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INTRODUCTION

"We are convinced that there is no power on earth which can deprive a nation of its right to independence."

K. Ataturk

This thesis deals with the very essence of modern Turkish nationalism. Its historical, sociological and political aspects and implications will be examined. After a rather summary survey of European nationalism in general, as a social and political phenomenon, with its historical development up from its earliest stages, with all its diverse, sometimes even divergent aspects and trends, humanitarian and defensive, aggressive, and integral, universalist. We will try to examine the characteristic features of modern Turkish nationalism, based on rational principles devoid of aggressiveness, humanitarian and constructive, aimed at creating strong foundations for the future development of a nation which under the guidance of a wise and farseeing leader, awakened from the long Ottoman sleep to an entirely different present and future. To mark the true sense and historical significance of that
fundamental transformation apparent and understandable, we must trace it back to the remote past of the Turkish nation, to the Turkish ancestral spirit of the pre-Ottoman era, to the patriarchal society. The fundamental characteristics of Kemalism, as a socio-political movement, and its outgrowth, modern Turkish nationalism, have already been dealt with by historians and political scientists without, however, tracing them back to their historical and sociological antecedents and roots. That is why the phenomenon has not been appreciated correctly, with all its aspects and implications. To those authors, Kemalism seemed to be a rather purely rational concept, devoid of any links with the past, so to say rootless, artificially grafted into a new tree, a new political entity. To assess it properly, one must go back to the early stages of Turkish history, and social development through the ages, to the evolution which took place during the Islamic Ottoman era, with its various pan movements: Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism, Pan-Turanism and Pan-Turkism. Kemalism, which takes part of its roots from Pan-Turkism, is merely the antithesis and negation of Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism.

The main idea of Ataturk, the very essence of Kemalism, the source of modern Turkish nationalism, besides
the effort toward westernization, was a return to the Turkish national heritage, to the patriarchal Turkish way of life, with its true Turkish national features, culture and tradition, by eliminating all the elements of alien origin, which became gradually superposed during the Ottoman era, and overshadowed or obscured the true core of Turkism, of the Turkish national heritage to an extent as to render it quite different, almost alien.

Nationalism became one of the six pillars, six basic principles of Kemalism and of the new structure of the modern Turkish State. However, its true significance was much deeper: the whole structure of new Turkey, of her new moral, ethical, social and political life and entity, was to be revised and built upon the national heritage, upon truly national foundations, all that as a result of the awakened national consciousness, essentially Turkish, neither Islamic, Ottoman or Turanist. This was the sense and the significance of the Kemalist reforms, their very nature, their ideological but at the same time realistic and sober foundations.

The essentially constructive role and significance of modern Turkish nationalism, within the new Turkish State as well as outside, within the international society,
has to be studied against the background of the contemporary nationalist trends prevailing in certain areas of the world. That comparative study will be necessary to ascertain the correct place and role of Kemalist Turkey in the world of to-day.

Before proceeding on this essay about nationalism, a question, which could arise in any person's mind, should be answered. Could any person writing an article or essay on his own country, especially on a delicate matter such as his country's nationalism, be ever impartial? Although it would be hard for any person, in such circumstances to be definitely impartial, it would still be hard on the other hand for a foreigner to reflect the feelings and voice of an alien nation accurately and also in an impartial manner. It is not impossible, but it is extremely difficult to find such authors. A Turkish author once wrote that "if the foreigner knew, and the national citizen could be able to do, then a complete objective result could be achieved". Although this statement bears considerable truth, it could be added that a man is still a man and it is very likely that he might be unable to guard himself from certain negative influences. A foreigner could no less be impartial than a citizen of a nation. The foreigner influenced by
historical or certain other aspects could write books far from the truth. As said, individuals are usually defeated by their feelings, as usually certain feelings prevail upon rational thought. Thus if the moral faults or mistakes of a foreigner are deeper than those exaggerations of a citizen, it is preferred to have the essay from the latter one. Thus we will try to be as objective and rational as possible. The cases shall be criticized or credit shall be given, wherever it is deemed necessary. However, if in certain aspects deep acknowledgement is found, this will not signify that we forget the method of impartiality. It is because we write about an unbelievable truth, a miracle. Otherwise, an American author would not have defined Turkey as an utopia to be envied by her Middle Eastern neighbors, an example to be emulated. Moreover, the impartiality and sincerity of an essay should not be judged according to the length of negative criticisms it bears.

Being originally emotional, nationalism, the major universal force in present international politics, follows different courses in various countries. Nationalism may, indeed, appear simply as a rapid process of westernization, as it did in the Turkey of Ataturk in the 1920s. Or it may, on the contrary, assert its allegiance to the old ways and old traditions.
INTRODUCTION

Thus, in his study *Nationalism and Social Communication*, K.W. Deutsch gave a quite superficial characteristic, both unilateral and incomplete, of nationalism of modern Turkey by describing it as a rapid process of westernization and thus completely overlooking the deep roots it takes in the past, its assertion of its allegiance to the old ways and old traditions, which would be manifest and evident to anybody who would take pains to inquire not only in the fundamental principles of Kemalism and the Constitution of the Turkish Republic, but also in the spirit and essence of the reforms introduced by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk during the period of 1922-1928. While emphasizing the need for a rapid westernization of the nation and its new political structure, Kemal Ataturk was eager to free the Turkish language, literature and history from all foreign, so to say, alluvial elements, and to revive all the ancient historical traits and characteristics of the old traditions which became lost during the latter periods of the Ottoman Empire. He perfectly understood that once a nation has to undergo a surgery, a rapid and almost

---

wholesome transformation, with all the inherent danger of desintegration or loss of national characteristics, its future existence and strength must be built on the everlasting foundations of the historical past by drawing them from that part of the best one can find there.

That is why everyone who tries to study the nationalism in modern Turkey and trace its true picture, as different from all other nationalisms of the twentieth century, must conduct his inquiry on two different and mutually independent levels, while going along the lines firstly, of the revival of the ancient Turkish tradition, and, secondly, of the process of westernization and secularization without, however, loosing the characteristic national features.

Moreover, the feelings, if taken as a whole, would vary amongst each nation. The cause of their distinct feelings or way of thought, is nothing but the result of their history and culture which had given each different national group a different connotation. When dealing with Turkish nationalism, it is deemed necessary therefore, to deal to a certain extent with the earlier Turkish laws, customs and traditions which all form part of their culture and civilization. A brief study of nationalism in general is
left to the next chapters, while the others shall deal specifically with Turkish nationalism in particular, its origins and the courses it followed to its present stage. The most important phase is no doubt the present one, i.e., Kemalism, an ideology founded by Kemal Ataturk, Father of the Turks. As Kemalism is closely related with the complex policies of transformation realized in Turkey, emphasis shall be given to the reforms. In the twentieth century, these reforms in Turkey had peaceful, rational and idealistic tendencies, which were denied by several western nationalist doctrines. To be able to understand where Turkish nationalism actually stands, a brief study of nationalism in general is appropriate and necessary.

Turkish nationalism as a conscious trend, both emotional and rational, is a recent phenomenon in the history of the Turkish nation. The Ottoman Empire was a specific medley of several different nationalities which were allowed to maintain their national heritage, religions and languages. It must be confessed that this was a true liberal and humanitarian attitude exercised by the Ottoman State, a case rarely found elsewhere in the world at that specific stage of history. Thus within that multi-national state the Turks, although the dominating race, had neither
the opportunity nor the need for developing a national consciousness. As a matter of fact, such a consciousness for that time being would have been against the interests of the State. Thus, the main thing was to keep the empire a going concern through the vicissitudes of history, particularly at a time when the decaying empire was called the "sick man", until it collapsed, unable to endure the strains of World War I. It was in this atmosphere of internal decay, upheavals, heroic resistance, defeat, and foreign invasion, that Turkish nationalism grew up, and gained strength, as a consequence of the instinct of self-preservation and a reaction of national pride against the catastrophic humiliating reality. The awakening came with Mustafa Kemal, by gathering the Congresses of Erzerum and Sivas, held in 1918, and also by proclaiming the "National Pact". It is true that the ground was prepared to a certain extent by the earlier teachings of a few writers, thinkers and poets, like Emin Bey, Namil Kemal, and particularly, by Ziya Gokalp. The latter may be regarded as the spiritual father of Turkish nationalism.

