to linguistics and from pragmatism to postmodernism*” (Akkaya, 2019: 399-400). Although the Annales tradition is influenced by these thinking methods at different levels, one has to stress especially on structuralism here. In fact, aforementioned discourses here based on metanarratives both are intertwined with the concepts, understandings and theories related to philosophy and, after that, the political and social field and direct them in a specific direction.

The Annales has always emphasized on analyzing the integrity of the social fabric (Wallerstein, 2013: 204). The studies of the Annales School historians are the indicators of a historiography understanding “which will deal with analyzing the structure rather than narrating the events.” Therefore, in the works of the Annales School, “structure” has been an important term (Delice, 2011: 104). According to Braudel, the peculiar contribution by historians to social sciences is that they acquire social sciences the awareness that all structures are subject to the change (Burke, 2017: 85).

On the other hand, the concept of structure in the philosophy of science is considered within Structuralism. Structuralism is a movement of thought which have been popularized since 1950s and which is influential on a wide area from mathematics to cybernetics along with social sciences (Arslantürk and Amman, 2013: 490-491). Structuralism includes focusing on structures. The source of modern structuralism is linguistics. The most prominent representative of it is Ferdinand de Saussure. Within French structuralism, anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss is prominent (Ritzer and Stepnisky, 2014: 615-616). For all structuralists, structuralism is a method (Ergun, 2005: 82). Structuralism, as a strong French philosophical and literal movement, influenced considerably the historians of the Annales School (Yılmaz, 2009: 224; Van den Braembussche, 1979: 304; Nawaz and Ali, 2016: 26). However, there are significant differences between structuralism and the Annales despite an overall compatibility (Clark, 2018: 239). In addition, the Annales stands close to English idealism along with being French historiography tradition.

The fact that Braudel and the structural history of the Annales are more indebted to the enmity they bear towards all types of phenomenology than to structuralism has an implication. In this regard, it compromises with the theses of thinkers – such as Foucault, Althusser, Lacan- who intellectually aspire to eliminate the subject (Clark, 2018: 248). At this point, thinkers who are influenced by the Annales and who make a contribution to it benefit from the intellectual discussions and criticism made in the 20th century. The core of these discussions has an interdisciplinary stance based on political, sociological and philosophical hypotheses.

Apart from the Annales, another historical thinking method which is in vogue in this period is elevated on the ground of Marxism (Yılmaz, 2009: 224). Marxist historiography aims to provide a framework which mediates understanding the processes in the past and sheds light on the analysis of causal powers in the present system, which contribute to the struggle for freedom of the human or hinder it with its functions (Blackledge, 2017: 41). Although Marxist methods make the class struggle continuing throughout the history the main subject of history, ethnic groups, women, laborers, peasants, minorities and other social concepts can only find their place in 20th century historiography by means of Neo-Marxists (Taştan, 2016: 117). Wallestein was the president of the Braudel Center for a long time. Wallestein, who first changed the location of Annales, later enabled Annales to be shaped in a "Neo-Marxist" style (Yeğen, 2016: 31). Structuralism came to make a great sense in social sciences with Althusser. Althusser explains the determination of the superstructure that is ultimately legal, political and ideological by the substructure, i.e. economic base, in the Marxist social thinking with two different thoughts within Marxist tradition. According to him, the first of these thoughts is the acceptance that the superstructure is relatively more autonomous against the productive forces and relations of productions within the substructure. The second

thought is that the superstructure and the substructure mutually affect each other (Say, 2013: 338). Another 20th century Marxist thinking method or pursuit that has to be mentioned here is the Frankfurt School or critical theory. The Critical Theory that was put forward within the Frankfurt School by Adorno and Horkheimer change the direction of criticism for Marxism and capitalism. Critical theory or school concentrated on the historical dialectic relationship between the human and the natural instead of class conflict, diverging from the Marxist tradition (Parlak and Doğan, 2016: 119).

In the meantime, postmodernism which influences every field of intellectual life shakes the foundation of established scientific institutions, methods, narrations, historical approaches and begins to struggle with all subjects in social sciences by asking questions about the basic object of science. Postmodernism which questions established concepts such as historical facts, the truth and objectivity as to how history is written and read began to question the rightness of discourses that the historian constructed by turning suddenly the historical truth that Ranke put forward in the 19th century and was based on documents to the truth and what the truth was (Taştan, 2016: 96). Structuralism which is associated with postmodernism is also one of approaches which contributes to critical thinking in history practice, with its form it takes at the end of the 20th century (Scott, 2017: 14). At this point, according to Foucault, who has post-structuralist and Marxist stance, (Nawaz and Ali, 2016: 14) there is no rational direction for history. According to Foucault, interpretation of a historical text by a historian cannot be distinct from the effect of historical texts which fall into the scope of discourses that are formed in time and constantly undergo a change (Oppermann, 2006: 9-10). In addition, French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan also make statements which force boundaries of structuralism by his view of “when the thing which shows and the thing which is shown are intertwined, the meaning never exists directly” (Elliott, 2017: 137).

On the other hand, postmodern history theory, by deconstructing traditional history methodology, emphasizes that history is made of discontinuous events, and that the historian has an objective characteristic. (Oppermann, 2006: 108). In this context, the essence of postmodern historiography is that it arose as the perception of the past with a more fragmental perspective compared to modern historiography (Şimşek and Pamuk, 2014: 25).

4. RESTRUCTURING OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, THE ANNALES SCHOOL AND THE OMBUDSMAN PARADIGM: A TRILOGIC FRAMEWORK

4.1. Social Sciences, Positivism and Modernity

The positivist approach in social sciences undertook a constituent role, being inspired by natural sciences. Social sciences were founded on the endeavor of understanding modernity (Altunok, 2012: 4-5). In this respect, social sciences are the product of modernity. Social sciences emerged following great transformations (especially the French Revolution) resulting in modernity in the West. In addition to this, social sciences were formed on the Enlightenment tradition (Kızılcelik, 2004: 1-2; Gülenç, 2012: 146).

