Modernising Turkey with Statistics: Implementing ISI Expertise in the Turkish Statistical Reform at the End of the 1920s

Aykiz Dogan
UMR Développement et Sociétés, IEDES, Université Paris-1 Panthéon-Sorbonne

European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire
Volume 30, 2023 - Issue 1: Special Issue: Exploring the International Statistical Institute, 1885-1938/ Explorer l'Institut International de Statistique 1885 - 1938

Pages 73-100 | Received 31 May 2022, Accepted 03 Jan 2023, Published online: 30 Mar 2023

Download citation

Abstract:
This study explores the relations between the International Statistical Institute (ISI) and Turkey during the early republican period. It investigates the ISI's influence in Turkish statistical reform from the mid- to late-1920s through a Belgian expert who led this reform and conducted the Turkish Republic's first population census. The study proposes to consider the ISI as an international authority and expert space for the negotiation of conventions of quantification, which contributed to the formation of an international statistical system. Focusing on the case of Turkey in the process of modernisation and nation-building during the 1920s, it analyses how this international framework structured national quantification policies outside the Western world, and what this meant for state organisation and social order.

Keywords: International Statistical Institute; statistical expertise; Turkey; census-taking; Belgian statisticians; international norms;

Résumé : Cette étude explore les relations entre l'Institut international de statistique (IIS) et la Turquie au début de la période républicaine. Elle examine l'influence de l'IIS dans la réforme statistique turque du milieu à la fin des années 1920 par le biais d'un expert belge qui a mené cette réforme et conduit le premier recensement de la population de la République turque. Cette étude propose de considérer l'IIS comme une autorité internationale et un espace d'expertise pour la négociation des conventions de quantification, qui a contribué à la formation d'un système statistique international. En se concentrant sur le cas de la Turquie dans le processus de modernisation et de construction nationale pendant les années 1920, elle analyse comment ce cadre international a structuré les politiques nationales de quantification en dehors du monde occidental, et ce que cela a signifié pour l'organisation de l'État et l'ordre social.

Acknowledgements: The author wishes to thank Martin Bemmann, Jürgen Nautz, the editor, Lia Brazil, and the two anonymous reviewers for their invaluable contributions to this article. She also thanks the archivists of the Belgian statistical office (STATBEL) for kindly sharing documents regarding the Belgian census of 1920.

Author biography: Aykiz Dogan holds a PhD in sociology from the University of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne. She is an associate researcher at the UMR Développement et Sociétés and is currently teaching at the Sorbonne Institute of Development Studies (IEDES) graduate programme.

 https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2023.2165437

Introduction

Soon after affirming political independence at the Lausanne conference and proclaiming the Republic of Turkey in 1923, the government resumed the earlier (Ottoman) efforts to reform state statistics. These reforms were part of a larger programme of state transformation, often studied in the literature as 'modernization'. In their efforts to construct a nation-state according to international norms and standards, Turkey's political leaders sought expertise and, in the case of quantification policies, found it partly in the International Statistical Institute (ISI). In 1926, the Turkish government hired the director of the Belgian statistical administration and ISI member, Camille Jacquart, to head the establishment of a central statistical office and the reorganization of administrative statistics. This study seeks to understand how the ISI's expertise was translated in Turkey's statistical reform and what type of relations the Turkish state established with the ISI.

Previous research provides valuable information on the 'statistical internationalism' which developed through the initiatives of pioneers such as the Belgian statistician Quetelet into the Congrès internationaux de statistique, international scientific networks and structures which shaped the ISI as a Western-international club of statistical experts, an ideologue and a producer of norms in statistics since its creation in 1885.[1] A still open question, however, is to what extent and how this international framework structured national quantification policies outside the Western world, and what implications this had for state organization and social order. This study seeks to answer this question focusing on the Turkish Republic, which employed in the mid-to late-1920s Belgian expertise which, since the time of Quetelet, has influenced the work of statisticians in the Western world and the ISI. It argues that the ISI should be considered as an international authority and expert space for the negotiation of quantification policies and standards, which contributed to what Desrosières calls 'the cognitive and political construction of a "conventional space of equivalence"' at an international level, hence to the emergence of an international statistical system.[2]

In its efforts to modernize state statistics and integrate into the emerging international statistical system, Turkey was not an isolated case. Bemmann points out that it was, to the contrary, typical in the post-First World War period for 'young' governments in Central and Eastern Europe, South America or Asia. According to Bemmann, many governments at this time adopted the mantra repeated by Western observers that a country's 'modernity' could be recognized, among other indicators, by the state of its official statistics. For various states aspiring to this modernity, becoming visible in international statistics and thus being able to show their importance with respect to other states was a major incentive to invest in and reorganize national statistical institutions. In the 1920s, this statistical visibility and the capacity to compete with other countries in numerical terms became a major objective for governments, requiring substantial investments in financial resources and personnel, but also the acceptance and application of 'conceptual and methodological norms of "Western" origin'.[3] There is little research on the Turkish statistical reform in the early republican era and even less that addresses its international dimension.[4] As part of a larger research project, this article provides a socio-historical perspective on the relationship between the ISI and the Turkish state building in the interwar period which has not yet been studied in the literature.[5] It analyses publications of the ISI and Turkish statistical office, Turkish archival documents (Presidency Republican Archives), legal documents, press articles and other historical sources. First, Turkey's relationship to the ISI is outlined from the fall of the Ottoman Empire to the establishment of the Turkish Republic's central statistical office by Camille Jacquart, a Belgian statistician and ISI member in 1926. The second section focuses on how Jacquart applied ISI recommendations in conducting the Turkish Republic's first general population census in 1927 and how census results were presented at the

pp.73-100 https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2023.2165437

international congress in Cairo at the end of the year and in the official census booklet. This focus enables a discussion on the implementation of ISI expertise in the production of demographic statistics in Turkey based on concrete examples.

Entrusting Turkey's Statistical Reform to an ISI Member

Statistics as a 'state science' was embedded in the Turkish state-making and modernization project from the beginning.[6] The statistical reform dated back to the nineteenth century, when the Ottoman state engaged in modernizing its statistical machinery according to international expertise and changing social, political and economic conditions.[7] Russian, French and US experts were hired to reform state statistics. These reforms were part of major transformations in line with global tendencies, such as the creation of autonomous statistical administrations, development of census-taking, adaptation of international conventions and norms.[8] The Ottoman state hence took part in the emerging 'technical internationalism' during the second half of the century and participated in international organizations (IOs), conferences and conventions in the field of quantification.[9] It was, for instance, among the 17 signatories of the Metre Convention in 1875,[10] a founding member of the International Institute of Agriculture (IIA) and affiliated to the ISI at least since 1911.[11]

Bemmann emphasizes that it was common for governments during the early twentieth century to invite foreign experts to train and advise their officials or to send their public experts to study at Western universities. But it was rare to entrust the reform of a national institution to a foreign statistician as in Chilli or Ecuador.[12] In Turkey too, a foreigner was employed to construct the statistical office. Already in 1917, the German statistician Eugen Würzburger had been invited by the late Ottoman government to establish a central statistical office.[13] These centralization efforts were interrupted at the end of the First World War. After an independence struggle against Allied occupation and the Sevres Treaty, Turkish nationalists succeeded in affirming a sovereign nation state. The government of Mustafa Kemal followed a strategy of 'symmetrical internationalisation' to integrate Turkey into the international community as an equal and sovereign member by modernizing the state according to European standards and norms.[14] Inviting a statistician from the international expert community of the ISI for an extensive statistical reform was part of this strategy. By this step, the Turkish government aimed at integrating its own officials in international expert networks and at legitimizing its statistics – and its state – in the international sphere.

The publication of the Turkish statistical office's second director, Celal, emphasized Jacquart's position as evidence of the reorganization of Turkish statistics according to scientific methods and international expertise in an international scientific journal in 1933. He noted that the Central Office created in 1926 was 'placed under the direction of Mr. Camille Jacquart, an eminent Belgian statistician, member of the International Statistical Institute and Director General at the Belgian Ministry of the Interior'.[15] His affiliation to the ISI was also highlighted in official documents regarding the decision to invite him as a statistical expert.[16]

A doctor in law, Jacquart (1867–1931) had specialized in statistics in Belgium's statistical administration since 1898. Partly due to his linguistic competencies especially in French, German, Dutch and English, he carried out international missions as well as administrative roles in international delegations for the reconstruction of state borders after the world war.[17] He was well connected to international statistical expert networks. Besides the ISI, he was a member of the steering committee of the International Bureau of Commercial Statistics at Brussels, which he represented at the League's International Statistical Commission in 1920.[18] As a social scientist, Jacquart taught in institutions of higher education, including the Catholic University

of Louvain (where he had studied). He contributed to the scientific literature with his numerous publications and played a founding role in Belgium's first sociological association.[19]

When, upon the ISI's advice, the Turkish government contacted the Belgian government to ask for an officer capable of leading the reorganization of administrative statistics, the latter designated the director-general of statistical administration at the Interior Ministry.[20] Merkezi İstatistik Dairesi (Central Statistical Office) was established in 1926 among the first technical institutions of the Republic.[21] Jacquart was appointed as its first director while still being a Belgian civil servant.[22] He chose his two assistants himself by directly asking Prime Minister Ismet Pasha. As the director of Belgium's statistical administration, Jacquart had met Mehmed Celal (Djélal) and Selim Sabit when they were sent by the Turkish Ministry of Commerce to study at the University of Brussels.[23] They were appointed as deputy director and secretary-interpreter of the office respectively.

A proponent of statistical centralization, Jacquart used the opportunity to experiment with this model in Turkey.[24] The Office's responsibilities included harmonization of all statistical activities and methods, gradually centralizing all statistical work. Priority was given to demographic statistics through the reorganization of population registers and a general census.[25] In a report addressed to the Interior Ministry in November 1926, Jacquart proposed uniform rules for civil registers.[26] During this same period, this Ministry sent the director-general of the population administration, Abdülmuttalip, 'to Europe to make enquiries regarding the administrative organisation of statistics'.[27] His report on 'the population registers in civilised countries and in Turkey', was based on the debates within the ISI.[28] Abdülmuttalip briefly summarized a study, which was published in the ISI's *Bulletin* of 1906. The Belgian statistician Edmond Nicolaï, who was probably a superior of Jacquart, had proposed making civil registers compulsory at the 1895 session and, upon the ISI's request, had conducted a study on these systems which he presented at the 1905 London congress.[29] Based on this report, Abdülmuttalip noted that these registers were compulsory only in 'Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands'.[30] He summarized some of Nicolaï's arguments regarding the usefulness of these registers for migration statistics, voters' registers, police administration, military service, monitoring of compulsory education, the compilation of birth, death and marriage certificates, and so on. Abdülmuttalip's report cited the ISI resolution which recommended the generalization of population registers in each country, but did not mention that it was a compromise against the French opposition to making them compulsory.[31]

The employment of a Belgian ISI member (instead of a French or another member) hence produced particular effects in the organization of civil registers in Turkey and the integration of Turkish statistics in international publications. These registers were important sources for comparative studies, such as the ISI project of annual compilations which had been elaborated since 1895 and led to a collaboration with the League of Nations for Statistical Yearbooks.[32] It might be argued that Turkey's integration into the international statistical system and even the statistical cooperation with the League (as demonstrated by Dogan[33]) owed largely to the incorporation of ISI expertise in Turkish quantification policies.