It was the nationalist feeling which transformed a defeated power into a victorious country, a decaying Empire, a sick man, into a healthy and useful member of
the nations and, finally, into a dependable ally of the free Western world. Thus, the new Turkish nationalist State was built on the ashes of a decaying Empire, on the very same soil, by the same people, but along entirely new lines, with a completely different character, way of thinking and acting. Turkish nationalism, truly democratic and humanitarian, is also notable for its sincere enthusiasm for westernization. The importance of this movement is that it established an entirely new form of government, way of life and way of thinking within less than twenty-five years, while Europe, though a more educated and civilized community, took more than three hundred years to complete the Renaissance, Reformation and Industrial Revolution. Turkey, through this act, differs vastly from the other Middle and Near Eastern countries which still lack the basic and primary phases of an effective reformation. And an unbelievable truth was that all these changes were initiated and realized by a single man whom the Turkish people followed with great love, enthusiasm and will. He was no one else than Mustafa Kemal, later very rightly called Ataturk, "Father of the Turks". He was not a dictator, but only a strong ruler. If he were a dictator, he was not a dictator as understood in the west, that is to
say, he was not a dictator to impose his personal will and ambitions. If he were a dictator, and, if he imposed something, that was nothing but democracy and not tyranny.

However, as mentioned before, all these reforms aiming at the reorganization of the State and nation, along the western lines, would have been vain and even dangerous, had they not been accompanied by the desire of reviving the ancient national tradition and of harmonizing these two apparently quite opposite trends.

Despite the danger of straying from the subject, but for the purpose of having a clear picture of the evolution, the Turkish mind went through, it is almost impossible to delete certain passages from the following pages which, at first glance, would seem unnecessary. It is useful to say that a study of the early Turkish group feeling could not be overlooked by a student of modern Turkish nationalism, as it should always be borne in mind that the real Turkish spirit could be found in the very early Turkish society. Although the nationalist movement theoretically and intellectually emerged in the late nineteenth century, and was accomplished practically in the late 1920s, it would still be inaccurate to base the study of Turkish nationalism on this recent period. Such a limited study
would be a groundless one. A house, perhaps, could be built without any foundation, but its collapse would be a matter of days. So if the early Turkish patriarchal society, its nature, its early traditions and its way of life were not to be examined, the further developments and conclusions would be somewhat groundless. In modern Turkish nationalism we speak about atavism, meaning reversion to type. If the structure of this early society is unknown to any reader, the very essence of modern Turkish nationalism, and the significance of the transformation would not be clearly understood. For example, thinking about the suffrage given to the women in modern Turkey, it would be no doubt necessary to consider the social position they held in the earlier theocratic Ottoman Empire. The change, naturally, could not be seen otherwise. Furthermore, the same method should be applied to the patriarchal Turks and the Ottoman Turks. What was the status of women in the patriarchal society and what happened to their social position under the influence of religion and other factors.

For these reasons, the following chapter shall be developed along four lines. Following a brief survey of nationalism in the general sense, another brief survey of
nationalism in the general sense, another brief survey shall be devoted to the study of the early Turkish patriarchal society, which shall be followed by a research on the Ottoman society. It is only after these researches that we shall be able to come to our final study, that is to say to our subject, modern Turkish nationalism. The links with the ancient national tradition cannot be overlooked in any way while dealing with modern Turkish nationalism, that is to say Kemalism. Hence, in order to observe the essence of Kemalism and especially, to note the points where it differs from modern nationalism, that is to say, from the contemporary nationalist doctrines, it will be necessary to delve with the problem of nationalism in general, mainly from the point of view of its origin and its nature.
CHAPTER I

NATIONALISM

"The nation is neither race nor tribe, nor the whole of the people who live in the same country, nor all the Moslems together. The nation consists of the complexus of individuals, who have a common language, a common national loyalty, a common morality and esthetic feeling, that is to say, of those who derive their culture from these sources."

- Ziya Gokalp

Unless we define the characteristic features of nationalism, the study of a certain country's nationalism would be somewhat without foundation. A deeper need for such a background shall be felt when notable signs of contradictions appear between the general principles of the doctrine and the particular case. Following an analysis of the term and definition of the phenomenon, the factors which constitute a nationality shall be briefly examined. Later, a theoretical and practical criticism shall be put forward relating to the origins of nationalism. Originally, there is no more vexed problem in politics than the nature of nationality and nationalism. The origins
of the word suggest birth, and in turn, that may suggest descent (Jus sanguines) or place of birth (Jus solis) or both, as determining factors in nationality.

Thus, after having defined the origin of the word, and before delving into the problem of nationalism, it would be useful to describe the nature of a nation. Renan in his celebrated essay Qu'est ce que qu'une nation? concludes that a nation is a spiritual idea, the consciousness of a shared past and desire to project the unity into the future.

A nation, in short, is the product of what Plato called a mythos, an emotional attachment to historical origins, past sufferings and glories, and to common traditions, as well as to future hopes and fears.

Nationalities are created out of ethnographic and political elements when nationalism breathes life into the form built by preceding centuries.

In modern Turkey, it is not the form which was built by preceding centuries, it is the national spirit, national consciousness, developed as a result of historical traditions and heritage.

---

NATIONALISM

It is quite interesting to note that

Nationalism is, first and foremost a state of mind, an act of consciousness. It demands the nation state, and the creation of the nation state strengthens nationalism. Here, as elsewhere in history, we find a continuous interdependence and interaction⁴.

In this sense the ideas controlling the life and actions of a nation would be its nationalism, a collective consciousness of fellowship and sentiment of particular kind⁵.

As stated by Hilderbert Boehm⁶,
nationalism in its broader meaning refers to the attitude which ascribes to national individuality, a high place in the hierarchy of values. In this sense it is a natural and indispensable condition and accompanying phenomenon of all national movements. In so far as the political life of the national state is governed by national forces, there is hardly ever any sharp distinction between patriotism and nationalism. On the other hand, the term nationalism also connotes a tendency to place a particularly excessive, exaggerated and exclusive emphasis on the value of the nation at the expense of other values, which leads to a vain and importunate overestimation of one's own nation and thus to a detraction of others. Nationalism of this sort stands in the same relation to national feeling or national consciousness as does chauvinism to genuine patriotism. Although it represents but one aspect of national movements, this narrower kind of nationalism, espoused by militant groups and often by mass parties, exercises an enormous political influence.

⁴ Ibid., p. 10, 18-19.
⁶ Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, Vol.11-12, p.231.
Like most political and philosophical conceptions, beliefs in this respect also change regarding the essential elements which form a nation.

The racial element is rejected by modern writers from a view that almost all the nations were mixed with each other in history and a definitely pure race does not exist anywhere. Language is the most important factor in modern nationalism. This element was subject to criticism as well, for the following reasons. Today a Swiss nation exists, but a Swiss language does not. On the contrary, these people speak different languages. From a different point of view there are more than twenty nationalities who all speak Spanish. However, despite all these facts, language remains a major concept from which all the intellectual and spiritual existences of a nation spring. Language is particularly important because it is the cause of racial and political conflicts. Religion is a concept teaching internationalism, and not nationalism. However, under certain circumstances, religion is sometimes directly connected with nationalism. For example, the American clergy during World War II preached nationalism and patriotism instead of solely religious aspects which bear an international character. Nevertheless, especially at the last
stages of history, nationalism began to replace religion, a vacuum which came into existence since the policy of secularism came into being as a natural outcome of nationalism. Thus, being emotional, nationalism was successful in "becoming almost a sort of religion and filling the vacuum in man's soul created by the secularization" which coincided with the emergence of modern nationalism.

First, the main elements which form a nation are thus spiritual conceptions. These abstract notions are common heritage, common problems, hopes, joys and fears. Secondly, the notion of a common aim, a common tradition and culture, plays an important role in this aspect. John Stuart Mill \(^7\) wrote that "the strongest cause for the feeling of nationality (...) is identity of political antecedents: the possession of a national history and consequent community of recollections, collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret connected with the same incidents in the past".

6 W. Theimer, Encyclopaedia of World Politics, London, Faber, p. 301.

Ernest Renan, who has already been mentioned, expressed his view in an interesting way such as Stuart Mill has done. The two essential elements which make up the soul or spiritual principle of a nation are, according to Renan, "possession in common of a rich heritage of memoirs; (...) a heritage of glory and grief to be shared (...) to have suffered, rejoiced and hoped together". It is not hard to conclude from these facts that nationalism at the present stage of history has become a matter of life and death, as well as a dynamic cause of progress for the nations.

Nationalism, now obviously a world-wide phenomenon, vitally affecting both the material and intellectual development of modern civilization, shows itself, as history has already proved, through the will and determination of the people to live independently and to have the right to exist. As stated accurately by Raymond Gettell,

the combination of the idea of sovereignty within the theory of revolutionary rights created the concept of nationalism. The independence of the sovereign state was associated with the right of its people to control their own government; and the doctrine arose that every group that was sufficiently distinct and permanent to have a national character should be permitted to direct its own political destiny.