The dominant scientific method in social sciences in the 19th century was based on the positivist paradigm (Kızılcelik, 2004: 30). Positivists reject all mystic thoughts, essential and ontological references and all invisible links among events, constituted relying on mind (Akın, 1997: 21). Moreover, it can be said that social sciences have been capitalist in general since its constitution (Altunok, 2012: 13). In this respect, bourgeois which is the dominant class of capitalism which became dominant after the 19th century needed social sciences, which is based on positivism, to adopt a attitude towards the change being experienced, overcome the chaotic environment caused by transformation at macro level, to restructure the social and restore it. In this situation, social sciences maintained its development as an extension of liberal ideology at this stage (Kızılcelik, 2004: 47-48). While the partner of capitalism was structuring modernity, the dominant ideology of the 19th century; scientific disintegration with specialization fields which are different from each other emerged: market-economics, state-politics and civil society- sociology (Altunok, 2012: 92). The science branches here acts with the aims of organizing the society in the rational direction with Enlightenment influences, of progressing and of creating a “rational/scientific society” (Özlem, 2013: 58).

The Enlightenment approach have two crucial influences on social sciences. Primarily, the knowledge of the Enlightenment desires to reach the pure truth by clearing human thought from the uncertainty of historical and cultural elements. The other crucial influence of the Enlightenment thought is seen on the methodology of social sciences. This occurs in a way that positivist approach is exactly reflected on social sciences (Köroğlu and Köroğlu, 2016: 9). Positivism can measure the real source of knowledge by

excluding the metaphysic, dogmatic and intuitional and alleges that it is a predicable natural science (Dağıstan, 2017: 457).

The radical change caused by industrialization and modernization in the social structure, in other words, the need of understanding and interpreting “the disturbance”, brought about social sciences (Kuyucuoğlu, 2015: 675). The fact that sociology which is at the center of social sciences is established by a French man (Auguste Comte) is not a coincidence. Sociology established by Comte contains a positivist/universalist discourse. As Comte model natural sciences for this science whose subject is society, at inception, sociology is expressed as social physics. At the background of this expression, it lies a belief that social sciences also have a nomothetic identity as natural sciences (Hira, 2000: 83). Windelband divides disciplines as nomothetic and ideographic and reveals that natural sciences which run after universal laws are “nomothetic”, and that sciences which analyze particular events and individual cases are “ideographic” (Dağıstan, 2017: 453).

We can mention two basic influence in forming the conceptual framework of modern science with an Enlightenment and positivist characteristic. First of them is the influence of Francis Bacon. Bacon thinks that the knowledge obtained with experience strengthens the human, which will make the condition in which it lives far better. He defends that the knowledge should make progress in itself in order for it to make such a radical change on human life. The second of them is the influence of Descartes. Cartesian dualism absolutely splits two worlds from each other. On one hand, there are fact, material, i.e. physical realty world. On the other hand, there are subjective mind, conscience, individual experience and values world. In the radical distinction between natural and human, material and reason, physical world and spiritual world, it is true that the world which science belong to is objective facts world (Dağıstan, 2017: 451). The view that modern science seeks the exact knowledge with an empiric attitude, and that philosophy seeks the imaginary and the controversial in a metaphysical or speculative way is dominant. This view is also the basis of the distinction between science and philosophy (Dağıstan, 2017: 452).

4.2. Crisis in Social Sciences and Restructuring

The formation in social sciences in line with the interests of dominant classes in 19th century, legitimation of Western world dominance in historical flow, social science paradigm which was conditioned on capitalist world economy and whose epistemological motives were built on universal, positivist, nomothetic and Europe-centered framework began to be questioned after 1945s (Kızılcelik, 2004: 54). According to Braduel (2007: 115), social sciences in the 20th century were in a general crisis. Because of information accumulation and lack of collaboration between disciplines, these sciences cannot maintain their development.

In social sciences, after 1945, serious intellectual and methodological problems came into question. These problems was sloganized by some contemporary schools and scientists in a meeting called as Gulbenkian Commission and in the report presented here as “Open Social Sciences” (Gulbenkian Commission, 2009). “Opening Social Sciences” or “Re-thinking Social Sciences” brings into question matters such as opening to different cultures, returning those which were left aside to historiography again, interdisciplinary quests, returning to hermeneutic philosophy and postmodern discourses (Göle, 2013: 310).

The fragmentation of social sciences as narrow specialization fields and encouragement of excessive specialization prevent understanding the social reality as a whole (Başkaya, 2015: 71). There exists the state of excessive disunity under the name of specialization from the beginning. In order to eliminate this problem in social sciences, it is necessary to re-consider social sciences, eliminate the mutual communication problem and establish a new link between disciplines and create social sciences colloquium (Kızılcelik, 2004: 59).

The epistemological foundation that social sciences are based on is at the center of questioning, depending on modernism criticisms (Hira, 2000: 81). Today, from the social sciences perspective, positivism as the understanding of the human and science and scientific method is intensively criticized. Positivism criticism are more focused on the thought that natural sciences cannot be adapted to social sciences (Köroğlu and Köroğlu, 2016: 10).