Jacquart's transnational mission gave him a career ladder. He resigned from the Turkish Office in 1929 to hold the post of general secretary of the Belgian Interior Ministry. The Turkish government sought to find a replacement by asking for help again from the ISI's international officers. The Turkish ambassador at the Hague requested advice from the 'Secretary General Director of the Permanent Office' of the ISI, the Dutch statistician officer Willem Methorst, who accepted to 'propose a candidate'.[34] The Turkish government was looking for an expert 'of a neutral nationality' and especially 'someone from the northern countries, namely: Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway and Sweden'. Although there are no archived documents to confirm it, the Turkish Government probably set the same criteria when looking for an expert

in 1925 and favoured Belgium because of its political position more than its technical advances or statistical methods.

Methorst stated in January 1930 that his 'efforts to find a national from one of the first four countries had failed' and proposed 'the former director of the Central Bureau of Statistics of Sweden, Mr. Rickard Sandler'. Sandler was not a statistician and not an ISI member. He was a socialist politician who had temporarily served as prime minister before taking office as Sweden's statistical office's director.[35] Methorst also proposed a 'German candidate', unless it would pose any 'inconvenience' from the point of view of the required neutrality. The Turkish government preferred to continue with Jacquart and negotiated with the Belgian government, who agreed in early 1930 to lend Jacquart twice a year.[36] However, the latter came to Ankara only once in October 1930 for the preparations of the second general census, before dying a few months after his return to Belgium.[37]

Mehmet Celal (Aybar) replaced Jacquart as director and headed the office until his death in 1947.[38] He represented the Turkish Republic in international statistical conferences and became its first ISI member in 1933.[39] He presented the second census of Turkey that he conducted in 1935 at the ISI Congress in Athens.[40] His report to the prime minister mentioned the particular interest of his audience in Turkish census methods and machines.[41] The proceedings noted, in fact, his suggestions regarding how census forms could be better organized in order to reduce the costs of perforation by machines. He also presented a comparison between census-taking in Turkey and in Europe and participated in the negotiations of ISI recommendations on 'statistical methods for the countries of the Far East'.[42] Although he was not a particularly active member, he nevertheless asserted a Turkish presence in this international space and a non-European point of view in the negotiation of international knowledge and standards. The ISI meetings were an opportunity for him to meet international demographers, approaches and techniques, and to learn more about the organizing country.[43] Aybar also presented a paper on the 'Population of Turkey' at the 24th ISI Congress (Prague, 1938), and participated in the commission on the 'Organisation of Statistical Services' of which he had been a member since 1933.[44] This last session before the war was interrupted by international political conflicts and the congresses were not resumed until September 1947.[45]

When Mehmet Celal became the Office director, Selim Sabit Aykut (1892–1958) was appointed deputy director. The latter's report to the prime minister regarding the 18th ISI Congress (Warsaw, 1929) states how the ISI's international events were perceived by Turkish state actors. He presented it as an opportunity to

> benefit from the scientific and professional discussions and debates of the Institute by participating in them; to learn about the latest developments and policies in statistics by exchanging with the Institute members, professors and statistical officers; and to make [Turkish] statistical organisation and above all, [Turkish] national revolution and existence known to the world of international statistics.[46]

The Turkish Republic's First General Census According to ISI Recommendations

Jacquart's mission in Turkey included conducting an exhaustive general census to count the population after decades of war, the resettling of the frontiers and the population exchange with Greece (1923). Jacquart carried out the Republic's first population census on 28 October 1927, followed by an agricultural and an industrial census in November and December. We analyse its preparation and implementation as presented by the two directors of the Office, Camille Jacquart and Celal (Aybar), as a concrete example of the application of ISI norms in a national context peripheral to Europe.

Following the negotiations at the first ISI congresses, a resolution voted in 1891 had decided to 'demand from all the countries of Europe a succinct report of the results of the last census'. These reports were to be 'translated into French' and published in the ISI *Bulletin*.47 Within this framework, Jacquart presented a report on 'The Census in Turkey' at the 17th session of the ISI. Held between 29 December 1927 and 5 January 1928 in Cairo, it was the first ISI congress to meet outside Europe. It was also the first to receive a delegation from the Republic of Turkey. The list of delegates in the official congress document included a particular distinction for the Turkish delegation headed by the Turkish ambassador to Egypt.48 The diplomatic representatives were separated from the two directors of the Statistical Office, by tagging the latter as 'technical advisors'.49 No other delegation included such separation, despite the diversity of the participants' titles. Perhaps it was due to Jacquart's dual status that the Turkish authorities sought to frame and limit his role in the delegation. Jacquart was one of the three full members from Belgium, while the three Turkish delegates were listed separately as non-member guests since Turkey had no membership in the ISI yet.50 It was Jacquart who presented the Turkish census by emphasizing his leading role, thus speaking on behalf of the Turkish state.51 Furthermore, contrary to the Turkish delegates, Jacquart actively participated in debates, such as the one regarding the proposal of the Hungarian Statistical Institute's director, A. Kovacs, for basing 'nationality statistics' on spoken languages. In response to the objection of the Italian statistician, C. Gini, that the ISI should 'refrain from issuing wishes' on this type of 'very delicate matter, of an eminently political character', Jacquart supported the proposal to appoint a commission, but called for 'discarding the words nationalities and minorities and for the study of scientific methods aimed at establishing statistics on "ethnic groups"'.52 While Dündar claims that Jacquart's position aligned with the views and interests of the Turkish state and it was a major reason for his employment by the Kemalist government, there is not sufficient empirical data to support this argument.53

The statistical standards and instruments negotiated at the ISI sessions and the very process of negotiations and decision-making were highly political. The Turkish government tried to use Jacquart's international capital as an active and respected ISI member to affirm the modernity of Turkish bureaucracy and statistics, while limiting his status to apolitical technical expertise. Jacquart's presentation of the Turkish census at an ISI Congress was itself a manifestation of the government's recognition of the ISI's authority and it confirmed the integration of the new Turkey into the ISI's statistical system. Jacquart's report on 'The General Population Census in Turkey' was published in the ISI *Bulletin*.54

The official census booklet published in 1929 by the Central Statistical Office as the *Recensement général de la population* was prepared by the 'Acting Director-General' Celal after Jacquart's departure and was largely based on this report. This booklet remains the only publication of this office to contain a French translation of the Turkish part.55 This French part enabled Jacquart's control over the census presentation, even though it is not clear whether he checked it before publication as it contained spelling errors. It contributed to consolidating the cooperation with the ISI, which has been interested in national statistics since its creation.56

In general, international activities of the ISI for the coordination and standardization of national statistics were based on a series of resolutions voted at its international congresses (sessions). Within the framework of its project for a 'secular census of the world', or rather of 'civilised humanity', the ISI sought to promote national censuses.57 The census norms negotiated in ISI sessions were disseminated through various instruments and tools (instructions, guidelines, questionnaires, nomenclatures, and so on) to ensure the comparability of results.58 The two brochures, *Texte de vœux* published in 1903 (edited by Bertillon59) and 1912 (by Methorst60), gathering ISI resolutions and recommendations were part of this strategy. As Bertillon put it, these resolutions 'constitute the code of statisticians' which 'is by no means imperative, but it

contains authoritative advice which is always best to follow when there is no major reason to deviate from it'.[61]

Jacquart applied this principle in conducting the Turkish Republic's first census. He was experienced in the application of the ISI's conventions at the Belgian statistical administration during the 1900, 1910 and 1920 censuses. There is reason to assume that the latest Belgian census book (completed and published in 1926) provided a concrete example largely based on ISI recommendations for the Turkish census. Even the 'Table of Contents' of the Turkish booklet was modelled on the Belgian book. They both contained two chapters, 'Census Principles and Methods' and 'Analyses of the Results', and an annexe of legal documents (laws, decrees, instructions, bulletins and others). However, the Belgian book was much more voluminous and included two additional volumes with detailed tables, which often had no equivalent in the quite brief Turkish booklet.

The homologies among the Turkish booklet, Jacquart's report and the Belgian book support the hypothesis of an international model shaped by the ISI norms. We argue that a standardized way of presenting the census process and results circulated through models (published examples) and multi-positioned international experts like Jacquart. Not only did they share visible formal and structural similarities, but they also presented the census as a scientific study conducted by the state's specialized officials and applied common principles recommended by the ISI.

Census Preparations: Adapting ISI's Recommendations and International Expertise to National Particularities

The Belgian expert was not the only authority in the implementation of the census and was assisted by various state actors in the preparations.[62] However, he was the key actor in the application of international expertise and norms. He narrated his field investigations in his report to the ISI as an expert sent to a foreign mission that he considered from a quasi-anthropological perspective.[63] By doing so, Jacquart gave the message to his fellow ISI statisticians that Turkey was somehow a particular field that he scientifically studied to apply the best adapted methods and policies. He emphasized that learning about the geographical and social morphology, climatic and social rhythms helped him to plan the census. He explained, for instance, why contrary to the general tendency he did not fix the date to 31 December, but the end of October.[64]

The Belgian expert considered Turkey's particularities as divergences from Western norms in social and political organization and infrastructure and framed them in terms of 'special difficulties'. Some of these difficulties were in fact already reported by Ottoman officials during previous censuses and are highlighted by historians among the factors of undercount. These included communication challenges due to the linguistic diversity, or complications in the census of nomadic tribes and isolated settlements or individuals in rural areas.[65] The Belgian expert identified further problems, such as 'the large number of illiterates' (which raised the problem of finding census takers[66]); 'the inaccuracy of the information concerning the number of inhabitants and the number and names of localities'; the poor transport and communication infrastructure; distance between settlements; or even the 'size of the country' ('equivalent to the area of France, Belgium, Holland and a third of Germany combined') which was out of the ordinary compared to European nation-states.[67]

Indeed, the census policy normalized by the ISI's international authority posed structural questions in its translation into the Turkish context because it was based on the state organization in Western Europe: the education of the multitudes into a linguistic and national unity; their sedentarization on a delimited territory; the administration system dividing it into manageable and well-connected units through solid infrastructures and networks of

communications and transport; and so on. The policies promoted by the ISI and international experts such as Jacquart were in fact embedded in a whole set of governmental technologies which sought 'legibility'.[68] They fostered a normative definition of statehood requiring a precisely delimited, segmented yet connected territory, a thoroughly monitored and disciplined population and state bureaucracy.