8 Ibid.

NATIONALISM

During the present stage, nationalism rules the minds of the masses who either demand national sovereignty, or of those who have already achieved it. Those who did not yet achieve this ultimate goal express it under the slogan of "independence" or "self determination". Thus, "nationalism is the ideology which keeps the modern society a going concern and supplies cohesive force within, if not among the national states".

However, although nationalism is one of the most sacred worldly ideologies, it should never be carried to extremes, as by so doing the national feelings of certain other communities would be provoked, and consequently unrest may ensue. By provoking the national sentiments of the German people, Hitler equally provoked the national sentiments of his neighbours and thus became responsible for the crisis. In Turkey, nationalism is kept within moderate limits.

10 "By the way, 'self determination' is not a right but a goal in international politics." - (Mr. Paul Martin, in a speech delivered at the UN Assembly, Third Committee, October 27, 1955.) - Division of External Affairs, Government of Canada, Statements and Speeches, No. 55/39, p. 1.

NATIONALISM

As claimed by Overstreet, nationalism in its beginnings was a liberating force, but it was not long before the development of nations into super powers competing with one another for territory and prestige, turned them into vast military and economic mechanisms controlling the life of citizens. The freedom of the citizen became a freedom to do what his nation permitted him to do. What the nation demanded of its members was the kind of instant and unquestioning struggles with other nations.\(^{12}\)

As will be shown, Turkish nationalism, after being a liberating force, did not turn into the aforementioned form of nationalism, as it always remained peaceful, sober, realistic, cooperative and constructive.

Origin of Nationalism

Thus, although many contemporary authors derive the history of nationalism from the eighteenth century, it would be somewhat inaccurate to state that nationalism in general is a product of these late centuries. If the French Revolution is to be taken as a milestone in the history of the evolution of nationalism, it should not be regarded as a cradle, but rather as the dawn of its re-emergence.

In the study of nationalism, Hans Kohn, although deriving the history of nationalism from the late eighteenth century, and arguing that the first great manifestation of modern nationalism was the French Revolution, does not deny that this concept had its roots deep in the past.

As reported by Raymond Gettell, nationalism existed as a subconscious sentiment until the close of the eighteenth century. It was recognized as a political fact at the partition of Poland in 1772. But national differences began to emerge at the time of the Renaissance. During the medieval period, the Roman ideal of unity in language, religion, law and government persisted, but by the fifteenth century the influence of the geographic features of Europe, the developments of local dialects into modern languages, and the realization of common customs, interests and traditions, began to separate the peoples of Europe into distinct nations. Theoretically the matter


NATIONALISM

could be explained in the following manner. If we accept the existence of the present day, we cannot deny the existence of yesterday as well. Between these two days, both of which are a reality, there is no doubt a dark night. Thus, the same applies to the age of modern nationalism, the past of which is consciousness of kind, and which cannot be denied. Between these two ages there existed a dark era known as the Middle Ages, where this concept of early nationalism was lulled. It is therefore considered somewhat inaccurate to state that nationalism is a product of the recent centuries and did not exist previously. Nationalism existed before the French and English revolutions, and only since has it become a driving force of the domestic and external policies of most of the nations.

Nationalism, however, became more common to mankind only since the French Revolution, and consequently, has since played an increasing role in the international field of politics. The fulcrum of nationalism was searched by several authorities and many of them varied in their conclusions. Among the authors who derived the root of nationalism from the early years of history are Hans Kohn, Carleton Hayes, William Ebenstein, M. Boehm, Sadri Maksudi and Tekin Alp. In quoting an old Turkish proverb which
NATIONALISM

says: "Wherever there is no smoke, there is no fire", it could be similarly argued that wherever there is some doubt there should be some truth. If there is a considerable disagreement on the origins of nationalism, it could be claimed that there should be some truth, at least, in its early origins, in one way or other.

As characterized by Hayes, we can distinguish three kinds of nationalism, that is to say, humanitarian, liberal and integral nationalisms. In the eighteenth century there emerged rather suddenly a philosophy of nationalism, which appeared in the midst of dynastic, popular unrests, and the colonial wars.

It emerged also in the midst of the curious intellectual developments that were equally characteristic of that century. It promised a way of escape from the crazy evils of the time, to a logical millennium of the near future, and faith in just such a millennium was a marked trait of the eighteenth century thought17.

This kind of nationalism was nothing but the humanitarian kind of nationalism "which was the earliest and for some time the only kind of formal nationalism"18.

18 Ibid.
According to the same scholar, the liberal nationalism of the nineteenth century was a fairly intellectual movement throughout Western and Central Europe. It tended to ignore both historic and natural rights. It was chiefly evolutionary, and not reactionary. It stressed the absolute sovereignty of the national state, but sought to limit the implications of this principle by stressing individual liberties, political, economic and religious, within each national state, and the responsibility of all national states for the establishment and maintenance of international peace. Liberal nationalism looked forward to a political map in which each nationality should have an independent state of its own, that is to say, a policy of self-determination. Integral nationalism may be defined as the exclusive pursuit of national policies, the absolute maintenance of national integrity, and the steady increase of national power, for a nation declines when it loses military might. Integral nationalism, as a matter of fact, is hostile to the internationalism preached by humanitarians and liberals. It makes the nation not a means to humanity, not a stepping stone to a new world order, but an end in itself. It puts national interests alike above those of the individual and above those of humanity. It refuses co-oper-
NATIONALISM

ation with other nations except if such co-operation may serve its own interests, real or fancied. It is lingoistic, distrusts other nations, labors to exalt one nation at the expense of others, and relies upon physical force. It is militarist and tends to be imperialistic. In the face of it, a league of nations, or any other international organization for peace and security is threatened with stelirity and destruction. Besides, in domestic affairs, integral nationalism is highly illiberal and tyrannical. It would oblige all citizens to conform to a common standard of manner and morals, and to share the same unreasoning enthusiasm for it. It would subordinate all personal liberties to its own purpose, and if the common people should murmur, it would abridge democracy and gag it. All these things it would do 'in the national interest'.

Regarding the origin of the discussed ideology, it is quite interesting to note the following argument expressed by Carleton J.H. Hayes.

It should not be assumed, however, that there was no consciousness of nationality among civilized peoples in ancient or medieval times. The fusions

19 See also the Encyclopaedia of World Politics, p. 301: "Group feeling that might be described a nationalism in the wide sense may be found in tribal, Graeco Roman, Medieval and other civilizations."
of tribes in an empire or a theocracy often served to create a fairly large community, which can properly be termed a nationality, with kindred language, customs and traditions, whose members, if not supremely loyal to the community as such as a whole, if not as patriotic to it as their forebears had been to their several tribes, were quite aware that they were alike among themselves, and different from foreigners, and on occasion they could evince a real nationalism. These were such occasions in the history of the ancient Egyptians, Jews, Greeks, Armenians, Persians. In the later middle ages acute consciousness of nationality was evidenced, for example, by Italians and Greeks in the fourth Crusade, by Frenchmen and Provencals in the Albigensian crusade, by Slavs and Teutons in their 15th century conflicts and by Frenchmen and Englishmen in the concluding phases of the Hundred Year War.

In one of his more recent books Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism, Hayes wrote that

the ancient Greek had been supremely patriotic about Athens or Sparta, but not about Greece. The ancient Latin speaking Roman had bestowed the utmost patriotic devotion upon the city state of Rome or the whole heterogeneous Roman Empire, but not upon the Latin nationality as such. The mediaeval European had been vastly more patriotic about his own town or his country, or about Christendom as a whole, than about particular national state.

This fact does not weaken our point but, on the contrary, adds strength to it. The author does not deny the


21 Ibid., p. 241, (quoting the above book).
existence of this feeling. Due to the political and social circumstances, the feeling was expressed in a way other than it is at the present.

From historical studies, it is equally obvious that throughout most of the period of recorded history, say from 5000 BC to 1700 AD, and wherever civilization has most advanced, the earlier and primitive tribal nationalism tended to be submerged. To a very large degree it ceased to command the supreme loyalty and patriotism of civilized men.\(^{22}\)

According to the same scholar, what submerged it and long kept it submerged was one or another or a combination of four historical developments which substituted new types of human groupings and new objects of patriotism. One was the advance and diffusion of all the agricultural and industrial arts, the domestication of animals and plants and the expanding use of copper, iron and boats, which emphasized the interdependence of these tribes. Another was the conquest and consolidation of tribes by military empires such as the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Chinese, the Persians, the Romans, or the Arabs. A third was the spread of intertribal religions such as Buddhism, Christianity or Islam. A fourth was the development of literary languages such as Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Chinese, and the employment of these languages by intellectuals of many different tribes in preference to the several tribal dialects of the illiterates.\(^{23}\)

The following idea could be easily added. The reality that nationalism positively existed but was rather

\(^{22}\) Ibid., p. 241.