A natural sciences and psyche/social/cultural science discussion which started in the 19th century has caused a quest for method, depending on the distinction of facts/subjects, As a result of these method quest and discussions, two different philosophy of science developing especially in German came out. On one

hand, basing on discussions in the German History School, a hermeneutic understanding which desires to establish psyche/culture sciences according to natural-scientific method and the knowledge ideal tried to be grounded especially by Schleiermacher and Wilhelm Dilthey. On the other hand, a hermeneutic approach which desires to establish psyche/culture sciences on the foundation of its peculiar epistemology and method was developed by the New Kantian School (Seyit Coşkun, 2018: 62). Accordingly, diverging from natural sciences methods and entering into effort to search for a scientific method based on culture was brought into question by the representatives of the German History School (Aysevener, 2015: 140).

Hermeneutic method which objects to the subject-object distinction by positivism is defined as “phenomenological idealism which bases knowledge and the acceptance of truth on subjective experience and specific context.” This definition causes hermeneutic method to be confronted by natural science methods which desire to develop general rules. While the “explanatory method-nomothetic” of natural sciences is based on casual characteristics of material/physical events, the “semantic method of social science-ideographic” emphasizes on the importance of understanding and interpreting social events. Hermeneutic method which was employed to merely explain and interpret religious, literal and legal texts according to the time and conditions at the beginning turned into an important paradigm in sociology with the efforts of Dilthey and Max Weber (Kuyucuoğlu, 2015: 681). While American sociology, which is influenced by English idealism, enjoys an individual and experimental characteristic, European sociology is more general and factual (Arslantürk and Amman, 2013: 57). German sociology arose as a reaction to the naturalist and positivistic understanding of French sociology. Weber, who is the equivalent of Durkheim of French sociology in German sociology, borrowed this discipline from Dilthey, who is one of pioneers of understanding term (Ergun, 2005: 101-102). The value related understanding style which was introduced by Rickert and Dilthey (Habermas, 2011: 102) played an important role in developing the interpretive sociology of Weber. Apart from the causal explanation that has been made in natural sciences, Weber, by developing his own interpretive sociology, made a trial of a method different from Comte and Durkheim tradition (Hira, 2000: 87).

Positivism-oriented objectivity criticism in social sciences also started with Dilthey, Windelband and Ricker and continued with Gadamer, who was one of scientist who would maintain this tradition later (Kızılcelik, 2004: 58). In addition, positivist method came to be criticized, primarily, by science circles with Popper’s criticisms for positivism understanding, with his scientific understanding based on falsification rather than verification (Hira, 2000: 86). Habermas, one of contemporary German sociologists, also believes that the objectivity of natural sciences cannot be directly reflected on social sciences as social sciences deal with the universe of formations interpreted before. In other words, the focus of interest of research intensifies on a social world which is made of meaningful behaviors of the human (the subject) (Hira, 2000: 87). According to Habermas, the diversity of dynamics that affect individual or social actions of historical players prevents the formation of a historical causality theory encompassing all of them (Aysevener, 2015: 134). On the other hand, according to Wallerstein, the world- systems is a social system, and the powers which hold it together and conflicts have boundaries, structures, member groups, rules of legitimation and coherence (Malhut, 2011: 212). According to Wallerstein’s modern world- systems, the origin of capitalist world economy dates back to, high likely, the 16th century, not the 19th century; and this system was introduced in a part of the world, substantially in Europe, and spread all over the world with consecutive inclusions/additions (Aydınalp, 2010: 31). According to Wallerstein, the rise of capitalism is the consequence of a division of labor based on commerce. The development of world division of labor is the same thing as the development of capitalism. Accordingly, in a nutshell, the assumptions of world-systems theory are as follows: 1) the existence of conflict and competition among central powers, 2) demand insufficiency 3) wage pressure, 4) quest for cheap raw materials (Akbulut, 2007: 83-87). Wallerstein mentions two different types of world-systems, which he names as world empires and world economies (Mooers, 1997: 19). In the Wallerstein’s social sciences methodology, the analysis of world-systems is of primary importance. He establishes relations with social sciences at a large scale in order to explain the development of capitalist system in historical and factual sense.

As a result of changes, criticisms and the opinions of some thinkers mentioned until now, history is not now seen as a field which can have access to laws related to itself with causal explanations which we run across in Comte or Marx. Hence, the objectivity of historical knowledge is opened up for discussion. This new discussion topic is based on hermeneutic tradition (Aysevener, 2015: 149).

4.3. Social Sciences, the Annales School, Eclecticism and Interdisciplinary Approach

The subject of sociology is social events. And, social events happen through history and has a historical dimension. In this case, sociology has to consult to history in order to grasp and explain its subject properly (Güçlüer, 2012: 81). History is the laboratory of sociology (Arslantürk and Amman, 2013: 26). Every sociological analysis requires historical perception horizon, historical perspective and the full/intensive, even flawless, use of historical materials (Kızılcelik, 2001: 2). Again, every social fact is historical, and every historical fact is social (Ergun, 2005: 24).

Historical facts cannot be independent from the interpretation of the historian (Carr, 2009: 15). The conclusion that Burke draws from the Annales School, which he identifies as one of milestones in historiography, also support this thesis. Burke notes that we cannot reduce humans of the past to historical causality retroactively with such an ease in historical narration which is concerned with human, that understanding them is a complicated task, and that we cannot mention a history which is independent from the earthliness of the historian who is committed to understand it (Özdemir, 2019: 16).

As expressed by Braduel, “it is not possible to deny that sociology and history frequently unify, complement each other and intermingle.” The reason for that is simple. In one hand, history has its imperialism and its expansionism. On the other hand, it has natural identity. Only history and sociology are holistic sciences which are inclined to expand their pursuits to any aspect of the societal. As long as history is all sciences of the human in the enormous area of the past, it is synthesis, orchestra and existent in all parts of the feast, if time analysis in all its forms opens current time’s doors. And, here, it always finds sociology together with it as sociology, by its nature, is synthesis, and temporal dialectic forces it to go towards past, willingly or unwillingly” (qtd. Kızılcelik, 2001: 4).