Within this framework, Jacquart insisted on 'the need to have a list of towns and villages'. He proceeded to an account of administrative districts and a comprehensive classification by dividing localities into smaller units. He considered and justified this policy as an essential step for the quantification of buildings and inhabitants.[69] Detailed instructions distributed to local public authorities explained how 'to divide the localities into a certain number of districts whose inhabitants can be counted in a round of a few hours' and to group buildings into blocks.[70] As a form of spatial engineering, this regulation aimed at reorganizing administrative divisions and involved additional measures such as house numbering and street naming. These policies provide a concrete example of the application of governmental techniques that were developed in Western states and colonial administrations for surveillance and control of the territory.[71]

After his field studies, Jacquart proceeded to trial censuses in locations which he considered 'to be representative of the various social conditions of the country' and 'to experiment with the census methods which seemed most suitable after studying the country's conditions'.[72] The eight trials conducted from December 1926 to April 1927 provided an opportunity for the Belgian expert to assert his authority over local officials. He observed the reaction of the local people and native elite who could question his decisions.

Toprak's study shows that Jacquart was prompted to respond to public criticisms that appeared in the pro-government cultural weekly, *Hayat Mecmuası*. In an article published six days after the Ankara census, a Turkish intellectual questioned Jacquart's methods, criticizing the limited scope of the questionnaire. This journalist argued that there were still many economic and social questions to be answered, but that it would be complicated to conduct another census, as it was both costly and burdensome for the people.[73] In his reply published a few weeks later, the Belgian expert argued that asking more questions than those recommended by the ISI would have certain drawbacks. It was the first time that a census was conducted according to scientific methods in Turkey and its main purpose was to know the quantity of the population. It was essential to carry out the census in one day in order to limit the variations. Questions that could lengthen the process and thus distort the results were to be avoided, given the limited number of enumerators and their varying skills. The questions should be limited to those that were understandable and applicable even by the least competent agents. Special censuses to describe the country's social and economic situation were another matter and required experienced, competent and paid agents. Jacquart furthermore claimed that during his trips various people warned him to avoid financial issues which could give the false impression that the census might serve to impose new taxes, and lead many to shun the census or lie about their age or occupation. It was necessary to maintain the support and voluntary participation of the people and to avoid backlash and animosity.[74]

This controversy highlights three points. First, Jacquart's decisions were manifestly based on the ISI's recommendations, which served to legitimize his choices. He also took into account Turkey's social conditions and the advice of local actors, at least in his legitimation strategies. The public policy he negotiated in this way thus hybridized international expertise and local emic knowledge. Second, this controversy indicates that the international expert's activities were not exempt from criticism and that his authority could be challenged and questioned. He had to legitimize his decisions not only in front of the Council of Ministers (according to the law[75]), but also in the public arena. Thirdly, this controversy underlines that census-taking was prone to social resistance.

In fact, this was a common problem discussed within the ISI. For example, in a debate on 'Industrial Censuses and Unemployment Statistics' at the 1905 London session, the Belgian demographer Nicolaï stated that the most important concern in census-taking was 'to disturb as little as possible the inhabitant, who is generally reluctant to give information'.[76] The French and Belgian approaches differed on this issue, with the former favouring a general census also counting the industry, and the latter separating the population census from the industrial one.[77] In the absence of an ISI standard, Jacquart clearly favoured the Belgian approach. For in Turkey, too, he conducted the industrial and agricultural censuses separately a few weeks later.

Against possible resistance, Jacquart prescribed propaganda measures implemented through public discourses especially by himself and the prime minister, Ismet Pasha, as well as the press and other print media.[78] Ismet Pasha's propaganda sought cooperation from citizens, highlighting that the aim of the census was not fiscal or military but registering all members of the nation including women and children for administrative purposes. His call was read out loud in all the towns and produced, according to Jacquart, 'very satisfactory results', which he explained partly by the popularity of this political leader.[79] Jacquart's propaganda, on the other hand, sought to highlight the scientific and statistical value of this first general census and the exactness of results. In this regard, Jacquart's presentation to the ISI was part of this propaganda activity, which sought to legitimize the Turkish census not only to a national, but also to an international public.

The influence of ISI standards and recommendations regarding the census instruments is obvious. The census form ('*le bulletin*') was constructed 'as far as possible, according to the bases adopted by the International Statistical Institute'.[80] As Jacquart underlined at the ISI congress, it consisted of questions 'recommended as a minimum by the International Statistical Institute'.[81] Designed as a bilingual (Turkish–French) questionnaire, the census form consisting of 16 questions (see Appendix 1) brought only slight changes to the ISI model.[82] It was a more faithful translation than the Belgian questionnaire, which was limited to 11 questions.[83] The Turkish questionnaire included two additional questions (14 and 15) to collect data for the ongoing project of the reorganization of civil registers and identity cards. Some questions were simplified.[84] The ISI question on the degree of kinship or status in the household was excluded.

When introducing the choice of census form, Jacquart reported an impasse regarding the (non)translation of the term 'household'. The collective census form 'was preferred to the household form and the individual form' for two reasons. The first was '(1) to make it easier for agents who might not understand exactly what a household is, which has no equivalent in the Turkish language'.[85] This observation confirms the findings of Randall et al. that the use and interpretation of categories in different group cultures (demographers, enumerators, the population and others) produce direct implications for the design, conduct and analysis of the survey and the social production of data.[86]

The second reason was related to the practical use of the census form '(2) to facilitate the transport and assembly of the forms'.[87] This procedure differed from the one applied in Belgium, where enumerators distributed the forms, which were filled in by respondents themselves.[88] This method, which speeded up the process and reduced the number of enumerators, could not be applied in Turkey given the low rate of literacy. It was only applied as part of 'Special measures for boarding schools, barracks, civil and military hospitals, prisons, etc.' The census of these 'collective households' was entrusted to the authorities on which they depended.[89]

Another important distinction was that Belgian censuses were conducted 'exclusively on the *de jure population*', diverging from the ISI recommendation 'for economic reasons and given the few guarantees of accuracy offered by the census of the *de facto* population'.[90] In fact, while the pioneering Belgian statistician Quetelet organized the first census in 1846 according to the

de facto method (though combined with *de jure* principles), which inspired the ISI's decision in favour of this method, his attempt to identify the *de jure* population became more explicit in the subsequent census (1856), hence initiating the Belgian shift towards this method.91 This *de jure* method was 'based on usual residence' as defined by an existing civil registry system, which was under reconstruction in Turkey.92 Although, as in other large countries with regional governments such as Canada,93 the censuses of the previous Ottoman state had experimented with the *de jure* method, occasionally mixing it with *de facto* elements,94 Republican Turkey's first census sought to count the 'de facto population' as recommended by the ISI.95 As Jacquart explained,

> All persons found on the day of the census […] on the territory of the Turkish Republic, either in houses or shelters of any kind, numbered or not, or in the open air, on the roads, railways, boats, were to be entered on the census form.96

Overall, this method defined the multitude on the territory during the census, regardless of residence, nationality or other legal status, as the 'population'. In fact, both methods conceived of population as a political category distinct from that of the people or the nation.97

The *de facto* method was applied in Turkey by confining the population from 8 am to 5 pm as explained by Jacquart: 'In order to ensure order and speed of the operation, the inhabitants had to remain in their homes until the end of the census.' Jacquart reported that 'regulations were generally respected with a discipline that does credit to the Turkish people'.98 According to the Belgian weekly *Pourquoi Pas*, it was he who proposed this 'exceptional measure'.99 These measures, which were rather unusual according to international and national press articles, accompanied Turkey's subsequent censuses as well.

The solution adopted to overcome the problem of 'finding people in all localities capable of performing the duties of enumerator' was the use of forced labour.100 All literates were obliged by law to work as census takers.101 This obligation, which concerned mainly civil/public servants and students, helped to manage limited budget and labour resources in the context of financial distress, a problem which curiously was not mentioned by Jacquart. The government's difficulty in financing the census was, however, evident in its inability to pay the enumerators, who were asked to complete their mission without receiving any payment, but only a travel allowance.

Even with these measures, the shortage of staff was addressed as a potential problem. For these types of 'exceptional cases', the instructions authorized the appointment of the same enumerator for several villages, extending the census interval. The enumerator would start his work 10 or 15 days before the census and prepare 'a provisional statement of the inhabitants', which the local authorities would rectify by noting demographic changes such as births, deaths, arrivals and departures.102 In other words, the census was not actually carried out everywhere in one day, but was hybridized with a register system in some cases.

The number of enumerators reported by Jacquart as 'approximately 62,500' (about one agent per 218 inhabitants103) gives an idea of the scale of the resources mobilized. Note that in the Belgian census of 1920, this number 'was 7,575, i.e. an average of one registrar per 978 inhabitants'.104 This discrepancy was due to the 'special difficulties' in Turkey, such as the size of the territory, low density and transport conditions, but it was also due to the method used (which required the enumerators to fill in the census forms).

Jacquart explained to the ISI public that both the enumerators and 'controllers', who were again employed as compulsory and unpaid labour to 'assist and supervise' the enumerators,105 were trained by 'conferences' and received detailed instructions.106 Indeed, various measures were taken to control the application of the official plan by establishing a hierarchical control mechanism and assigning the police and gendarmerie a disciplinary role. As in Belgium, the first totals were calculated by the enumerators, controllers and local authorities.107 Jacquart

announced the preliminary results at the ISI Congress.[108] The final numbers were calculated by the Office using machines, as in Belgium.[109]

Presenting Turkish Census Results According to ISI Guidelines

The ISI called for processing a minimum amount of data in a uniform manner in all countries.[110] National statistical offices were expected to prepare their tables according to the 'international framework' and instructions diffused by the ISI and send them to the ISI secretariat. These guidelines were influential in the presentation of Turkish census results. Both the analysis of the results and bilingual tables presented in French and Turkish in the census booklet respected the 'international framework'. The analysis did not question the alleged neutrality and universality of this framework, but the results themselves signalled its arbitrary character.