\(^{23}\) Ibid., p. 240.
Nationalism undermined during the Middle Ages, was largely due to the fact that at that time religion reconciled this feeling. This would not absolutely mean the denial of the existence of nationalism, which existed under a different name: Consciousness of kind. The Renaissance, or rather the Reformation lifted some of the veil and consequently revealed these feelings which were largely undermined. The Reformation was more than a religious movement. It was to a large extent a national movement. As claimed by Sadri Maksudi seventeen centuries BC, the struggle between the native Egyptian Thebes and the invading Hyoskos (Shepherd King) tribe ended with the victory of the Egyptians. This could easily be explained by an early nationalist feeling.

Secondly, the reason the Sumerians fought the Akkads, who intended to settle in southern Mesopotamia (forty centuries BC), was the very same. The cause of their rivalry was not only an economic one, but a rivalry to dominate the country. The abstract cause which led these people to fight was mainly the consciousness of Sammiism and Sumerism, two

24
A tribe of Turanian descent.
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A tribe of Salian descent.
entirely different consciousnesses with two different languages and cultures. Another example could be found in the Hundred Year War. The French national consciousness awoke during the Hundred Year War as a result of the English aim of destroying France, and again after the French Revolution. In the same manner, the Greek resistance and consequently the victory over the Persians can be explained by the existence of a Hellenic feeling and hatred caused by their subjugation by the Persian invaders. This feeling can be easily explained as a group feeling, a subconscious sentiment of kind, i.e., as a subconscious nationalism.

Coming to the Turks, we can observe that wars among the various Turkish tribes in Central Asia were frequent. They were as frequent as wars against the Chinese Empire. After the death of their father, the sons used to fight between themselves. (Such was the cause after the death of Genghis Khan.) The Khans used to fight one another to dominate the other's country. Thus, history has always recorded these wars among the Turks, while the wars with

In these wars Joan of Arc became a symbol of French nascent and national consciousness.
China were recorded as Turco-Chinese Wars\textsuperscript{27}. Thus, if there were no factors separating these two peoples, making them conscious of themselves, how was this distinction done? There were surely factors which made these people two different communities. These elements could be found in the Turkish way of life, language, tradition, laws and customs, and the same idea applies naturally to the Chinese as well.

Furthermore, if liberal allowance has been made for these evidences of a historic development of nationalism which followed the primitive tribalism, "the fact remains that it was more spasmodic and less commanding"\textsuperscript{28}. Hence the formation of various nations came into being as a result of the awakening of their national consciousness. Nationalism existed in the ancient times, but not in the same understanding as accepted by modern philosophy at the present stage.

It should be admitted that nationalism, in these earlier years, did not exist in the meaning which is accepted at the present. By then it was rather a subconscious

\textsuperscript{27} In this respect it is interesting to note that the famous Chinese Walls were built against any Turkish attacks.

\textsuperscript{28} Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, p. 241.
matter, a matter of consciousness of kind or group feeling. If nationalism did not exist in the proper sense as understood today by modern philosophy, at least certain national elements existed definitely. Consciousness of kind, or group feeling, is the root from which modern nationalism emerged, and in this case Turkey is definitely not an exception.

In modern times and with continuously waxing strength since the 17th century nationalism has re-emerged, first in Europe and then in other continents. It is akin to primitive tribalism, in that it directs the supreme loyalty of its adherents to a community of language, customs, and historic traditions. But it differs from primitive tribalism in noteworthy respects. Instead of being based on a small group of persons, banded together by actual blood relationship and identity of religious practices and economic interests, it is based on a relatively large group of persons connected very distantly, if at all, by blood, professing almost any religion, or none at all, and having widely divergent economic interests. Modern nationalism, depending on larger units and being less substantial than primitive tribalism, is more artificially engendered and propagated; it relies more on conscious purposefulness on the written and especially on the printed word and on a special kind of mass education.

Nature of Nationalism

Although nationalism is essentially exclusive and emotional, and its main character is aggressiveness (chau-

Ibid.
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Vinism, racialism, imperialism), the nationalism as preached in certain civilized and cultured countries could be rather "federalist, liberal, democratic, pacifist, idealist and mainly rational"^30.

First, nationalism could be, as was the case in the early years of its re-emergence, democratic as well as humanitarian. "In the first half of its existence, from the late eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century, nationalism was essentially inspired by humanitarian democratic ideas, and this was the story of French, American, Czech, Italian, Irish and Polish nationalism"^31.

Only towards the end of the nineteenth century it became parochial, intolerant, bigoted, persecutive and, finally, imperialistic as well as aggressive. It is a curious phenomenon that the new Turkish nationalism, in other terms Kemalism, though a twentieth century nationalism, is a humanitarian democratic nationalism, and does not resemble certain contemporary aggressive nationalist doctrines such as Fascism, National Socialism, Shintoism or Sovietism.

---


Modern nationalism is federalist, as it is aimed at creating large units of people. Modern nationalism is a step higher than feudalism, and its second step is a supra national state. Is this goal going to be achieved? Did the UN open the path to such an end? As this matter is a problem by itself, and out of our concern, its study is disregarded. Nationalism could be conservative. If today it is aggressive, that is the result of the twentieth century political and economic ideas. Nationalism was conservative. Today, because of political and mainly because of economic reasons, its ill-conceptions, racialism, were put into effect. Lebensraum took its root from economic reasons. Turkish nationalism is especially important at the present stage of history, as it differs from other nationalistic conceptions in being rational, sober, conservative and democratic. The English and French revolutions were democratic as well, and it is therefore easy to believe in democratic nationalism. "Like Irish and Czech nationalism, Jewish nationalism too has aimed at national freedom and democracy, and not at the conquest or suppression of other nations".  

32 Ibid., p. 659.
Before concluding the study on the nature of nationalism, it would be worth while to study whether nationalism is aggressive or peaceful in its very nature. In our theoretical approach we observe that Mazzini had quite peaceful ideas. Giuseppe Mazzini, the father of nationalism, in his Pact and Fraternity wrote that nations do have certain missions, but these missions are not imperialistic ones, but missions toward a common goal of a fraternally united mankind. Speaking to a certain extent about Czech nationalism, it would be worthwhile to quote certain ideas of Thomas G. Masaryk, father of Czech nationalism.

Between the love of one's nation, the love for one's country, and humanity, there is no disagreement; as it is between modern nationalism and humanity. Already that the new and foreign word indicates that patriotism as our revivalists demanded it and lived it is something different from the nationalism of today. As far as our programme is concerned, remember that I told you with regard to the development of Europe and to our own history, that is, we must take a hand in world politics and consequently be in lively and friendly contact with other nations. Our national revival is

33 Patriotism appeals to all residents of a country, regardless of their ethnic background.
Nationalism appeals to all members of an ethnic unit, regardless of their country of residence.
a child of Enlightenment and of late Romanticism; it sprang from the humanitarian ideals of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries which were broadcast in France, Germany, everywhere. Humanity, that is too our national programme, the programme of Dobrovsky, Havlicek and of Komensky in his day, of our kings George and Charles and of St. Venceslas. Humanity does not exclude or weaken the love for one's nation. I can, nay, I must love my nation positively, but because of thatindeed not hate other nations. True love is not proven by hatred, but only by love. Mankind is a sum of nations, it is not something outside the nations and above them (...) If I ask politics to serve mankind, I do not infer that they ought not to be national, but just decent. That's all 34.