The Annales School is one of the most innovationist and memorable formations of the 20th century in terms of interdisciplinary tendencies in social sciences. The Annales is formed to take the lead in social sciences, in particular economy and social history fields. Thus, the Annales School symbolizes a stance which is against the dominant social science understanding of the 19th century, i.e. the design for the fragmentation of social sciences in the framework of specialization tendencies (Kızılcelik, 2004: 119-123).

4.4. Ombudsman Paradigm in the Development of Social Sciences with conjuncture

Although the institution of ombudsman appears to arise in 18th century in the modern age, it finds its real identity with public administration in the postmodern age. To be more precise, this structure or institution which was seen only in two states until the World War II has increased its prevalence and acceptability level from this date to today with developments with conjunctures within the framework of political, sociological, scientific, cultural and legal dynamics and their influences on public policies at a national and international level. In this respect, ombudsman can be named as a “postmodern auditing paradigm” (Doğan, 2019: 315).

The spread of ombudsman to the world states and continents at a large scale came true in stages and waves. The first ombudsman wave which covers 1950s-1960s occurred in Scandinavian countries. After 1960, the second spread wave began, and the ombudsman institutions were established in New Zealand in 1962, in England in 1967 and in Northern Ireland in 1970. The third ombudsman wave occurred in Mediterranean countries such as Spain, Greece and in some Asian and African countries with the collapse of authoritarian regimes in these countries. In addition, as a fourth wave, the institution of ombudsman was established in countries called as new democracies which proclaimed their independence with the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1989 (Parlak and Doğan, 2015: 93-97).

Transparency, accountability, liability and fairness in the quality of services given within the body of public administration, which are the accepted governance principles of the dominant paradigm in recent times of the theories of public administration as a branch social sciences are effectively and perfectly in with participation based on liberality, freedom, equality and human rights concepts, which are inherent in ombudsman (Doğan, 2017: 280). Because of this fact, the institution of ombudsman became effective in running away from communist or authoritarian regimes in the world in 1980s (Gregory and Giddings, 2000: 2). Ombudsman also played role in the continuity of management reforms in the field of public administration in different states in 1990s (Buck et al., 2011: 122). Ombudsman has become effective in development of democracy in Latin America (e.g. Peru and Venezuela) and in some Mediterranean

countries (e.g. Spain and Greece) and in fighting against corruption in countries which used to be under the dominance of the old Soviet Regime (e.g. Poland and Romania) (Reif, 2004: 8-9).

In this regard, with the development of ombudsman as a historical/sociological concept and a scientific fact, there formed an ontological, methodological and epistemological bond with the progress of social sciences with conjunctures (Doğan, 2019: 316).

4.5. The Reflections of the Annales School and Social Sciences on the Development of Ombudsman Paradigm

The biggest contribution by the Annales School to social sciences methodology is the information production process which is based on a new historical understanding. Thus, the Annales makes criticism of scientific historiography by supporting the German idealist view of 19th century and English empiric tradition along with its support to French traditional historiography. At this point, while noting the interdisciplinary quality of social sciences, the relationship between history and society is especially emphasized. Accord to Annales historians, historical events and facts are not analyzed by positivist paradigm which is peculiar to the Enlightenment Age. Information production process based on positivist methodology has come to end. In theory production and scientific methodology development, one should take advantage of historical sources and facts and get to the core of events.

The development of a social science theory that is not based on history or historical research is not possible. In this regard, the epistemological and methodological influence of the Annales on social sciences become decisive in formation and establishment of ombudsman paradigm. The Annales as a new historiography method or a historical approach contributed to ombudsman paradigm or theory in its progress and spread all over the world. As a result, the Annales provides an intellectual ground to ombudsman by reminding the evaluation of concepts such as democracy, freedom, participation, ethics, which are inherent in ombudsman, according to the condition of the period and by triggering different schools.

Depending on the relationship between the Annales and the restructuring of social sciences, intellectual discussion made in the philosophy of science in development of theories on ombudsman in social sciences cannot be overlooked. Thus, ombudsman paradigm sets its direction, depending on intellectual discussions and the desire for determining a new method. This direction can be followed both from the studies on different political ideologies and from the responses of ombudsman to developments with conjuncture in scientific and cultural sense and in the sense of its positioning capacity according to it. Ombudsman as a historical and social concept and as a theory and a method is influenced by new ideas, thoughts and movements in both historical and social sense.

5. CONCLUSION

In order to produce ideas within the framework of a specific methodology and develop theories in social sciences, the first issue to consider is how events and facts are formed through a historical process. At this stage, daily lives in past times, major cultural and economical transformations and the heritage left from some thinkers are of great importance in terms of thinking tradition in social sciences.

Ombudsman, which is the subject of the study and is desired to be related to different thinking schools and discourses, is a structure which arose in Sweden in the 18th century. That this structure arose in Sweden is not independent from the Enlightenment thinking experienced in Western Europe, modernity and capitalist conditions. The rise of ombudsman in Sweden is the extension of liberal ideology tradition. Consequently, the great transformation experienced in West Europe also influenced Sweden, and this study alleges that this was the most important factor in the establishment of ombudsman. Therefore, values such as equality, freedom, rights and participation – which are basic characteristics of ombudsman- are values which constitutes the core of liberal democracy.

Hence, ombudsman takes its place in history as a compatible structure to liberal democracy tradition. After that, the general situation of social sciences, which constitutes the pillar of ombudsman, should be observed in order to observe how ombudsman develops at a scientific level. After the Enlightenment, social sciences were exposed to some criticisms by some intellectual circles or schools of thought (e.g. German History School or English empiricist thinking tradition) as it made progress with positivist thinking method. At this point, the most intense criticisms are that social sciences should have a methodology different from natural

sciences and that social sciences should focus on analyzing social relations among humans. The hermeneutic philosophy which was put forward in this period was developed as an alternative discourse against positivism. Despite all these discussions, positivist paradigm in social sciences maintained its dominant characteristic until the second half of the 20th century.