According to the final results, there were '13,648,270 inhabitants within the borders of the Turkish Republic': 6,563,879 men and 7,084,391 women. While the international system was statocentric and contributed to the imagination of states as spatially closed entities of delimited population, it prioritized the political construct 'Europe' as an indivisible entity. The Turkish tables on territorial distribution therefore distinguished between 'Asian Turkey' and 'European Turkey', representing 92.37% and 7.63% of the total population and 96.85% (738,761 km2) and 3.15% (23,975 km^2) of the total surface area.[111] These categories were also used in regional tables applying ISI guidelines regarding the 'population density'.[112] This categorization was in fact an international standard given the ISI's particular attention to calculating Europe's area. The resolution of the Berlin session (1903) recommended calculating it 'according to physical geography, i.e. according to the natural limits of Europe' or 'according to political geography, i.e. including all the territories situated in physical Europe or outside physical Europe and administered as European provinces'.[113] Turkey was excluded from this European geopolitical identity. The League statistical yearbooks prepared in cooperation with the ISI secretariat (first published in 1927) classified Turkey under the regional category 'Asia', but sometimes also under 'Europe', in this case by dividing it into 'Turkey of Asia' and 'Turkey of Europe'.[114] This classification was an important issue for Turkey's leaders who sought to integrate it into political Europe.[115]

Even outside Europe, statistics according to international standards required any state to go through a system of equivalence with the administrative system of West European states. For example, data for national administrative divisions were presented with their translations into European-international categories in brackets: '63 Vilayets (Provinces), 328 Cazas (Districts), 699 Nahiyés (as composed of several villages)' as well as '39,901 villages'.[116]

The Turkish booklet did not always follow the same order as the ISI 'international framework' and there were omissions. In particular, ISI recommendations regarding house and household statistics were not applied and Tables 6 and 7 were literally missing in the booklet.[117] Even though there was a brief inventory, it did not include the questions recommended by the ISI, but presented the results of the numbering operation in three tables.[118] The first showed the number of 'inhabitants per 100 houses per vilayet' which was, according to the French geographer Demangeon, a particularity of Belgian statistics.[119] The second table presented 'building statistics' according to three categories adapted from the five categories used in Belgium.[120] The last table was the only one to follow the ISI guidelines for 'distinguishing special establishments according to subdivisions'.[121] However, it used four categories instead of the eight recommended, and left a majority unclassified as 'other buildings'.[122] Note that international categories did not allow classifying certain establishments in Turkey, such as craft workshops, which were numerous according to the industrial census.[123]

According to the ISI's international norms, the state was to label, number, count and categorize any construction within its territory, as well as to measure the level of urbanization. However,

the classes created in Turkey for 'urban localities' did not follow ISI guidelines, probably due to the low rate of urbanization. ISI's classification was based on the social morphology of industrialized and urbanized societies. It recommended regrouping the population by the number of floors of inhabited houses and by age (neither were applied in Turkey) according to three groups: 'a. Countryside (centres up to 2,000 inhabitants); b. Cities (from 2,001 to 100,000 inhabitants); c. Large cities (above 100,000 inhabitants)'.[124] Turkish results presented cities in four categories from '10,000 inhabitants' to '40,000 and more' (the last category[125]), which together represented only 16.29% of the total population. In fact, 75.80% lived in 'villages' characterized by 'less than 5,000 inhabitants'.

Furthermore, while ISI recommendations which attributed special attention to sex-disaggregated statistics were followed in Turkey, those regarding breakdowns by age groups could not be followed.[126] For example, ISI instructions were applied to present the distribution of civil status by gender and by *vilayet*, but not by age groups.[127] Indeed, the official booklet noted a problem with age statistics: 'This distribution did not give true and statistically satisfactory results.'[128] In particular, 'the age distribution figures for children were found to be often lower than the normal rates', apparently due to parents' false statements.[129] The classification was thus made according to only three groups: 1) 'children and young people' (48.06%); 2) 'the adult population, (20–60 years)' (46.52%); and 3) 'inhabitants over 60 years' (5.52%).[130] It was, in fact, not only child age data that were inaccurate, as the report argued, but also those of adults. The ISI recommendation for a distribution 'by annual age periods' could not be respected.[131]

Beyond misinformation, this problem was a question of a standardization policy for increasing legibility. While particularly after the Population Register Regulations of 1878, Ottoman enumerators recorded date and place of birth, among other civil information, these practices did not involve the standardization of different calendars in use until the Kemalist reforms, which abolished all time and measure referentials other than the international system between 1925 and 1933.[132] Celal Aybar returned to this issue during his presentation on the second census at the 1937 ISI Congress:

> I would, however, like to point out the peculiarity of one of the questions which, in the manner in which it was asked, departed from the system almost uniformly practised by other countries. In the present census, instead of asking the date of birth of the person to find out his/her age, s/he was asked directly his/her age. This alternative was chosen because in Turkey most people know their date of birth according to different calendars (Hegira, Gregorian, Arabic, Roman, etc.) and the indications contained in the birth certificates themselves do not specify which calendar was used. In order to eliminate in advance, the risk of errors associated with calculating age on the basis of the declared date of birth, it was preferred, despite all the risks that this might entail, to ask people's ages directly. However, the enumerators were obliged to verify the statements of the inhabitants by referring to official documents, whenever the appearance of the declarant would make the age declared by him/her implausible.[133]

This excerpt reveals how the standardization of data based on international conventions was a multi-level process of uniformization. It required the synchronization and 'standardisation of the time reference', which contributed not only to the legitimization of the Western norm, but also to its transformation into a global system.[134]

There were also difficulties in making uniform occupational statistics negotiated during several ISI sessions.[135] The instructions were based on the 'draft nomenclatures' presented at the 1889 session and evolved since then, recommending '12 general divisions'.[136] The resolutions recommended that '[s]tatistics of occupations should embrace the whole population, i.e. not only the working population, but also members of households without occupation', and indicate 'the social position' of household members, 'the principal occupation and the accessory occupations'.[137] These guidelines were not fully implemented in the Turkish census which used

‘broad occupational categories’ only partially respecting ISI nomenclatures. Celal’s report in the official booklet explained that

> [a]s the largest part of the population is engaged in agriculture and the answers given to the question of occupation were not clear enough to allow for a detailed classification, it was preferred for this first census to restrict the breakdown of occupations into nine main categories.

However, only six categories were applied: agricultural; industrial; commercial; public employment; liberal and other; no occupation; and total (employed population).[138] This classification was similar to the Belgian adaptation of the ISI nomenclature.[139]

Deviations from Belgian and European statistics were all the more remarkable as the tables depicting the Turkish labour force as principally agricultural did not sort the data in alphabetical or descending order (Appendix 2).[140] They simply copied the ISI model whose reference was clearly industrial capitalist economies. The sorting order also seemed arbitrary in other tables such as the one that applied ISI instructions regarding infirmities.[141] In spite of all these ambiguities, the ISI’s international framework allowed Turkey in the process of nation-building to assert an ethno-religious homogeneity by numbers.[142]

In the ISI’s international system, census-taking also covered agriculture and industry to assess economic resources and activity. In Turkey, too, two additional censuses were conducted within a few weeks. Jacquart presented them at the Cairo congress, however, as ‘trials given the conditions prevailing in the country’, and not real censuses.[143] This evaluation diverged from the Turkish government’s point of view and expectations.[144] We will not go into detail regarding these censuses, which depicted an unindustrialized, agricultural and artisanal economy. Although these operations did not meet all international criteria according to the expert, the results served the Turkish government as a main source for quantifying the economic situation of the country, for policy-making, and for communicating statistics to IOs such as the League’s Economic and Financial Section. These statistics also served as an important source for foreign experts invited to make surveys and policy recommendations on the Turkish economy. The stakes were therefore high and multiple for the Turkish government.

Conclusions

This study attempted to analyse the translation of ISI expertise in Turkey’s statistical reform conducted by a Belgian expert as part of the modernization policies and nation-state building during the first decade of the Republican period. The analysis confirms the hypothesis that the ISI was perceived, both within its expert spaces which negotiated norms in statistical policies, but also from its peripheries, as an international authority guiding national institutions. By providing an international space of equivalence and comparability, the ISI greatly contributed to the emergence of an international statistical system. The study on Turkey’s modernization through an extensive statistical reform shed light on certain specificities regarding the integration of non-Western states into this system. The ISI’s international framework, intertwined with Belgian expertise, greatly influenced Turkish quantification policies and instruments, but also involved various contradictions. The ISI experts, including Jacquart, considered the Turkish state rather outside the European political system which structured ISI’s international norms. Even when these conventions were applied by adapting them to Turkey’s national context, ambiguities in the classification of results often highlighted the arbitrary character of the ISI’s categorization system. The Turkish experience in assimilating international norms which was presented by Jacquart and Celal to the ISI public received particular attention, because it provided feedback for the non-Western applications of an international endeavour which was paradoxically conceived both in terms of civilizational

difference (particularism) and universalism. The implementation of the ISI's expertise in Europe's periphery indeed contributed to extending the hegemony of West European values, models and definitions of statehood, which were mostly based on a capitalist and industrial economic organization with high urbanization and bureaucratization tendencies, as well as a quest for eligibility through standardization policies and refined governmental techniques which target the population and territory.

As a modernizing country actively invested in internationalization, Turkey deliberately and explicitly used the ISI's guidance and expertise.145 It also sought cooperation with the ISI as a means to advertise 'modern' Turkey and to integrate Turkish statisticians, such as Celal Aybar, into the ISI's expert circles. The ISI influenced both the reorganization of the Turkish civil registry system and census-taking policies, hence the two sources of public statistics.146 This influence, consented to by the strategic internationalism of the Turkish government, derived from the ISI's strategies, which embodied a whole international network of expert statisticians (including Jacquart) and aimed to define and disseminate its standards through various mechanisms and instruments. At the intersection of Turkey's and the ISI's strategies, Jacquart played a key role in the double integration of the ISI system into Turkish statistics and Turkish statistics into the ISI system. The ISI recommendations as translated by the Belgian expert shaped statistical policies, instruments and methods in Turkey. Jacquart hybridized international and national expertise to characterize and represent Turkey's population, to circumscribe and map its territory with numbers, and to construct a quantified definition of the imagined nation. He led the construction and centralization of Turkey's statistical administration and trained its future director and the Turkish Republic's first ISI member, Celal Aybar. However, Jacquart was not the only actor translating the ISI expertise in Turkey, as national experts also contributed to this process.