Is it necessary to add anything more after having quoted all these sincere words and this advice, which the world at the present stage needs more than ever before? The significance of modern Turkish nationalism could be once more pointed out. There is a certain analogy between Czech nationalism, as outlined by Masaryk, and modern Turkish nationalism, humanitarian as it is, the latter, however, much more positive and realistic. Like Czech 35, Finnish or

34 Ibid., p. 569.

35 Due to its analogy with modern Turkish nationalism, we would like to note as briefly as possible a few notes regarding the rise of modern Czech nationalism: The Czechs, since several centuries had a culture of their own. During the second century several works were written in this language, amongst which the Chrinique de Dalimil could be mentioned. In the seventeenth century the Czechs lost their
Jewish (Zionism) nationalisms and many others, modern Turkish nationalism has also its root in the early Turkish culture; however, this tendency is much more explicitly marked in the latter. Similarly, the Turks had undergone notable changes, though their country was not occupied by an alien force. However, they also partly went on different lines than their ancestors. The matter shall be studied in detail on our further pages. The historical roots of Turkish nationalism shall be studied under four aspects:

(1) Language. Because it would be accurate to say, despite the criticisms directed towards this aspect, "a linguistic independence is a preliminary to a political sovereignty". Language is closely related with script. Therefore, importance shall be put on this subject as well.

independence, when Ferdinand II conquered the country. Since then, the Czechs were rather forced to forget their subconscious nationality, their own culture and history, and many Czechs did lose their identity. During the nineteenth century everyone, including the Prussians, believed that a Czech people do not exist any more. However, this belief was quite false, as the national feeling was only eclipsed, and was not dead at all. Certain personalities such as Dobrovsky (1753-1828), Jungman (1773-1847), Celakovsky, and especially Tomek, had great influence in reviving the ancient Czech history. People became nationally conscious once again. The cultural awakening resulted in the political independence, completed by T.G. Masaryk.

(2) Religion. Rather as a cause which dilutes the national unity of a country into a much broader concept not identical with national consciousness.

(3) History. As an inseparable companion of political theory. Without its aid, the reasons of the ideas of many philosophers or writers, or the activities of statesmen would not be clearly understood.

(4) Soil. The transformation of being nomads into settlers. Nomads could hardly be conscious and devoted to a specific territory.
CHAPTER II

PATRIARCHAL TURKISH SOCIETY

"The Turk is the noblest of the nobles. This nobility is not artificial or showy - it is the gift of nature."

Pierre Loti

The motherland of the Turks, who racially show an intermixture of Mediterranean and Aryan race, is Central Asia. The first Turks lived between the Aral Sea and the Gobi Desert, and expanded later. In different periods of history these Turks formed vast empires in this area, covering a territory from the Yellow Sea in the east, to the Caspian Sea in the west. Among them, the Kiptchacks, Ouygurs, Iskits, Huns, Sky Turks (Gok Turk)\(^1\), Gaznes, Harzems Oghuus, and the Empire of Tamerlane, are the best known ones.

\(^1\) It is believed that the term 'Turk' derived its origin from the term Tuk-\(\text{yu}\)\(^1\), as the Chinese used to call the Sky Turks. Since the Chinese are unable to spell the letter 'r', the word could easily be considered as Turk.
Turanian Unity

The Central Asian Turks, because of uniting all the various Turkish tribes under a single flag, formed practically a unit, physically as well as consciously, the so-named: Turan\(^2\). Now our concern will be concentrated on the sociological aspects of these Turkish tribes, that is to say, the Patriarchal Turks.

Due to the fact that the Central Asian Turks were united under a single flag, and, as a consequence, played an important role in the earlier years of history, it would be fitting to mention a few incidents relating to Attila and Mete, the best known khans of the Huns, a Turkish patriarchal tribe.

Both Mete and Attila formed a Turkish unity in Central Asia at different periods of history. While Mete created this unity through bloodshed, by clambering over the bodies of most of his close relatives, including his parents, Attila succeeded much better by approaching the problem in a psychological manner.

\(^2\) Turanism was the twentieth century tendency attempted in World War I, and derived its claim from this historical basis.
Attila, who aimed to unite all the Turks in different parts of Central Asia, and under the rule of different khans and flags, first sought to realize the Turanian unity in a spiritual manner instead of a physical one. After having appeared on the stage, his first work was to travel all across the Turkish lands in order to preach the need of 'brotherhood', so that they might succeed in dominating the world. He announced himself as a sacred soul (tanrikutu), or in other terms shan-yu, as the Chinese used to say. The people had deep faith in him and, as a result, followed him sincerely. While marching on the enemy, Attila, in his early years, had under his command people of the same customs, people who spoke the same language and, finally, who had the very same patriarchal tendencies.

Attila and Mete, as well as Jingiz, are those patriarchal Turkish rulers who symbolize the early Turkish society, especially because they created a Turanian unity which deeply affected the course of history. In these domains, where the people were united under a single flag, the sole rule which dominated the lives of the individuals, was the Ture and the Yasa. How could this be explained, if not by consciousness of kind or group feeling. It was this spiritual strength, this group feeling, which gave power to the
early patriarchal Turkish people. For the purpose of emphasizing the value of this feeling, a later stage of the Hun Empire should be noted. After having expanded in the east, but mainly in the west, Attila accepted foreigners into his armies and used them as foreign mercenaries. The sole aim of these non-Turks, that is to say of the Scandinavians, Germans and Slavs, was nothing else but to loot the conquered countries. In other words, they possessed none of the ideals that the Huns did. As the consequence of this mixture, the morality of the Huns was completely ruined. It should be pointed out that the blame should not be put upon these alien peoples. Had the Germans, Slavs or Scandinavians been in the Huns' place, and hired foreign mercenaries, their fate would have been most probably the very same.

Civilization

Research shows that the early Turks had a highly developed civilization while their contemporaries were far more primitive. The discoveries at Anav (near Ashakabat) of certain materials which were unknown to other tribes in the other parts of the globe, show this explicitly. Material, such as copper, was used for making of various objects, macis made of flints and mill stones, which existed 5000 -
4000 years before Christ, show how highly was developed the Central Asian civilization. This civilization was well spread, and could be found in many parts of that area.

Music, literature, poetry, all these form the culture of a nation. If different nations have different music, customs, poetry, literature, etc., it does mean that they have a distinct culture of their own. It is needless, and useless to try to compare one culture with another, which might be a mystery in the history of civilization.

Famous or not, civilized or uncivilized, a certain culture would still be a culture of those people alone. Consciously or unconsciously they would say: "It is my song, my music, my literature, my poem, my language, my custom, my law, - and not his". Such sayings form a major part of the basic principles of nationalism, and a student of early Turkish history would be able to note that such sayings existed among the people despite the early age. In those days, nationalism, in the modern sense, did not exist. But "the feeling of a common culture existed which, quite possibly, might have influenced the emergence of the national spirit".

All these facts prove that a democratic feeling, as well as a group feeling were very strong among the early Turks and made them nationally conscious by themselves, and in opposition to others.

However, these early Turanian states collapsed as a result of the Chinese influence and intrigues. Nevertheless, history proved that these Turks never hesitated to liberate themselves from the foreign yoke, and that they often formed new states. The Babur, Humayun, Akbar, Sky Turk, Hun, Şahîçihan, and the Empires of Cingiz as well as that of Tamerlane, are among the noteworthy early Turkish empires.

An interesting and unavoidable example which might prove the existence of a group feeling among the early patriarchal Turks can be found in the form of two statues which were erected during the years 832-833 AD. These two statues, erected by Orkhon Khan, stand even today near the Baykal Lake, the very same place where they were erected. As their existence can hardly be denied, they can be accepted as a proof of the national consciousness or group feeling, found in those early days.

Bay in Turkish signifies 'Sir', kal signifies 'remain'.
In order to have a clear picture about the inscriptions, it is deemed necessary to note, at least briefly, the historical background of these two statues.

Like Tuny-Yapgu Khan, Bumin and Istemi Khans were the rulers of the Eastern Sky Turks. After the partitioning and after a period of foreign domination, i.e., living under the Chinese yoke for fifty years, these Sky Turks rebelled against the Chinese under the leadership of Kutluk Kagan and his famous minister, Tonyu-kuk. The people were liberated, and the grandchildren, Bumin and Istemi Khans, erected the Orkhon statues in memory of their grandfather Kutluk Kagan and also as a symbol of liberty and freedom.

The inscription, which have a great deal of importance, read as follows:

After the blue firmament and the mysterious earth were created, man was created. Over all my ancestors, Bumin and Istemi Khans, were masters. After becoming rulers, they governed the Turkish State, and applied Turkish laws. Completely surrounding the country were many enemies. By waging wars, the Turks forced these neighbors into submission. They were great and wise khans... We had a state, we were a nation; where is our state now? We were a nation that had its own Khan; where is our Khan now? For what state and for whom are we using our powers? Thus the Turks became the enemies of the

---

Chinese rule. They wished to destroy the Turkish nation and dry its progeny. But the Turkish god and the Yersu spirit did not wish it in this way. They proclaimed that the Turks should not disappear, but become a nation. Hence for the realization of this manifest destiny, the god and the Yersu spirit made Iltiris the Khan. In order to avoid the vanishing of the name and reputation of the Turkish nation, they promoted my father and mother to khan and hatun. Because of my devotion to the Turkish nation, and to secure and endure the name and reputation of the Turkish nation, I, too, passed my nights without sleep and my days without rest.