While these discussions are made in social sciences, some thoughts on the field of history are put forward as well. In history, which returns to social historiography with the Enlightenment, scientific thinking method is determined as natural sciences-oriented after positivism become influential in this field. The science of history which acquires the quality of science in this period maintains its development with emphasis of positivism-oriented progressive history. However, With the Annales School, a big methodological shift is observed in the Marxist historiography method which began to become more obvious especially in 20th century, postmodern history theory and the science of history. The Annales School or tradition objects to the understanding of 19th century-positivist academic historiography, which is furnished with cultural and psyche/spiritual sciences and defends that history should be studied holistically and by relating it to different disciplines. The Annales tradition which makes a revolution in the field of history also influences the field of social sciences and has been a solution for the aforementioned crisis in social sciences.

After observing the transformation and method quests in social sciences and history, when we return to ombudsman, we see that this structure has increased its importance and its spread areas especially after the World War II, i.e. after 1945s. As a matter of fact, although the number of ombudsman institutions were only two in the world until this date, this number has become about 200 today. It should be said that the great spread of ombudsman came true, primarily depending on political, economical, cultural and scientific conjunctures in the world. This situation is by no means coincidental. Eventually, wars, economic crises, major intellectual criticisms and policies that reflect on the practice affect ombudsman under the discipline of public administration as well as they primarily affect social sciences.

Another explanation that has to be stated here should be on postmodernism. The discourse of postmodernism, as a rebellion project against modernism after 1945s, has criticized strongly all assumptions belonging to the modern age. The transformation caused by this is realized in the field of public administration as transition from modern public administration to postmodern public administration. The governance understanding reached by public administration theories as the summit are also integrated with ombudsman. Ombudsman is “a postmodern auditing paradigm.” In this respect, the link of ombudsman paradigm with postmodernity can be easily seen both as a historical age and an epistemological essence. Here, the link of ombudsman with liberal ideology determines the process.

Another matter about the rise of ombudsman paradigm is the field of intellectual knowledge which emerges along with the argument of restructuring of social sciences. Different theoretical concepts related to governance, in particular ombudsman paradigm, are also the indicators of this accumulation. Therefore, the argument of restructuring of social sciences in the 20th century triggered the development of ombudsman.

When it comes to the Annales as a thinking style or a method, ombudsman was first elevated on the historical ground which was based on Enlightenment/positivism and liberal principles. Then, together with the conjuncture, hermeneutic tradition and philosophical discussions in social sciences occurred after the World War II, it changed its direction and found the direction which enabled it to advance toward its prime target. At this point, the Annales tradition attached more importance to viewing history holistically and getting rid of prejudices and symbolizes a transformation in social sciences and ombudsman paradigm. It shifted the focus of deep social, political and philosophical discussions which means viewing ombudsman holistically or making theories to this direction.

Consequently, ombudsman paradigm with its intrinsic humanistic liberal values like gratification, freedom, ethics, equality and participation is integrated with and supports discussions in historical, social and philosophical fields against uniform, malevolent and unfair thoughts and methods of the 20th century. The Annales tradition has an integrity with both ombudsman paradigm and the discourse of the restructuring of social sciences, which is the main argument of this study. Therefore, there is a trilogic link among them. As a matter of fact, the relationship established here reveals certain dynamics in the formation of an ombudsman theory. Because the establishment of the ombudsman theory is based on the integrity of information that can be explained with certain motives. This relationship also establishes a scientific, philosophical, historical, political, sociological and economic basis of the ombudsman. Again, the flexible

structure of liberal ideology and its shaping depending on the conjuncture in different periods and centuries is another factor which strengthens and values ombudsman. In this regard, it has found its real identity with the aforementioned direction, and we can say it has become a paradigm in social sciences.