The government's investment in statistical reform according to international norms was in line with the global tendencies of the inter-war period which promoted the development of a European international system into a more global one. Turkey's relations with the ISI during its construction as a new nation were largely guided by its aspiration to integrate into the 'political Europe' defined as a system of states sharing common values, norms and modes of government. This reform was moreover in continuity with earlier Ottoman policies. It was based on previous relations with the ISI that, after affirming political independence, the republican regime recognized this IO as the principal international expert authority in statistics and sought to apply its norms and integrate in its statistical system.

Appendix 1

The Turkish census form (*le bulletin*)
Numéro de la circonscription :
La signature de l'agent-recenseur :
L'approbation du contrôleur :
1. Numéro du bâtiment.
2. Le nom de famille. Le nom du père. Le nom du recensé.
3. Homme ou femme.
4. La date de naissance, si le recensé ne peut pas la déclarer on mettra l'âge.
5. Le lieu de naissance
6. L'état-civil (célibataire, marié, veuf ou divorcé)
7. La langue maternelle. (La langue parlée dans la famille).
8. La résidence habituelle
9. La nationalité.
10. La profession ou la situation.
11. Le recensé sait-il lire un imprimé ?
12. La religion.
13. Le recensé a-t-il un infirmité et laquelle ?
14. Le recensé est-il déjà inscrit dans les registres ?
15. Le recensé a-t-il une carte d'identité ?
16. Observations[147]

English translation

District Number:
Enumerator's Signature:
Controller's approval:
1. Building Number.
2. Last name. Father's name. The surname of the respondent.
3. Male or female.
4. The date of birth, if the respondent cannot declare it, note the age.
5. Place of birth
6. Marital status (single, married, widowed or divorced)
7. Mother tongue. (The language spoken in the family).
8. Habitual residence
9. Nationality.
10. Occupation or status.
11. Can the respondent read a printout?
12. Religion.
13. Does the census taker have a disability and which one?
14. Is the respondent already registered?
15. Does the respondent have an identity card?
16. Observations

pp.73-100 https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2023.2165437

Appendix 2

"The relative importance of the different occupational categories among themselves" (Table 17) and occupational distribution of the population aged 12 and over (Table 13) according to the Turkish census booklet[148]

TABLO — 13
TABLEAU

MESLEKLER PROFESSİONS	Erkek Hommes %	Kadın Femmes %	Yekûn Total %
Ziraî - Agricoles	64.46	33.80	47.71
Sınaî - İndustrielles	6.42	0.65	3.27
Ticarî - Commerciales	5.98	0.17	2.81
Serbest - Libérales	1.09	0.15	0.58
Umumî hizmetler - Empois Publies	6.01	0.03	2.75
Muhtelif - Diverses	2.53	0·34	1.34
Meslekler yekûnu - Total Des Professions	86.49	35.14	58.46
Mesleksizler - Sans profession	13.51	64.86	41.54
Yekûn - Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLO : 17
TABLEAU

MESLEKLER PROFESSİONS	Erkek - Hommes Erkamı mut'aka Chiffres absolus	%	Kadın - Femmes Erkamı mutlaka Chiffres absolus	%	Yekûn - Total Erkamı mutlaka Chiffres absolus	%
Ziraî - Agricoles	2,678,737	74.53	1,689,324	96.17	4,368,061	81.63
Sınaî - İndustrielles	266,895	7.43	32,474	1.85	299,369	5.59
Ticarî - Commerciales	248,512	6.92	8,843	0.50	257,355	4.81
Serbest - Libérales	45,247	1.25	7,416	0.42	52,663	0.98
Umumî hizmetler - Emplois Publics	249,771	6.94	1,715	0.10	251,486	4.70
Muhtelif - Diverses	105,334	2.93	16,947	0.96	122,281	2.29
Meslekler yekûnu - Total des Professions	3,594,496	100.00	1,756,719	100.00	5,351,215	100.00

Notes

1. Brian, “Statistique administrative”; Desrosières, *La politique des grands nombres*; and Gagnon, “Les réseaux de l’internationalisme.”
2. Desrosières, “Décrire l’État.”
3. Bemmann, “Weltwirtschaftsstatistik,” 372–4.
4. See Dogan’s studies on the first relations between the League of Nations and the newly constructed Turkish Statistical Office headed by Camille Jacquart. Dogan, “Negotiating Turkey’s Economic Statistics” and “Modern State Building.”
5. Dogan, “L’étatisation turque.”
6. Foucault, *Sécurité, territoire, population;* and Desrosières, *Pour une sociologie historique*.
7. Barkan, “Essai sur les données statistiques”; İnalcık, “Did the Ottomans use Statistical Methodology?”; Karpat, “Ottoman Population Records” and *Ottoman Population, 1830–1914*; Shaw, “The Ottoman Census System”; Toprak, “Quantification in the Ottoman State”; and Behar, “Ottoman Population Statistics” and “Qui compte ?”
8. For the European context see Desrosières, *La politique des grands nombres*, 180–217; and Desrosières, *Pour une sociologie historique*.
9. Speich-Chassé, “Technical Internationalism.”
10. BIPM, “Member States.”
11. Elected in 1911, the Ottoman member of the ISI, Djavid Bey, was the finance minister of the Union and Progress Government between 1909 and 1914 (Stemerdink, *Members of the International*; see his biography in Ryan, “Cavid Bey”). After the fall of the Ottoman Empire and the political revolution which led to the creation of

 https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2023.2165437

the Turkish Republic in 1923, Djavid Bey was accused, among other Unionists, of being involved in the assassination attempt against Mustafa Kemal, and was executed in 1926 shortly after Jacquart's arrival in Ankara.
12. Bemmann, "Weltwirtschaftsstatistik," 372–3.
13. Statistisches Landesamt des Freistaates Sachsen, "Geschichte."
14. Liebisch-Gümüş, "Intersecting Asymmetries."
15. Djélal, "La Statistique en Turquie," 427.
16. For example, the decision of the Council of Ministers to invite him underlined his status as a member of the ISI. Presidency Republican Archives (hereafter BCA) 30–18-1-1_14-40-16 (June 10, 1925).
17. Dufrasne, "Camille Jacquart."
18. Dogan, "Negotiating Turkey's Economic Statistics"; Dogan, "Modern State Building"; and Dogan, "L'étatisation turque," 351–78.
19. de Bie, "Les débuts de la sociologie"; Dufrasne, "Camille Jacquart"; Dogan, "A Transnational Scientist of the Social"; and Dogan, "Des sociologues catholiques."
20. Dufrasne, "Camille Jacquart"; and Dogan, "L'étatisation turque," 399–406.
21. The decree no. 3517 of the Council of Ministers for the creation of the Central Statistical Office under the Prime Minister's Office came into force on 25 April 1926 (published in the Turkish Official Gazette no. 388 on June 2, 1926). See also TUIK, "History."
22. Jacquart came to Ankara with his wife and took office in March 1926. BOA HR.İM.17780(February 25, 1926). Decree No. 4526; BCA 030–10-0-0_22-79-10 (December 19, 1926).
23. Jacquart's letter to the Prime minister, June 18, 1926 (original in French). BCA 30–18-1-1_18-28-16 (April 25, 1926).
24. Dufrasne, "Camille Jacquart."
25. Decree no. 3517.
26. The archived document is in Ottoman. BCA 30–10-0-0_24-134-1 (November 7, 1926).
27. BCA 30–18-1-1_19-41-15 (July 13, 1926).
28. This report was published in two parts in the journal of urban planning, *İstanbul Şehremaneti Mecmuası*. Abdülmuttalip, "Medeni Devletlerde ve Türkiye'de."
29. Edmond Nicolaï was then director at the Belgian Ministry of the Interior and Public Education. Nicolaï, "Rapport sur les registres de population."
30. He also noted European countries where these registers were optional ('Austria, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Spain, Sweden and Norway', and 'to a certain extent, Romania, Hungary and Bulgaria') Abdülmuttalip, "Medeni Devletlerde ve Türkiye'de."
31. See the proceedings in Institut international de statistique, *Bulletin* (Tome XV), 42, 97.
32. *Aperçus de la démographie des divers pays du monde* were also published within this framework. Bunle and Levy "Histoire et chronologie," 18–19; and Dogan, "L'étatisation turque," 420–3.
33. Dogan, "Modern State Building."
34. Quoted from Methorst's original letter (in French) of August 15, 1930. The analysis is also based on his earlier letter of January 14, 1930. BCA 30–10-0-0_201-375-5 (October 26, 1930).
35. Methorst's letter of January 14, 1930. Ibid.
36. BCA 30–10-0-0_201-375-5 (October 26, 1930); 241–614-5 (May 31, 1930).
37. BCA 30–10-0-0_241-614-6 (June 10, 1931); 241–614-7 (June 23, 1931).
38. He graduated from the Istanbul faculty of law and started his career in public administration. He adopted the surname Aybar following the Surname Law promulgated in 1934. TUIK, "Celal AYBAR"; and Yiğit and Tunçel, *100. Yılında Türkiye'de Coğrafyacılar*, 33.
39. BCA 0–10-0-0_26-147-13 (March 4, 1933). Celal is elected as a member of the ISI following the commitment of the Turkish government to pay annual grants. BCA 30–10-0-0_26-147-4 (August 21, 1930); 30–10-0-0_24-136-7 (July 16, 1933).
40. Aybar, "Le second recensement général," 3–11.
41. BCA 30–10-0-0_229-541-18 (October 19, 1936).
42. "Première section: Statistique Démographique," in Institut International de Statistique, *Bulletin* (Tome 29), 76, 7.
43. He specified in his report that at the end of the Congress he visited the Greek Statistical Office to investigate and learn about its organization and mode of operation. BCA 30–10-0-0_229-541-18 (October 19, 1936).
44. BCA 30–10-0-0_24-138-20 (September 27, 1938).
45. Aybar died before this 25th session in Washington, where he was supposed to present two papers. Aybar's papers "Particulars Concerning Turkish Population Census" and "Renseignements sur recensements de la population en Turquie" were published in: Goudswaard, *25th Session*, 122.
46. BCA 30–10-0-0_24-135-4 (September 15, 1929).
47. Bertillon, *Texte des voeux*, 8.
48. BCA 30–18-1-1_26-61-3 (November 9, 1927).