Thus, any reader of the Orkhon inscriptions would certainly agree that the Turks as early as the eight century were quite aware of their distinct personality, that is to say, they had a primitive feeling of consciousness.

Character

The early Turks were, by nature, warriors, brave and honest fighters. They had a great love of justice and truth. Like all primitive tribesmen, they had a complete loyalty to the rigid laws of their society and an unshake-

6  
Yer signifies earth and su signifies water.
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able faith in their rulers, kagan or khan. Respect for the women and love for the youngsters was a deeply rooted habit. Mercy for victims and helpless persons was as well a basic principle.

The early Turks were populists as well. The case could easily be observed in the Toy and Sollen ceremonies, where all the members of the tribe used to be entertained at parties given by the princes or dignitaries. Rich or poor, every man was automatically invited. The early Turks were therefore populists, that is to say, democratic and moreover humanistic.

Populism is a major factor which constitutes the Turkish character. It can be claimed that populism, to a great extent, was not abandoned despite the alien influences, marked in the following centuries. The Turks, since

---

8 This historical fact would be of some interest if not deep concern. While the Central Asian Turks were coming to settle Anatolia, a tribe of them witnessed a battle being fought near the present-day Ankara. One side was on its retreat. By nature, being warriors, and feeling sorry for the defeated and considering it disgraceful not to aid the helpless, these new coming Turks intervened in the battle in favor of the retreating forces, without knowing, however, who was who. The tide of the battle changed. Thus, the victors were the Seljuki Turks, while the defeated were the Mongols. As a prize, the Seljuki Turks granted to these nomad Turks a territory near Byzance, thus making them a buffer state. These Turks were the Kayii tribe from the Oghuz Turks, who in the following years formed the Ottoman Empire (1299).
While ending this brief point, it would be interesting to note an article written by Thumama B. Ashras:

The Turks are afraid of nothing; it is their foes who are intimidated. When Turks want something, they do not draw back their hands before getting it. And they would not seek worthless goals. Their pride is great. Whatever they plan to do, they do. They do not seek after the impossible. The literature of Basra (Basorah), the wisdom of Greece, and the art of China are old to the Turks. Turks are open hearted. They don't hold prejudices and mean ideas. The Turkish language is as impressive as the bodies and voices of the Turks. Every Turk sees himself as a lion, his foe as a prey, and his horse as an antelope...

Life - Religion

Loyalty to the land and especially to the khan, i.e., the sovereign, was the main concern and aim of the people. The khan was considered the living representative of the gods, a similar concept to the Western belief of the Divine Right of Kings. However, it must be stressed that this concept differed from the Western concept, as the ruler in the Turkish society did not have absolutew

rights. The rule of the khan - kagan - was never absolute, since in his decisions he used to get the approval of a council, - Kamutay.

The dominant pre-Islamic religion was Shamanism, the belief that the gods are mobile and show themselves from time to time in various forms, such as fire or thunderstorms. These gods, according to the Shamanist belief, used to live in certain 'totems' and all things they touched, became sacred. As these gods were considered to be the ancestors, Shamanism could be named as a religion of ancestral worship.

The early Turks, in general, considered wolf as their ancestor and therefore used to pray to this animal. The head of a wolf was their symbol. Even in this fact, we may observe how deeply the Turks respected their ancestors.

In general, the Turks believed in three different gods. The most powerful was the Sky god (Gok tanri); the Earth god (Yagiz yer) and finally, the god of War and Family. However, the Turks "never gave a place to religion in their social life"\(^\text{10}\), such as Berkhausen pretended, "the Turks (...) were indifferent to religious rules"\(^\text{11}\).

---


11 Ibid.
However, one should not carry this argument to the extreme, because then the existence of the aforementioned gods would be denied.

Thus, it would suffice to say that the early Turks were strictly secular.

Position of Women

The position of women among the early Turks is of most interesting nature. Without going into detail, a few facts can easily show the traces of the early democracy which existed in the primitive Turkish societies.

The Hatun, i.e., the wife of the Hakan (Kagan or Khan), had equal rights with her husband. Each imperial order began in the following manner: "The Khan and the Hatun declare that...". A treaty was not valid unless it included the signature of the Hatun. The Khan was always accompanied by his wife regardless of where he went, even on the battlefield. The Khan was practically incapable of receiving any ambassador, unless in the presence of his wife, the Hatun.

Ibn-Batuta, the famous Arabian traveller, expressed great surprise in his books when he wrote: "I saw among
the Turks) something curious. Here women are respected. They are even more highly considered than the men."¹²

The same traveller wrote: "The Khan used to seat his wife on the throne, before he, himself, was seated."¹³

More striking for him was the fact that, during his visit to the Ottoman capital, at that time Bursa, he was received by the wife of the Sultan, while her husband was absent¹⁴.

Ibn-Batuta confesses further that he "thought that it was a servant and not a husband who used to walk with a woman in the streets"¹⁵.

Another important fact was that the early Turks, unlike Arabs, used to welcome the birth of a girl. The Turkish women were definitely unveiled, and played an active role in the social life of the patriarchal Turkish society.

---

¹² Necmeddin Sadak, Sosyoloji, Ankara, Milli Egitim Basimevi, 1949, p. 130.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Halide Edip, Turkey Faces West, New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press, 1930, p. 6.

From this point of view, the early Turks, unlike the Arabs, were quite humanitarian and democratic. This democratic spirit changed to a remarkable extent following the influence of the Arabs. As Grenard in his treatise Le Turkestan et le Tibet reports that, among the present Central Asian Turks, the patriarchal Turkish spirit still exists as lively as it existed before. Accordingly, the reason was that the Arabic influence had not penetrated this region, where these Turks still keep the early customs and traditions. This report could be based upon the fact that these Turks were successful in avoiding alien influences. Perhaps the great distance was a protection against Arabic influence.

Grenard is surprised to note that, although being Islamic, the Turkish women in Central Asian district enjoy great respect and that young people who get married have usually known each other for a long period and do not marry blindly at the behest of their parents, as was the case with the Arabs and Persians.

But after a few centuries, the Ottoman Turks lost their true nature and fell under the influence of Arabia, Persia and Byzantium, which were no samples of purity at all.
However, Halide Edip reports that there were certain regions in Anadolu itself where the Turks did not change significantly, partly disregarded certain Islamic teachings. According to her interesting reports, there are Turkish nomad tribes called the Yuruks, living at the present time in Turkey, in the Adalia and Smyrna mountains, who reveal how greatly they differ from the settled peasantry in the position of women. Both are Moslems, (...) but the settled Anatolian peasantry have been altered by other influences, while the nomads are as they used to be centuries ago. Theirs is a society which would delight the soul of the western feminist in some respects. The women are not veiled, polygamy and divorce are practically unknown, marriage is the outcome of long intercourse and free choice. Women are on equal footing with men in every respect, being responsible in social and tribal affairs as well as in personal morals. However, this was only in a certain small locality, as the whole nature shall change to a great extent in time.

Law

The early Turks were strictly bound to their unwritten laws. The Ture stated that the kagan was bound to rule the people according to their wishes. Accordingly, he used to be elected in a rather democratic manner by the

16 Halide Edip, Turkey Faces West, p. 6.
Kamutay, i.e., a council. This council was elected by the people themselves. This fact clearly proves that the early Turks were democratic in their way of life. The ruler, i.e., the kagan, was considered the Head of the State, but, at the same time, the servant of his subjects.

The **Ture** contained the customs existing for centuries. The election of the khan by a council was a rule of the **Ture**. According to the same **Ture**, the khan was compelled to rule his subjects according to the wishes of the majority. The clause set forth by the revolutionaries of the French Revolution in 1789, existed among the Turkish people long before this date. However, as the Khan was considered theoretically as having been elected by the gods as well, the Turks combined the theories of aristocracy and democracy. The declaration of war, according to the **Ture**, was a matter up to the Khan. The appointment of the army leaders and other important decisions had to be approved by the Kamutay.

Leon Cahun, in his celebrated work **L'Historire de l'Asie**, wrote

From the first century until the present, Asia has been undergoing a transformation more profound than that of Europe. The most decisive changes occurred between the fifth and the thirteenth centuries, with the Turkish people as the main and most energetic factor... The Turkish kings were quite different from the "people eater" kings of some other nations. The Turkish kagan cared for his people. He believed that his mission in life as king was to feed the hungry, to dress the naked, and make prosperous the poor... For this purpose the kagans did not rest at night and did not know rest during the day; they had other missions to fulfil. The Turkish kagans did fight and work day and night for the great fame of the Turks and for national glory. The Egyptian Pharaoh, the Persian emperor or the Assyrian king would slaughter people just to celebrate their own glory and to show the power of their gods; the Turkish kagan would think only of the prosperity of his nation. Remarkable philosophy for the eighth century...