REFERENCES

- Akbulut, Ö. Ö. (2007). Küreselleşme Ulus-Devlet ve Kamu Yönetimi, TODAİE, Ankara.
- Akgün, S. (2015). “Siyasi Tarih Eğitiminde Annales Okulu ve Yöntem”, Journal of Educational Sciences, June: 17-29.
- Akın, E. (1997). Bilim ve Siyasal Sistem, Gazi Büro Kitabevi, Ankara.
- Akıncı, A. (2011). “Demokrasi ve Liberalizmin Zorunlu Birlikteliği”, PARADOKS Ekonomi, Sosyoloji ve Politika Dergisi, Ocak, 7(1): 7-28.
- Akkaya, M. (2019). Filozofça Bilgi Kuramı: Eleştirel Bilgi Felsefesi Tarihi ve Diyalektik Materyalist Epistemoloji, Belge Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Alpkaya, F. (2020). Braudel’den Wallerstein’e Tarihe Bakmak, Ayrıntı Dergisi, Retrieved from <https://ayrintidergi.com.tr/braudelden-wallersteine-tarihe-bakmak/>, (23.06.2020).
- Altunok, M. (2012). Türkiye’de Kamu Yönetimi Düşüncesi: Tarihsellik ve Disipliner Bağımlılık, Gazi Kitabevi, Ankara.
- Anderson, S. V. (1973). “Public Access to Government Files in Sweden”, The American Journal of Comparative Law, 21(3) (Summer): 419-473.
- Arslantürk, Z. ve Amman, M. T. (2013). Sosyoloji, Çamlıca Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Ateş, D. (2013). “Uluslararası politika ve Avrupamerkezci tarihyazımı”, İnsan & Toplum, 3(6): 107-133.
- Aydınalp, H. (2010). “Immanuel Wallerstein ile Sosyal Bilimleri Yeniden Düşünmek”, Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 39(2): 27-48.
- Aysevener, K. (2015). Tarih Felsefesi, Say Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Başkaya, F. (2015). Avrupa Merkezilik, Resmi İdeoloji Bilim ve Sosyalizm, Öteki Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Bayram, Y. (2014). J.S. Mill’in Liberal Düşünce Geleneği İçindeki Yeri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme. Üçüncü Sektör Sosyal Ekonomi, 49(1): 1-17.
- Berger, S. (2007). “The Power of National Pasts: Writing National History in Nineteenth-and Twentieth-Century Europe”, (Ed. Stefan Berger), Writing the Nation: A Global Perspective (pp.30-62), Palgrave Macmillan, UK.
- Blackledge, P. (2017). Marksist Tarih Kuramı Üzerine, çev. Şükrü Alpagut, Yordam Kitap, İstanbul.
- Braudel, F. (2007). “Tarih ve Toplumsal Bilimler”, çev. Deniz Erksan, (Der. Ali Boratav), Tarih ve Tarihiç: Annales Okulu İzinde (ss.115-163), Kırmızı Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Buck, T., Kirkham, R. and Thompson, B. (2011). The Ombudsman Enterprise and Administrative Justice, Ashgate Publishing, UK.
- Burke, P. (2007). “Modern Avrupa’nın İlk Dönemlerinde Toplum ve Ekonomiye Giriş”, çev. Fatma Tümen, (Der. Ali Boratav), Tarih ve Tarihiç: Annales Okulu İzinde (ss.19-32), Kırmızı Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Burke, P. (2017). Fransız Tarih Devrimi: Annales Okulu (1929-2014), çev. Umut Yener Kara ve Turgay Sivrikaya, Işık Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Caiden, G. E., Macdermot, N. and Sandler, A. (1983). “The Institution of Ombudsman”, (Ed. Gerald E. Caiden), International Handbook of the Ombudsman: Evolution and Present Function (pp.3-21), Vol. I, Greenwood Press, London.
- Carr, E. H. (2009). Tarih Nedir?. çev. Misket Gizem Gürtürk, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Clark, S. (2018). “Annales Tarihiçileri”, çev. Ahmet Demirhan, (Der. Quentin Skinner), Çağdaş Temel Kuramlar (ss.225-251), İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.

- Clemente, M., Durand, R. and Roulet, T. (2016). "The Recursive Nature of Institutional Change: An Annales School Perspective", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, October, 30: 1-15.
- Coşkun, S. (2018). "Sosyal Bilimlerde Metodoloji Problemi", *Dört Öge*, 13: 59-72.
- Coşkun, Y. (2018). "The New Trends Among The Annales Historians: An Assessment of The Three Phases of The Annales Movement", *Cappadocia Journal of History and Social Sciences*, 11-October: 321-327.
- Çaykent, Ö. (2017). "Aydınlanma Tarih Yazıcılığı ve Edward Gibbon", (Ed. Ahmet Şimşek), *Dünyada Tarihçilik: Dönemler/Okullar/Yaklaşımlar ve Tarihçiler* (ss.89-107), Pegem Akademi, Ankara.
- Çelik, M. ve Dağ, M. (2017). "Kapitalist İktisadi Düşüncenin Geçirdiği Dönüşümler Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme", *Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi Akademik İzdüşüm*, 2(3): 50-70.
- Dağıstan, U. (2017). "Sosyal Bilimlerde Nesnellik Olgusu", *Türk & İslam Dünyası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 14, Aralık: 450-460.
- Darnton, R. (1971). "In search of the Enlightenment: Recent attempts to create a social history of ideas", *Journal of Modern History*, 43(1): 113-132.
- Delanty, G. (2004). *Avrupa'nın İcadı: Fikir, Kimlik, Gerçeklik*, çev. Hüsamettin İnaç, Adres Yayınları, Ankara.
- Delice, D. (2011). "Annales Okulu ve Ricoeur'un "Anlatı" Bağlamında Annales Okulu Eleştirisi", *History Studies*, 3(2): 101-124.
- Demir, M. (2019). *Evrensel Tarih Kuramı*, Aryen Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Doğan, K. C. (2017). "Yönetişim Kavramı ve Türkiye'de Demokratikleşme Reformları: Kamu Denetçiliği Kurumu (Ombudsman) Örneği", *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 47, Haziran: 267-287.
- Doğan, K. C. (2019). "Modernizmden Postmodernizme: Kamu Yönetiminde Yönetişim Kuramı Bağlamında Ombudsman Paradigması", *International Social Sciences Studies Journal*, 5(29): 312-317.
- Dural, A. B. (2013). *Çağdaş Siyasal İdeolojiler'de Kuram-Yöntem-Güncel Yaklaşımlar*, Paradigma Akademi Yayınları, Edirne.
- Durgun, F. (2013). "Rönesans'tan 19. Yüzyıla Avrupa Tarihyazımında İlerleme Fikri, Dönemselleştirme ve Orta Çağ Avrupa Tarihi Algısı", *İnsan & Toplum*, 3(6): 283-304.
- Durutürk, B. (2018). "Küreselleşme ve Kimlik Politikaları: Liberal Demokrasinin Alternatifleri", *Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi-OPUS*, 9(16), Aralık: 1415-1439.
- Elliott, A. (2017). *Çağdaş Sosyal Teoriye Giriş*, çev. ed. İbrahim Yıldız ve Aylin Görgün Baran, Dipnot Yayınları, Ankara.
- Ergun, D. (2005). *Sosyoloji ve Tarih: Sosyolojide Yöntem Sorunu*, İmge Kitabevi, Ankara.
- Gammeltoft-Hansen, H. (1995). "Communicating with Complainants", (Eds. Hans Gammeltoft-Hansen and Flemming Axmark), *The Danish Ombudsman* (pp.105-115), DJOF Publishing, Copenhagen.
- Gellhorn, W. (1967). *Ombudsmen and Others: Citizens' Protectors in Nine Countries*, Harvard University Press, USA.
- Gottreher, M. and Hostina, M. (2000). "The Classical Ombudsman Model", (Eds. Roy Gregory and Philip Giddings), *Righting Wrongs: The Ombudsman in Six Continents* (pp.403-414), International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), IOS Press, Amsterdam.
- Göle, N. (2013). "Batı-dışı Modernliğin Kavramsallaştırılması Mümkün mü?", (Haz. Tanıl Bora, Semih Sökmen ve Kaya Şahin), *Sempozyum Bildirileri Sosyal Bilimleri Yeniden Düşünmek Yeni Bir Kavrayışa Doğru* (ss.310-320), Toplum ve Bilim ve Defter Dergileri Ortak Çalışma Grubu, Metis Yayınları, Ankara.
- Gregory, R. and Giddings, P. (2000). "The Ombudsman Institution: Growth and Development", (Eds. Roy Gregory and Philip Giddings), *Righting Wrongs: The Ombudsman in Six Continents* (pp.1-20), International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), IOS Press, Amsterdam.