49. “Liste des Gouvernements et des Municipalités qui ont envoyé une Délégation Officielle” in Institut International de Statistique, *Bulletin* (Tome 23, 1e livraison), 6–9.
50. See the tables which list the members and guests. Ibid., 20–1.
51. Ibid., 58.
52. Ibid., 74–6 (for the entire debate see pp. 72–7). For the background of this debate, see: Labbé, “Internationalisme statistique et recensement.”
53. Dündar, “Compter, Classer, Contrôler.”
54. Jacquart, “Communication sur le recensement.” It was published following the request of the members and the favorable opinion of the ISI section. Institut international de statistique, *Bulletin* (Tome 23, 1e livraison), 58. This report is also archived in the Turkish State Archives. BCA 30-1-0-0_95-595-1 (April 25, 1928).
55. See the ‘Partie Française’ in: Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 127–69.
56. According to the resolutions voted at the 1887 session (Rome), the ISI would request from all European countries a succinct report in French on their last census results and would publish them in its *Bulletin*. Bertillon, *Texte des voeux*, 8.
57. This project was elaborated during the St Petersburg session of 1897 (Institut international de statistique. *Bulletin* (Tome XI, 1e livr.). As envisaged by the Hungarian statistician M. de Körösy, the project aimed to make ‘a homogeneous description of all civilised humanity’. Institut international de statistique, *Bulletin* (Tome XII, 1e livr.).
58. See, in particular, the resolutions of the Kristiania session. *Ibid*. See also: Methorst, *Texte de voeux*, 5.
59. Bertillon was the ‘Head of statistical works for the City of Paris, member of the Higher Council of Statistics and the Advisory Committee of Public Health of France, etc. Member of the International Statistical Institute’ (my translation from the original in French). Bertillon, *Texte des voeux*, 1.
60. Methorst was ‘doctor of law, director of the Central Bureau of Statistics of the Netherlands’; (my translation). Methorst, *Texte de voeux.*
61. Bertillon, *Texte des voeux*, 1.
62. Note that two special commissions were created in Ankara and Istanbul to assist the preparations as well as a third in Diyarbakir for applying specific measures to count the nomads. These commissions were conceived not simply as a deliberative body, but as a micro-government with the capacity to take public decisions and execute them. They included bureaucratic, military, scientific and local authorities in the decision-making process with quite broad responsibilities, including deciding on measures to be applied by police and local authorities. There is reason to believe that these commissions were designed by the Turkish political leadership rather than advised by Jacquart, as they had no equivalent in Belgium or in the ISI’s recommendations; they also resembled the temporary commissions that the Ottoman state used to form to assist various public policies. ‘Document No. 5’ in Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 160–1. Jacquart, “Communication sur le recensement,” 175.
63. ‘Cette préparation a consisté pour moi personnellement d’abord à parcourir les diverses régions du pays si différentes les unes des autres pour en connaître l’aspect physique, les mœurs et la mentalité de la population ainsi que le degré d’organisation administrative.’ Jacquart, “Communication sur le recensement,” 171.
64. ‘Il fallait tenir compte de ces circonstances pour fixer la date du recensement. En hiver cette opération sera toujours très difficile et même impossible dans les massifs montagneux du centre, de l’est, et de sud-est. C’est pourquoi le 31 décembre ne peut convenir. L’automne et plus spécialement la fin du mois d’octobre a paru convenir le mieux. A ce moment, les travaux des champs sont terminés; les nombreuses personnes qui villégiaturent au bord de la mer, sur le Bosphore ou dans la montagne sont retournées dans leurs localités de résidence habituelle, et la température est uniformément douce dans tout le pays.’ Jacquart, “Communication sur le recensement,” 172.
65. Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830–1914*, 10; and Shaw, “The Ottoman Census System,” 326.
66. The census found out that on the eve of the sign revolution that introduced the Latin alphabet and revised the Turkish language in 1928, the population that could read using Arabic characters represented 8.16%. For those of school age excluding ‘children under 7 years of age’ it was ‘10.58% for the whole country; 17.42% for men and 4.63% for women’. Office central de statistique, “Recensement général,” 138. Note the high discrepancy with Belgium where 92% of the population over 15 years of age was literate. Ministre de l’Intérieur et de l’Hygiène, *Statistique de la Belgique.*
67. Jacquart, “Communication sur le recensement,” 171–2.
68. Scott, *Seeing Like a State*.
69. Jacquart, “Communication sur le recensement,” 173.
70. See the chapter regarding ‘the formation of building blocks for the census’ in “Instruction aux Valis.” Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 151.
71. Rose-Redwood and Tantner, “Introduction: Governmentality”; and Denis, “Entre police et démographie.”
72. Jacquart, “Communication sur le recensement,” 171–2.
73. “Tahrir-i nüfus tecrübeleri münasebetiyle,” 17; and quoted by Toprak, “Cumhuriyet Ankara’sında İlk Nüfus.”
74. Jacquart, “Nüfus tahriri hakkında,” 13–14; and quoted by Toprak, “Cumhuriyet Ankara’sında İlk Nüfus.”
75. The decree no. 3517.

 https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2023.2165437

76. Institut international de statistique, *Bulletin* (Tome XV), 87.
77. Ibid., 40, 87, 271.
78. Jacquart, "Communication sur le recensement," 175. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*.
79. Jacquart, "Communication sur le recensement," 131.
80. See Celal's introduction in Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 132.
81. Jacquart, "Communication sur le recensement," 176.
82. These are the resolutions of the St Petersburg session in 1897 voted by the ISI following the report of M. de Kœrœsy (*Bulletin* XI, fascicule I, pp. 203 et 206) quoted in: Bertillon, *Texte des vœux*, 7; and Methorst, *Texte de voeux*, 8.
83. The Belgian census form excluded questions 11 to 16 asked by the Turkish *bulletin* (see the Appendix 1) but asked a question on education. Ministre de l'Intérieur et de l'Hygiène, *Statistique de la Belgique*, 23.
84. See for instance the eighth question in Appendix 1 on usual residence which simplified the ISI's question on 'usual residence and character, i.e. length of stay at the census location'.
85. Jacquart, "Communication sur le recensement," 176.
86. Randall, Coast, and Leone, "Cultural Constructions."
87. The method chosen was the registration of the persons found in each division on a single form'. Jacquart, "Communication sur le recensement," 176.
88. 'Les agents-recenseurs étaient chargés de distribuer à domicile les bulletins (de ménage ou spéciaux) pour permettre aux recensés d'y consigner les divers renseignements demandés, de les reprendre, de les vérifier et, au besoin, de les rectifier ou même de les rédiger. Ils avaient ensuite à les dépouiller en transcrivant leur contenu sur des cartes individuelles qui donnent les renseignements séparément pour chacune despersonne et pour chacun des ménages recensés.' "Méthodes du recensement," in Ministre de l'Intérieur et de l'Hygiène, *Statistique de la Belgique*, 2.
89. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 155.
90. "Méthodes du recensement," in Ministre de l'Intérieur et de l'Hygiène, *Statistique de la Belgique*, 1, 2.
91. Louckx shows that this shift in Belgian census-taking from the *de facto* to the *de jure* method was 'driven by governmental concerns' to increase surveillance based on the register system – for instance, updating address changes. Louckx, "Population, Territory, and State-istics."
92. The Belgian method covered all 'persons who have their usual residence in that locality, whether or not they are present on the census day'. Note that the usual residence was 'determined according to the rules established for registration in the population registers'. Ministre de l'Intérieur et de l'Hygiène, *Statistique de la Belgique*, 2.
93. On Canadian censuses and hybrid experimentations mixing *de jure* and *de facto* principles, see Curtis, *The Politics of Population*.
94. While existing literature does not provide a detailed discussion on the application of *de jure* or *de facto* principles in the Ottoman censuses, the studies cited in note 7 provide information about the Ottoman state's census practices since the first experiments in 1831.
95. See the debate about the difference between 'la population *de fait* (population présente), et la population *de droit* (population résidente)' at the Rome session (1887) and the resolution voted at the Congrès international de statique de Saint-Pétersburg (1872): 'les recensements doivent se rapporter à la population de fait'. Bertillon, *Texte de voeux*.
96. Jacquart, "Communication sur le recensement," 176. Note that while the *de facto* population counted only those present, the instructions required noting 'nominally absent' persons as well, who were then counted separately. 'Special measures' were taken 'for the census of nomads, i.e. people who have no stable dwelling and who are continuously transporting themselves with their livestock from one place to another'. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 156, 158.
97. 'Thus travellers in hotels or at friends' homes, the patients in hospitals, soldiers in barracks, pupils in boarding schools, all of them must be registered along with the inhabitants who are actually present'. See the chapter "Des personnes qui doivent figurer sur le bulletin nominatif," Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 156.
98. Jacquart, "Communication sur le recensement," 176–7.
99. Dumont-Wilden, et al., "Camille Jacquart," 2027–29.
100. Jacquart, "Communication sur le recensement," 171.
101. "La loi du recensement général de la population," No. 893 (2 juin 1926). Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 145.
102. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 154.
103. The census result (13,648,270) divided by the number of agents.
104. Ministre de l'Intérieur et de l'Hygiène, *Statistique de la Belgique*, 5.
105. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 155–8.
106. Jacquart, "Communication sur le recensement," 174.
107. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 158.