The well expressed statement of Leon Cahun is in full accordance with the ancestral spirit as can easily be observed in the early Turkish laws, customs and traditions, (toy and sholen) as well as with the inscriptions of the Orkhon statues.

The Yasa, was the general law which no one dared to abuse, as the slightest abuse resulted in the death penalty for the guilty person. A rather striking but true

18 Yasa in Turkish (old and contemporary) means law. At the present time Ana Yasa means Constitutional Law. (Ana signifies 'mother'.) Moreover it is believed that the term yasak (forbidden) derives its origin from the term yasa.
fact was that, according to the Yasa, a rider was supposed to offer his help to a person who dropped his bag. If in any case a rider failed to offer his help, he was sentenced to death. The kagan was considered the chief servant of the Yasa.

The patriarchal Turks were powerful, strong, and built lasting empires as long as they obeyed loyally and strictly these laws which, in general, were named the Oghuzname.

Ozans

The Ozans were the equivalent of the troubadours. They played an unquestionably important role in the Turkish life and way of thinking. Being usually good poets and musicians, they travelled across the land, preaching loyalty to the Khan, and country. The Ozans, besides being poets and musicians, were at the same time magicians, astrologers, etc. With their talent for speaking, they used to remind their audiences, among whom the Khan had a special place, of the ancient heroic victories of their ancestors. They used to read mythologic stories, sing ballads concerning the Ture and Yasa. After having noted
the nature of these laws, the importance of these Ozans becomes apparent. By these acts, the pride of the people was nourished.

In general, the Ozans used to teach the necessity of unity, and group feeling. The music they played, the poems they recited, were the property of the people, and not copied from aliens.

Due to the climatic change, the ancestral Turks were compelled to migrate from their motherland. The great sea which once existed dried up, and as a consequence of the intolerable dryness, the people had no other alternative but to leave the formerly fertile soil which turned into desert. Regardless of how much the people were devoted to this motherland, the physical change prevented them from living there longer. Consequently, the well known, great and deeply effective Turkish migration to the west, to the east and to the south began.

Although these migrating Turks conquered most of the territories they passed, and although they were the

---

19 The National Historical Thesis of the Kemalist era, which shall be discussed in our further chapters, derives its historical basis from these events. Accordingly, there is an unbroken thread of purposeful development from the earliest known Turks straight to modern Ankara.
dominating element and the undisputable victors, they acted quite mercifully toward the people they defeated. These early nomad Turks had unbreakable laws, and customs of their own. It must be admitted that people in certain regions had a finer culture, but they were lacking the strong unity to which the nomad Turks were accustomed. These Turks owed a great part of this unity to their natural character and to their laws. "The conquerors had unwritten laws, unviolable customs, rules of order and security, high ethical principles which proved to be more effective than the written laws, fine culture and civilization of the natives." \(^{20}\)

The victors, proud of their victories, used to live a life of their own, did not mix with the natives, used to marry among themselves, and consequently the natives were left to their own way of life. According to Brion, "Attila did not impose his own laws and customs on the defeated. He did not imitate his cruel contemporaries, who used to impose tyrannical rule on the victim." \(^{21}\). Thus, on the very


same land, two entirely different communities lived side by side. This could be explained, of course, by the existence of a sort of consciousness, i.e., a distinct consciousness among the early Turks which made them different from the other communities.

Following this brief survey of the ancestral spirit of the early patriarchal Turkish society, it would become possible to study the sociological changes which occurred in the following centuries.
CHAPTER III

EVOLUTION UNDER ALIEN INFLUENCES

In the previous chapter, a brief survey of the Turkish ancestral spirit was made. A study of the changes and causes affecting the Turkish society during the Ottoman era is now to be undertaken. Montesquieu once wrote that in every nation there are certain general reasons - motives - which would cause its rise or which would slow down the progress, or would lead it to decline and collapse. If a state, as a consequence of an encountered battle would perish, that is to say, because of a special reason (a direct cause), there would surely exist general reasons which actually must have caused the collapse.¹

From a study of the historic development of the Ottoman Empire, it may be seen that the State followed to a certain extent the pattern outlined in the aforementioned statement by Montesquieu. The Ottoman Empire rose and expanded quickly but came to an era of inactivity, followed by a complete collapse at the end of World War I. This war was not and could not be the sole reason for the Empire's

disintegration. There were certain general reasons which had developed long before the outbreak of World War I. That is why, in this chapter, we will try to outline these general causes so as to draw the historical background and to make understandable the essence and core of Kemalism as a reformist movement which led to the foundation of the modern nationalist Turkish State. Moreover, this chapter is of special importance as it also deals with the motives which caused the changes, as well as with the general outlook of the Turkish society in comparison with the early patriarchal one.

Before proceeding to the analysis, it should be strongly emphasized that any criticisms in the following pages with regard to the theologians is absolutely not directed against all theologians in general, but merely against the Islamic religious teachers, the Ulema and mollahs, that is to say, those who shared a great responsibility for the decay of the Ottoman Empire.

According to the greater majority of the Turkish authorities, religious theocracy and the Arabic influences

---

2 Ulema, as a technical term, was applied collectively to all religious functionaries of every grade.
were the major causes which led to the destruction of the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, let us examine the gradual change which the Turkish people underwent as a consequence of their being Islamized. The religious aspect is particularly important because in its wake it brought Asiatic mysticism, alien customs and traditions, and contributed to the lulling of the Turkish national consciousness. Nevertheless, it would be false to consider Islam, or rather the religious phenomena, as the sole cause for the changes. While the Arabic and Persian influence caused profound changes in the Turkish mind and way of life, the Byzantine Empire also was not an exception in aiding these non-Turkish countries in influencing the Turkish minds in their social lives.

Among the other factors which caused the decay were the gradual mixture of foreign blood and the weak policy of the integration of the minorities. The only integration, or rather Turkification of the minorities was realized through the Janizaries, the so-called tribute children, who were trained and educated in a special way.

In the present era the Turks are no longer in their motherland, but far away from her. They are no longer nomads, but settlers. Moreover, they are not Shamanists,
but have adopted the Islamic religion. It would be impossible to understand the secular policy followed by modern Turkish nationalism, unless the Islamic, Arabic and Persian influences were to be studied in the historical context. Time, religion, geography, foreign culture, alien customs and surroundings, are forces which influence every community, society or nation and consequently cause gradual and inevitable changes. No matter how homogeneous a society is, it could hardly protect itself from the influence of such social forces. With time, and under the impact of external causes, such as heat and cold, sun and water, even solid rocks crack, or irons become rusty.

It could hardly be said that human nature is stronger than these rocks, and would be able to avoid continuous alien influences. Thus, the ancestral spirit of the Turkish people, no matter how deeply rooted, was subject to a certain gradual change and transformation, such as would be the case in other societies as well.

After the Turks entered Anatolia in 1071, when the Selçuki ruler, Alp Arslan, defeated the Byzantine Emperor at the battle of Malazgirt, and then fell into the boiling pot of Near Eastern religion and culture, two different types of Turks emerged, types which vastly differed between each other.
The Imperialist Ottomans, that is the ruling class, the class with the willpower and the doctrines to build a lasting empire, were incontestably the moving force of the Empire to the end of the nineteenth century. They were a composite but a very clear-minded class from the very beginning. As long as this clear-mindedness lasted, as long as they were consistent in their doctrines for the state and the society as well, their power lasted in Asia, the Near East and Europe as well.

Their fundamental idea was not to base the state on race. Race, they felt, had nothing to do with it. The state was a geographical entity, with no end to people of mixed origins and cultures, and hence the common tie could be only a political one. Here, undoubtedly, we can mark a grave mistake, a mistake which was a major cause in the disintegration of the Empire. Even if the people were mixed on various grounds, they had to be educated in a single manner in order to build a lasting empire. As an auxiliary means of the classification of the groups they adopted a religious identification. Even the name of race was to be kept out. Hence they dropped their racial name, Turk, and replaced it by the name of Ottoman. This was a political name. They tried to get away from the tradition and the
culture of the race as well. To them, the Turkish element which had come with them, or had been in the country before their arrival, was merely a part of the human material of the newly founded state. The Turk was not considered the laster of the state. A common Turk meant nothing more than a common Greek, Bulgarian, Serb, or Persian. Even the imperialistic Ottoman Turks regarded them as inferior and not as the real owners of the country. The Imperialist Ottomans used to insult the real Turkish citizens by the term 'donkey Turk' or 'rude Turk'. Thus the real Turk, the Turk with all the ancestral heritage was left alone and perhaps had no other alternative but to become fatalistic and mystic. It was to be only Kemal Ataturk, who by awakening the national feelings of these real Turks and by initiating the motto 'How fortunate to say I am a Turk', would replace the humiliation with pride.