- Gulbenkian Komisyonu (2009). Sosyal Bilimleri Açın, Sosyal Bilimlerin Yeniden Yapılandırılması Üzerine Rapor, çev. Şirin Tekeli, Metis Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Güçlüer, E. (2012). “Tarihin Sosyolojik Anlamı”, Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Güz, 14: 79-91.
- Gülenç, K. (2012). “Sosyal Bilimlerin Geleceği Üzerine Yeniden Düşünmek”, Felsefe Dünyası, 1(55): 146-165.
- Habermas, J. (2011). Sosyal Bilimlerin Mantığı Üzerine, çev. Mustafa Tüzel, Kabalcı Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Harsgor, M. (1978). “Total History: The Annales School”, Journal of Contemporary History, 13(1) (Jan.): 1-13.
- Hertogh, M. and Kirkham, R. (2018). “The Ombudsman and administrative justice: from promise to performance”, (Eds. M. Hertogh and R. Kirkham), Research Handbook on the Ombudsman (pp.1-15), Edward Elgar Publishing, UK.
- Hill, L. B. (1974). “Institutionalization, the Ombudsman, and Bureaucracy”, The American Political Science Review, 68(3) (Sep.): 1075-1085.
- Hill, L. B. (1976). The Model Ombudsman: Institutionalizing New Zealand’s Democratic Experiment, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- Hira, İ. (2000). “Sosyal Bilimler: Yasa Koyucu Tasarımdan Yorumcu Tasarıma”, Bilgi, 3(2): 81-96.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (2009). Tarih Üzerine, çev. Osman Akınhay, Agora Kitaplığı, İstanbul.
- Hossain, K. et al. (Eds.) (2000). Human Rights Commissions and Ombudsman Offices: National Experiences throughout the World, Kluwer Law International, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Great Britain.
- Iggers, G. G. (2011). Bilimsel Nesnellikten Postmodernizme Yirminci Yüzyılda Tarihyazımı, çev. Gül Çağalı Güven, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul.
- İnsel, A. (2005). Neo-Liberalizm: Hegemonyanın Yeni Dili, Birikim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kahana, J. S. (1994). “Reevaluating the Nursing Home Ombudsman's Role with a View toward Expanding the Concept of Dispute Resolution”, Journal of Dispute Resolution, 1994(2): 1-18.
- Kızılcılık, S. (2001). “Sosyal Bilimlerdeki Multidisiplinerite Yönelimleri Çerçevesinde Tarih İle Sosyolojinin Yakınlaşımı ve Baykan Sezer”, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Mayıs, 25(1): 1-14.
- Kızılcılık, S. (2004). Sosyal Bilimleri Yeniden Yapılandırmak, Anı Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Kirchheiner, H. H. (1983). “The Ideological Foundation of The Ombudsman Institution”, (Ed. Gerald E. Caiden), International Handbook of the Ombudsman: Evolution and Present Function (pp.23-25), Vol. I, Greenwood Press, London.
- Köroğlu, C. Z. ve Köroğlu, M. A. (2016). “Bilim Kavramının Gelişimi ve Günümüz Sosyal Bilimleri Üzerine”, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 25: 1-15.
- Kucsko-Stadlmayer, G. (2009). The Spread of the Ombudsman Idea in Europe, 12 June 2009, Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/Lenovo/Downloads/Stockholm%20Conference_25.%20Back%20to%20the%20Roots_Gabriele%20Kucsko%20Stadlmayer%20(2).pdf, Friday, (12.04.2020).
- Kuyucuoğlu, İ. (2015). “Sosyolojinin Kuruluşunu Etkileyen Düşünce Akımları ve Klasik Sosyolojide Yöntem Tartışmaları”, Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 8(36), Şubat: 674-687.
- Lennan, G. Mc (2007). “Braudel ve Annales Paradigması”, çev. Deniz Erksan, (Der. Ali Boratav), Tarih ve Tarihi: Annales Okulu İzinde (ss.187-217), Kırmızı Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Malhut, M. (2011). “Sistem ve Tarih”, History Studies, 3(1): 203-216.
- Mooers, C. (1997). Burjuva Avrupa’nın Kuruluşu. çev. Bahadır Sina Şener, Dost Kitabevi, Ankara.
- Nawaz, R. and Ali, A. A. (2016). “Annales in Mirror of Postmodernism: Archaeological Appraisal of World System Theory”, Journal of Historical Studies, II(II) (July-December): 13-35.