108. Jacquart announced the first results as '13,649,945, of which 6,564,404 were men and 7,065,541 women'. Jacquart, "Communication sur le recensement," 174.
109. 'The work of counting the forms will be centralised at the Central Office. The contents of the collective forms will be transcribed onto individual cards by the employees of the population offices of the vilayets and cazas. At the same time, obvious errors in the forms can be corrected. Two months after the census, the Office should be in possession of the cards which, after verification and adjustment, will be used to draw up the perforated cards for classification and counting by electric machines.' Jacquart, "Communication sur le recensement," 178.
110. 'Qu'outre le dépouillement des résultats laissé à l'appréciation scientifique des bureaux de statistique, il est nécessaire qu'un petit nombre de données soient dépouillées dans tous les pays d'une manière uniforme' Article 3 of the resolutions voted by the ISI at the session in Saint-Pétersbourg 1897. Bertillon, *Texte des voeux*, 6; Methorst, *Texte de voeux*, 8.
111. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 133. See Tables 1 and 2 in the Turkish section. Ibid., 8–9.
112. See Tables 3 et 4. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 11–14.
113. My translation. Methorst, *Texte de voeux*, 6–7. Voir également le *Bulletin* (tome XIV), 63, 60, 48, 49.
114. League of Nations, *International Statistical Yearbook 1926*.
115. Note that during the negotiation of nomenclatures at the League's international conference of economic statistics in 1928, the Turkish delegates sought to classify Turkey under Europe. Société des Nations, *Comptes rendus de la Conférence*.
116. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 134. These divisions were largely based on the Ottoman administrative organization reformed during the nineteenth century. Ortaylı, *Türkiye teşkilât ve idare*.
117. See the resolutions of the St Petersburg 1897 session in: Bertillon, *Texte de voeux*, 7; Methorst, *Texte de voeux*, 9.
118. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 81–3, 135. See the tables 8, F-1 et F-2. Ibid., 16, 60, 73.
119. According to Demangeon, Belgian statistics presented 'a rather original map of the population density'. Demangeon, "Le recensement de la population."
120. Ministre de l'Intérieur et de l'Hygiène, *Statistique de la Belgique*, 1.
121. The ISI required indicating the number of habitants and establishments for: hotels; hospitals; houses of education and instruction; religious houses; houses of detention and correction; houses of refuge and charity; military establishments; other establishments (Art. 2). Résolutions de la session de Saint-Pétersbourg 1897," Bertillon, *Texte de vœux*, 7; Methorst, *Texte de voeux*, 9.
122. Schools (14,425), mosques (28,705), public buildings (9,820), public baths (1,702) and other buildings (836,866). Note that 'religious houses' were replaced by 'mosques', and that the number of 'military establishments' were not shared as Turkey considered them as an issue of national security and required special authorization for sharing any military statistics. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 135. See the Tableau F-2 (p. 73).
123. See the results of this census in Office central de statistique, "Compte-rendu du recensement industriel."
124. Bertillon, *Texte de vœux*, 8. Belgium used different categories by classifying communes instead of cities. Ministre de l'Intérieur et de l'Hygiène, *Statistique de la Belgique.*
125. 'I – 40 villes ayant 10,000 à moins de 20,000 habitants; II – 15 villes ayant 20,000 à moins de 30,000 habitants; III – 7 villes ayant 30,000 à moins de 40,000 habitants; IV – 9 villes ayant 40,000 habitants et plus.' Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 135. See also Table 9. Ibid., 17.
126. 'The distinction between the sexes must be included in all combinations of population tabulations.' Bertillon, *Texte de vœux*, 7; and Methorst, *Texte de voeux*, 9.
127. Instead of dividing by age groups as recommended by the ISI (0 to 15 years, 15 to 20 years, and so on with five-year intervals), only the percentage of married inhabitants over 19 years of age was presented. Bertillon, *Texte de vœux*, 7; and Methorst, *Texte de voeux*, 9. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 39, 136–7.
128. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 137.
129. 'There is reason to believe that the ages of the children have not been accurately reported due to ignorance or neglect by the parents. The age proportions only become normal from the age of 20 onwards, which is why the information on ages in the count and in the analysis has been combined into large groups.' Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 137.
130. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 137.
131. 'L'âge doit être dépouillé par périodes annuelles d'âge (il est désirable que l'on donne dans le tableau qui comprend les périodes annuelles d'âge une récapitulation par groupes quinquennaux).' Bertillon, *Texte de vœux*, 7.
132. They recorded, for instance, marital status, religion, health or occupation and provided documents that served as both birth certificates and identity cards, although these practices were interrupted by wars. Shaw, "The Ottoman Census System"; Karpat, "Ottoman Population Records."
133. My translation from the original in French. Aybar, "Le second recensement général," 8.
134. Zerubavel, "The Standardization of Time."

 https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2023.2165437

135. The guidelines quoted, in particular, the resolution of the 1893 session stating that the ISI attached great importance to the census of occupations which should be taken 'in all countries according to comparable nomenclatures'. Methorst, *Texte de voeux*, 10.
136. The ISI's 'International Framework for the World Census' defined '12 classes' as follows: **A**. Raw material production: I. Exploitation of the land surface (including fishing and hunting). II. Extraction of mineral materials. **B**. Transformation and use of raw materials: III. Industry. IV. Transport. V. Trade. **C**. Public administration and the professions: VI. Law enforcement (including police). VII. Public administration. VIII. Liberal professions. IX. Persons living mainly on their own income. **D**. Miscellaneous: X. Domestic work. XI. General designations, without indication of a specific occupation. XII. Unproductive and Unknown Occupation. Methorst, *Texte de voeux*, 10.
137. See the resolutions of the Kristiania session. Methorst, *Texte de voeux*, 11.
138. Tableau B. Répartition de la population d'après les professions (et le sexe). Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 49–52.
139. The Belgian categories were: industry; commerce; agriculture and forestry; public functions; domestic services; liberal professions; fishing; undetermined professions (and no profession). Ministre de l'Intérieur et de l'Hygiène, *Statistique de la Belgique*, 93–4.
140. According to the results, '39.26% of the total population declared that they had an occupation (54.84% for men and 24.83% for women)', while for those 'aged 12 and over, [..] 86.49% of men and 35.14% of women had an occupation.' The report noted that the vast majority was involved in agriculture. Indeed, 96.71% of women and 74.53% of men who declared having an occupation worked in agriculture (81.63% in total). The other occupations were dominated by men, with low female participation. These occupations were almost negligible for the total employed population (see Tables 13–17). Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 138–9.
141. 'infirmities, i.e. blind, deaf-mute, insane and idiots'. Methorst, *Texte de voeux*, 10. These statistics were not carried out in Belgium. The Turkish census adapted them by modifying the classes according to the handicaps resulting from decades of war. The ISI categories, idiots and insane, were replaced by 'crippled' and 'one-armed', which showed the highest frequencies. But the category 'other disability' still ranked highest (41% of the total reported). Overall, 1.42% of the population was disabled, 2.07% for men and 0.81% for women (see Tables 18, 19 and C). Office central de statistique, *Recensement général.*
142. Applying the ISI recommendations regarding religion and nationality statistics, Turkish results affirmed that 'Muslims constituted 97.36% and non-Muslims 2.64% of the total population of the country'. Among the non-Muslims were Christians, 1.9%, Israelites 0.6%, others 0.13%, unknown or no religion 0.02%, and these 'non-Muslim inhabitants' were concentrated in Istanbul, Izmir and Mardin. The distribution according to mother tongue described a slightly more nuanced picture; '13.58% of the population' speak a mother tongue other than Turkish. As for the distribution of nationalities, only 3.23% of the census population was of 'foreign nationality (political subjection)'. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 140–2. See also Tables 20, 21 and D. Ibid., 30–1, 61–2). Note that our study does not analyse the reality behind these statistics or the politics of violence which contributed to the statistical affirmation of a homogenous nation. See, for instance Dündar, *Crime of Numbers.*
143. Jacquart, "Communication sur le recensement," 178.
144. Dogan, "L'étatisation turque," 478–9.
145. Dogan, "Knowledge Transaction and State Making."
146. Desrosières, "Décrire l'État."
147. The bulletin was annexed to both Jacquart's report and the official booklet.
148. Office central de statistique, *Recensement général*, 24.

References

1. Primary sources

- Abdülmuttalip. "Medeni Devletlerde ve Türkiye'de Tahrir-i Nüfus İcrası, Ahval-i Medeniye Sicilatı ve Nüfus Defterleri Tanzimi Hakkındaki Usul ve Kavaidi Raporu I." *İstanbul Şehremaneti Mecmuası*, (December 28, 1926): 235–248.
- Abdülmuttalip. "Medeni Devletlerde ve Türkiye'de Tahrir-i Nüfus İcrası." *İstanbul Şehremaneti Mecmuası*, (January 29, 1927): 295–307.
- Aybar, Celal. "Le second recensement général de la population de la Turquie." *Bulletin de l'Institut international de statistique*, Tome 29, Session d'Athènes, Athens, 1937: 171–186.

- BIPM, Bureau International des poids et mesures. “Member States.” https://www.bipm.org/en/about-us/member-states/tr/
- Bertillon, Jacques. *Texte des voeux émis par l’Institut international de statistique*. Montévrain: Imprimerie typographique de l’école d’Alembert, 1903.
- Dumont-Wilden, L., G. Garnir, and L. Souguenet, eds. “Camille Jacquart, Secrétaire Général au Ministère de l’intérieur.” *Pourquoi Pas? Gazette hebdomadaire paraissant le vendredi*, 843, Bruxelles, 26 septembre 1930.
- Goudswaard, G., ed. *25th Session of the International Statistical Institute September 6–18, 1947 Washington, D. C. Proceedings of the International Statistical Conferences*, Vol. III. Calcutta: Eka Press, 122.
- Institut international de statistique. *Bulletin de l’Institut international de statistique*. Tome XV. London: Imp. Harrison & Fils, 1906.
- Institut International de Statistique. *Bulletin de l’Institut international de statistique*, Tome 23, 1^{e} livraison. Cairo: Imprimerie Nationale, 1928.
- Institut International de Statistique. *Bulletin de l’Institut international de statistique*, Tome 29. Session d’Athènes, Athènes, 1937.
- Institut International de Statistique. *Bulletin de l’Institut international de statistique*, Tome XI, 1^{e} livr. St Petersburg: Imprimerie Trenke et Fusnot, 1899.
- Institut International de Statistique. *Bulletin de l’Institut international de statistique*, Tome XII. 1^{e} livraison. Kristiania: Aktie-Bogtrykkeriet & Steenske Bogrtykkeri, 1900.
- Jacquart, Camille. “Communication sur le recensement général de la population en Turquie.” *Bulletin de l’Institut international de statistique*, Tome 23, 2^{e} livraison. Cairo: Imprimerie Nationale, 1928.
- Jacquart, Camille. “Nüfus tahriri hakkında.” *Hayat* 1, no. 12 (February 17, 1927): 13–14.
- Methorst, H. W. *Texte de voeux émis par l’institut international de statistique dans les treize premières sessions*. La Haye: W.P. Van Stockum&Fils, 1912.
- Ministre de l’Intérieur et de l’Hygiène. *Statistique de la Belgique. Population. Recensement général du 31 décembre 1920*. Tome 1. Brussels: Société anonyme M. Weissenbruch, 1926.
- Nicolaï, Edmond. “Rapport sur les registres de population.” *Bulletin de l’Institut international de statistique*, 314–351. Tome XV. London: Imp. Harrison & Fils, 1906.
- Office central de statistique. Recensement général de la population au 28 octobre 1927. Ankara: Imprimerie bachvekalet mudevvenat, 1929.
- Office central de statistique. *Compte-rendu du recensement industriel de 1927*. Angora, Istanbul: Imp. Zellitch Frères, 1928.
- Société des Nations. *Comptes rendus de la Conférence Internationale concernant les statistiques économiques Genève, 26 novembre – 14 décembre 1928*. C.163.M.64.1929.11.
- League of Nations, Economic and Financial Section. *International Statistical Yearbook 1926*. Geneva: Publications of the League of Nations, 1927.
- Statistisches Landesamt des Freistaates Sachsen. “Geschichte.” https://www.stla.sachsen.de/geschichte.html
- “Tahrir-i nüfus tecrübeleri münasebetiyle.” *Hayat* 1, no. 8 (January 20, 1927): 17.
- TUIK (Turkish Statistical Institute), “History” http://www.tuik.gov.tr/UstMenu.do?metod=tarihce
- TUIK. “Celal AYBAR.” Eski Başkanlar (Former President), http://www.tuik.gov.tr/UstMenu.do?metod=eskibaskan

2. Turkish State Archive documents

- BCA 30-18-1-1_14-40-16 (June 10, 1925)
- BOA HR.İM. 177 80 (M-25-02-1926)
- Décret No. 4526; BCA 030-10-0-0_22-79-10 (December 19, 1926)
- Decree no. 3517 (April 25, 1926) (published in the Turkish Official Gazette no. 388 on June 2, 1926)
- Jacquart's letter to the Prime minister, 18 June 1926. BCA 30-18-1-1_18-28-16 (April 25, 1926)
- BCA 30-10-0-0_24-134-1 (November 7, 1926)
- BCA 30-18-1-1_19-41-15 (July 13, 1926)
- BCA 30-10-0-0_24-134-1 (November 7, 1926)
- BCA 30-18-1-1_19-41-15 (July 13, 1926)
- BCA 30-10-0-0_201-375-5 (October 6, 1930)
- BCA 30-10-0-0_241-614-5 (May 31, 1930)
- BCA 30-10-0-0_241-614-6 (June 10, 1931)
- BCA 30-10-0-0_241-614-7 (June 23, 1931)
- BCA 0-10-0-0_26-147-13 (March 4, 1933)
- BCA 30-10-0-0_26-147-4 (August 21, 1930)
- BCA 30-10-0-0_24-136-7 (July 16, 1933)
- BCA 30-10-0-0_229-541-18 (October 19, 1936)
- BCA 30-10-0-0_24-138-20 (September 27, 1938)
- BCA 30-10-0-0_24-135-4 (September 15, 1929)
- BCA 30-18-1-1_26-61-3 (November 9, 1927)
- BCA 30-1-0-0_95-595-1 (April 25, 1928)

3. Secondary sources

- Barkan, Ö. L. "Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensement dans l'empire ottoman aux XVe et XVIe siècles." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 1, no. 1 (1957): 9–36.
- Behar, C. "Qui compte? 'Recensements' et statistiques démographiques dans l'Empire ottoman, du XVI e au XX e siècle." *Histoire & mesure* 13, no. 1/2 (1998): 135–145.
- Behar, C. "Ottoman Population Statistics and Modernization after 1831." In *Data and Statistics in the Ottoman Empire*, edited by H. Inalcık and Ş. Pamuk, 62–72. Ankara: State Institute of Statistics Prime Ministry Republic of Turkey, 2000.
- Bemmann, M. "Weltwirtschaftsstatistik. Internationale Wirtschaftsstatistik und die Geschichte der Globalisierung, 1850–1950." Habilitation thesis (unpublished manuscript), Freiburg, 2020.
- Berlivet, L. "L'exploration statistique du social. Administrations, associations savantes et débats publiques." In *Histoire des sciences et des savoirs II. Modernité et globalisation*, edited by K. Raj, H. O. Sibum, and D. Pestre, 411–433. Paris: Seuil, 2015.
- Brian, E. "Statistique administrative et internationalisme statistique pendant la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle." *Histoire & Mesure* 4, no. 3–4 (1989): 201–224.
- Bunle, H., and C. Levy. "Histoire et chronologie des réunions et congrès internationaux sur la population." *Population (INED)* 9 (1954): 9–36.
- Curtis, B. *The Politics of Population: State Formation, Statistics, and the Census of Canada, 1840–1875*. University of Toronto Press: Toronto, 2002.

- Cussó, R. “La quantification internationale à la lumière de la SSP et des Congrès internationaux de statistique: Continuités et ruptures.” *Journ@l Électronique d’Histoire des Probabilités et de la Statistique* 6, no. 2 (2010).
- de Bie, P. “Les débuts de la sociologie en Belgique. III: Les sociétés belges de sociologie et le centre interuniversitaire.” *Recherches Sociologiques* 17, no. 2 (1986): 193–230.
- Demangeon, A. “Le recensement de la population de la Belgique (1920).” *Annales de géographie.* 37, no. 205 (1928): 84–86.
- Denis, V. “Entre police et démographie.” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 133, no. 1 (2000): 72–78.
- Desrosières, A. “L’histoire de la statistique comme genre: Style d’écriture et usages sociaux.” *Genèses* 2, no. 39 (2000): 121–137.
- Desrosières, A. “Décrire l’État ou explorer la société: Les deux sources de la statistique publique.” *Genèses* 1, no. 58 (2005): 4–27.
- Desrosières, A. *La politique des grands nombres: Histoire de la raison statistique*. La Découverte, Paris, 2010 [1993].
- Desrosières, A. *Pour une sociologie historique de la quantification: L’argument statistique I*. Presses des Mines via OpenEdition, 2013.
- Djélal, M. “La Statistique en Turquie.” *Progress in Public Administration* 6, no. 4 (1933): 425–433.
- Dogan, A. “Negotiating Turkey’s Economic Statistics Implementation within the League of Nation’s Framework, 1926–1927.” In *Economic Policies of International Institutions in Diachronic Perspective*, edited by C. Brégianni and C. Roser, 77–108. LaDéHiS-EHESS. 2019.
- Dogan, A. “Knowledge Transaction and State Making from Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic.” *European Journal of Turkish Studies: Social Sciences on Contemporary Turkey*, 32 (2021).
- Dogan, A. “L’étatisation turque dans l’entre-deux-guerres et ses acteurs: Construire un ordre mondial par l’expertise.” PhD diss., University of Paris-1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, IEDES, D&S, 2022.
- Dogan, A. “A Transnational Scientist of the Social: The ‘Governmental Sociology’ of the Belgian Statistician Camille Jacquart (1867–1931).” *Working paper*, University of Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, IEDES, UMR D&S, 2022.
- Dogan, A. “Des sociologues catholiques au service de la Belgique coloniale: L’exemple du statisticien Camille Jacquart (1867–1931).” *Working paper*, University of Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, IEDES, UMR D&S, 2022.
- Dogan, A. “Modern State Building and Transnational Expertise: The League Advising for Turkey’s Statistical Internationalization (1926–1927).” In *Establishing a Global Monetary Order via International Institutions*, edited by C. Brégianni and C. Roser, 71–108. Athens: Academy of Athens & HFRI, 2023.
- Dufrasne, A. “Camille Jacquart.” In *Biographie Nationale*, Tome 39, edited by A. R. de Belgique, 471–478. Brussels: Bruylant, 1976.
- Dündar, F. “Compter, Classer, Contrôler.” *Turcica*, no. 37 (2005): 187–220. ,
- Dündar, F. *Crime of Numbers: The Role of Statistics in the Armenian Question (1878–1918)*. Routledge: New York, 2018.
- Foucault, M. *Sécurité, territoire, population: Cours au Collège de France, 1977–1978*. Paris: Gallimard, 2004.
- Gagnon, M.-A. “Les réseaux de l’internationalisme statistique (1885–1914).” In *L’ère du chiffre: Systèmes statistiques et traditions nationales*, edited by J.-G. Prévost and J.-P. Beaud, 189–219. Québec: Presses de l’Université du Québec, 2000.

 https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2023.2165437

- Inalcık, H. “Did the Ottomans Use Statistical Methodology?” In *Data and Statistics in the Ottoman Empire*, edited by H. Inalcık and Ş. Pamuk, 3–13. Ankara: State Institute of Statistics Prime Ministry Republic of Turkey, 2000.
- Karpat, K. H. “Ottoman Population Records and the Census of 1881/82–1893.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 9, no. 2 (1978): 237–274.
- Karpat, K. H. *Ottoman Population, 1830–1914: Demographic and Social Characteristics*. Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 1985.
- Labbé, M. “Internationalisme statistique et recensement de la nationalité au XIXe siècle.” *Courrier des statistiques*, no. 127 (2009): 39–45.
- Liebisch-Gümüş, C. “Intersecting Asymmetries: The Internationalization of Turkey in the 1920s and the Limits of the Postcolonial Approach.” *Acta Universitatis Carolinae Studia Territorialia* 19, no. 1 (2019): 13–41.
- Louckx, K. “Population, Territory, and State-istics: ‘Habitual Residence’ in the Belgian Census, 1846–1947.” *Journal of Social History* 54, no. 2 (2020): 503–525.
- Office central de statistique. “Recensement général de la population au 28 octobre 1927.” Ankara: Imprimerie bachvekalet mudevvenat, 1929.
- Ortaylı, İ. *Türkiye Teşkilât ve Idare Tarihi*. 3^{e} ed. Ankara: Cedit Neşriyat, 2010 [2008].
- Randall, S., E. Coast, and T. Leone. “Cultural Constructions of the Concept of Household in Sample Surveys.” *Population Studies* 65, no. 2 (2011): 217–229.
- Rose-Redwood, R., and A. Tantner. “Introduction: Governmentality, House Numbering and the Spatial History of the Modern City.” *Urban History* 39, no. 4 (2012): 607–613.
- Ryan, J. “Cavid Bey, Mehmed.” In *International Encyclopedia of the First World War*, Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin, 2019. [Online].
- Scott, J. C. *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Shaw, S. J. “The Ottoman Census System and Population, 1831–1914.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 9, no. 3 (1978): 325–338.
- Speich-Chassé, D. “Technical Internationalism and Global Social Change: A Critical Look at the Historiography of the United Nations.” In *What in the World? Understanding Global Social Change*, edited by M. Albert and T. Werron, 243–263, Policy Press, 2020.
- Stemerdink, G. J., ed. *Members of the International Statistical Institute: A Cumulative List for the Period 1885–2002*. Voorburg: International Statistical Institute, 2003.
- Toprak, Z. “Cumhuriyet Ankara’sında İlk Nüfus Sayımı (Tecrübe Tahriri−1927).” *Ankara Dergisi* 1, no. 2 (1991): 57–66.
- Toprak, Z. “Quantification in the Ottoman State or the Birth of Modern Statistics.” In *Data and Statistics in the Ottoman Empire*, edited by H. Inalcık and Ş. Pamuk, 95–112. Ankara: State Institute of Statistics Prime Ministry Republic of Turkey, 2000.
- Yiğit, A., and H. Tunçel. *100. Yılında Türkiye’de Coğrafyacılar: Türkiye Coğrafyacılar Biyografileri (1915–2015)*. Bilecik: Türk Coğrafya Kurumu Yayınları, 2017.
- Zerubavel, E. “The Standardization of Time: A Sociohistorical Perspective.” *American Journal of Sociology* 88, no. 1 (1982): 1–23.