- Oppermann, S. (2006). Postmodern Tarih Kuramı: Tarihyazımı, Yeni Tarihselcilik ve Roman, Phoenix Yayınevi, Ankara.
- Özdemir, M. (2019). “Avrupa-Merkezcilik ve Tarihyazımı Sorununun Bilimsel ve Kültürel Bilgiye Etkisi”, Universal Journal of History and Culture, 1(1): 12-23.
- Özgören-Kınlı, İ. (2015). “Mektuplarla Yeni Tarih Yazımının Doğuşu: Annales Okulu’nun Kuruluş Sosyolojisi”, Kebikeç, 39: 503-538.
- Özlem, D. (2013). “Evrenselcilik Mitosu ve Sosyal Bilimler”, (Haz. Tanıl Bora, Semih Sökmen ve Kaya Şahin), Sempozyum Bildirileri Sosyal Bilimleri Yeniden Düşünmek Yeni Bir Kavrayışa Doğru (ss.53-66), Toplum ve Bilim ve Defter Dergileri Ortak Çalışma Grubu, Metis Yayınları, Ankara.
- Öztürk, A. (2020). “Siyasi Düşünceler Tarihi ve Tarih Yazımı Sorunu”, Düşünbil, 89: 6-13.
- Parlak, B. ve Doğan, K. C. (2015). Kamu Yönetiminde Denetim: Karşılaştırmalı Ülke İncelemeleri Bağlamında Türkiye’de Kamu Denetçiliği Kurumu’nun (Ombudsmanın) Uygulanabilirliği, Ekin Kitabevi, Bursa.
- Parlak, B. ve Doğan, K. C. (2016). Kamu Yönetimi: Kamu Yönetimi Disiplininin Gelişmesinde Rol Oynayan Kuramsal Yönler Üzerine Bir Giriş, Beta Basım Yayım, İstanbul.
- Parlak, B. ve Ökmen, M. (2015). Yerel Yönetimler, Ekin Kitabevi, Bursa.
- Pirenne, H. (2014). Ortaçağ Avrupası’nın Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi, çev. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Reif, Linda C. (2004). The Ombudsman, Good Governance and the International Human Rights Systems, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Netherlands.
- Ritzer, G. ve Stepnisky, J. (2014). Sosyoloji Kuramları, çev. Himmet Hülür, De Ki Basım Yayım, Ankara.
- Roberts, M. (1986). The Age of Liberty: Sweden 1719-1772, Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Rowat, D. C. (1973). The Ombudsman Plan: Essays on the Worldwide Spread of an Idea, The Carleton Library No. 67, Canadian Publishers, McClelland and Stewart Limited, Canada.
- Say, Ö. (2013). “Yapısalcılıktan Post-Yapısalcılığa Çoğulculuğun İnşası”, Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi, 8(2): 331-346.
- Schmidt, M. G. (2002). Demokrasi Kuramlarına Giriş, çev. M. Emin Köktaş, Vadi Yayınları, Ankara.
- Scott, J. W. (2017). Eleştirel Tarih Kuramı: Kimlikler, Deneyimler, Politikalar, çev. Zerrin Yaya, Dost Kitabevi, Ankara.
- Seneviratne, M. (2002). Ombudsmen: Public Services and Administrative Justice, Butterworths, Law in Context, UK.
- Stacey, F. (1978). Ombudsmen Compared, Clarendon Press, Oxford, Great Britain.
- Şahin, B. (2009). “Liberalizm ve Demokrasi”, Eski Yeni, Sonbahar, 15: 33-38.
- Şimşek, A. ve Pamuk, A. (2014). “Tarih Yazıcılığının Dünü, Bugünü ve Yarını Üzerine Kısa Bir Bakış”, (Ed. Mustafa Safran), Tarih Nasıl Öğretilir? (ss.21-26), Yeni İnsan Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Taştan, Y. K. (2016). “Tarih: Kadim Dönemden 20. Yüzyıla Bir Bilimin Kimlik Arayışı”, Cihannüma Tarih ve Coğrafya Araştırmaları Dergisi, II/2, Aralık: 95-121.
- Topses, M. D. (2010). Aydınlanma Sosyolojisi, Anı Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Trevor-Roper, H. R. (1972). “Fernand Braudel, the Annales, and the Mediterranean”, The Journal of Modern History, 44(4) (Dec.): 468-479.
- Tunç, H. (2008). “Demokrasi Türleri ve Müzakereci Demokrasi Kavramı”, Gazi Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi, 12(1-2): 1113-1132.

Van den Braembussche, A. (1979). "The Annales Paradigm: A Case Study in The Growth of Historical Knowledge", (Eds. W. Callebaut, M. De Mey, R. Pinxten and F. Vandamme), Theory of Knowledge & Science Policy (pp.296-305), Communication & Cognition, Belgium.

Wallerstein, I. (2013). Sosyal Bilimleri Düşünmemek: 19. Yüzyıl Paradigmalarının Sınırları, çev. Taylan Doğan, bgst Yayınları, İstanbul.

Yapıcı, M. İ. (2015). "Annales Okulu'nun Siyasi Tarih Disiplinine Etkileri: Türkiye Örneği", Alternatif Politika, 7(1), Nisan: 87-117.

Yeğen, C. (2016). "Annales Okulu, Marc Bloch ve "Tarih savunusu: Veya Tarihçilik Mesleği" yapıtı üzerinden Bloch'un tarih anlayışı", Abant Kültürel Araştırmalar Dergisi (AKAR), 1(1): 23-37.

Yılmaz, K. (2009). "Movements in Historiography: The French Annales, Psychohistory, and Historical Materialism", Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Aralık, 35(2): 223-230.

<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Charles-XII>, (10.05.2020).

<https://www.informationsverige.se/en/>, (12.05.2020).