Before marking the evolution and the fate of the Turkish society under the influence of the Islamic thought, it would perhaps be useful to note certain aspects of the Islamic religion which preached anti-nationalism, and with which Arabic influence entered the Turkish society.

According to Hans Kohn, the Islamic religion does not provide merely a creed and a culture such as Christian-
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ity does, but also a common law, a central sovereignty and a social system. Unlike Christianity, Islam has but one sword. This might be one of the reasons why, in this religion, a struggle for power, a controversy, did not take place such as in the West. Moreover, in the Ottoman Empire the temporal leader (Sultan) was at the very same time the spiritual leader of all Moslems in the world (Caliph). Nevertheless, an artificially created religious group did not hesitate to demand an effective authority in the state functions. Islam, according to the same author, being more than a religion, includes legal and social principles and thus became the source of all order in public and private life. However, on the other hand,

Christianity, in accepting the succession to the Roman Empire, was led from the outset to acknowledge, in addition to canon law, a secular law springing from a source independent of the former and preceding it in date. The Roman Empire adopted the Christian religion. Mohamadanism, on the contrary, created its own Empire. Neither the public nor the private law of Mohammedan states could be discovered and developed anywhere but in the authority and interpretation of the sacred Scriptures.

The following argument of A.R. Valler is surely interesting. Summarily, Valler argues that

---

the penetration of the Norman language, literature and culture into Britain presented obstacles which changed the course of the flowing waters into more useful channels. These obstacles disappeared in time, and the ideas continued to flow in their normal way. Then it was noticed that the main sources were not harmed and on the contrary, new sources, with fresh streams supported the old main source. 

Although a similarity between this case and the formation of the Turkish Synthetic spirit is noticed by Halide Edip, still a great difference existed which could hardly be denied.

**Synthetic Spirit**

Because of its connection with the further developments of the Turkish society and in order to be able to observe the formation of what is called the Arabo-Turco Synthetic spirit, it would perhaps be useful to mention a historical event which no doubt would interest us indirectly.

Halide Edip, in analysing the formation of the British nation argued thusly:

---


Before the Norman invasion the English element was composed almost completely of the Teutons. The Anglo-Saxons who invaded Great Britain in the fifth century faced several invasions from their racial brothers, the Scandinavians, and especially from the Danes. Until the time of the Norman invasion they had only the Teutonic blood in their veins. After this Norman invasion, the ideas which dominated their humanity and civilization were the southern ideas, which signify that their material being was mixed with Norman, (Teutons and Normans in all classes intermarry), and their morality was kneaded with southern European and Christian influences. However, the Northern Teutonic humour did not hesitate to stamp these southern ideas - including Christianity - and the southern civilization with its own marks.

In order to adopt Islam, the Turks were neither physically conquered as was the case with the Czechs, nor faced with an invasion as was the case with the English. The Turks, however, were mentally conquered by an invasion which may be justly called an intellectual invasion whose consequence was naturally felt deeper. This mental invasion was more powerful than the above mentioned physical invasion, as it was undertaken in the name of God and religion. Thus, new elements entered into the Turkish society, elements which channelled the thinking of the Turkish mind in rather a mystic way, instead of leading it to perfection such as was the case in Great Britain.

Religion is a useful phenomenon in creating a civilization and culture. However, its misunderstanding of
Islam showed Islam as a religion opposing any progress. The Turkish intelligentsia shall be saved when these destructive obstacles are lifted by Kemal Ataturk and his regime.

Thus, with regard to the nomadic example, another similarity existed between the two cases. The Turkish nomads migrating to the west, were mixed with various peoples of different descent. Although teaching their own culture and tradition to the natives, the Turks being in a minority, were more influenced themselves. Such was the case in Mesopotamia, Arabia, North Africa and Europe.

The explanation of this change in the Turks was that they were far away from their homeland, besides being under alien influences and mainly being more or less in the minority as already mentioned. However, the influence of the Arabic culture among the Ottoman Turks was not as deep as is generally thought. This influence, being superficial and artificial, caused only the emergence of an artificial Turko-Arabie synthetic spirit, which was easily lifted by the Kemalist regime.

After the acceptance of Islam by the Turks, the original or the true Turkish ancestral spirit began to decay continuously. "The first blow to the ancestral spirit came from Satok Bogra Khan, a Turkish ruler, who by adopting the
Islamic religion opened the path to a religious era. It should be emphasized that, in comparison with Shamanism, the new religion adopted by the Turks was not in contrast with their character. As history has proven, it suited the Turkish character as long as religious misunderstandings and misinterpretations did not enter into the picture. The Turco-Islamic Synthetic culture was a factor of progress as long as it remained loyal to its origin, and was successful in protecting itself from foreign influence. However, this era was not very lengthy, and quite soon the Arabic influences began to appear not side by side with the religion, but in the religion itself. But after this source of inspiration had deteriorated, or rather disappeared due to the exigencies of the surroundings and time, these devastating seeds which penetrated the Synthetic spirit were perceived, and the decay ultimately increased by degrees.

It is hard to state when the Turks actually became Moslems. Their Islamization was gradual, and began in the year 750 BC. The Arabs by then had reached the borders of Central Asia and defeated the Chinese, as the Turks, who by that time were under the Chinese rule, left the Chinese

---

6 Ibid., p. 38.
army alone. The Islamization of the Turks continued from this date until the tenth century.

As a result of its being preached by the Arabic theologians, Islam, in time, included, to a certain extent Arabic elements. As the common people, especially if quite adept at learning the new religion would be ignorant of the fact, such alien elements would be more successful in influencing their minds and cultures.

It could not be argued that the Islamic Thought, as a product of the Islamic culture, did not change under foreign influences. Under the influence of the surroundings, the Islamic culture in Turkey was unable to protect itself from being subjugated by the Arabic influence. The speedy dispersal played a major role, although perhaps a negative one. Thus, although having its origins strictly among the Arabs, the Islamic culture became more or less international, showing its effects even in Spain. It could not be denied that the Byzantine civilization had a great effect on the Arabic culture and as a consequence of the Crusades, and this influence did not hesitate to show its marks on the religion.

Thus, the culture which was shown to the Turks in the latter ages as Islamic was not purely Islamic. Secondly,
between the emergence of Islam and the adoption of it by the Turks, at least a period of a century had passed, and during this period Arabic elements were mixed with Islam. In general, during the years when the Turks adopted Islam this mixture was not deep, but with time and through misunderstandings and misinterpretations, the Islamic religion lost much of its original nature in its political and social aspects. In general, it developed into fanaticism, and anti-Europeanization. This was probably the only defensive alternative towards European hostility expressed through the Crusades. But, in the Ottoman Turks, this dislike of the west existed, but only individually, and did not hold the state in its political activities. This is obvious in that the Ottoman Empire formed several alliances with western, i.e. Christian countries against other Christian states (Alliance with France, 1538, Crimean Alliance, 1856).

Art - Life - Culture

In order to observe the development of the Turkish culture and art, an aspect, dealt with in the previous chapter, it might be helpful to quote the following passage, which furnished valuable information:
"From the fourteenth to the end of the seventeenth century the Ottoman Empire was almost continuously at war with the Christian Powers of Western Europe. The terror inspired by the Turkish name among all the European peoples was largely responsible for the widely spread popular belief that the Turks were a race of uncivilized barbarians who, wherever they went, left nothing but smoking ruins behind them and stamped out every vestige of civilization. Religious fanaticism, coupled with the fear born of unbroken Turkish military success, resulted in creating among Europeans a state of mind which rendered them for the most part incapable of viewing Turkey and the Turks with an objective and unbiased eye.

"This almost universal prejudice obscured the real facts. In the first place, the Osmanlis, as opposed to the Mongol hordes of Jenghiz Khan, and the Tartars of Tamerlane, did not commit wholesale devastations in the countries conquered by them - witness the numerous Byzantine monuments of Constantinople, Nicæa, Pontus, Thessaloniki and Mount Athos, the Gothic churches of Cyprus, and even the classical monuments of Ancient Greece, most of which survived the Ottoman conquest intact, save for the white-washing and small structural changes entailed by the conversion of the churches into mosques.

"Secondly, a Europe which was itself dominated by the most extreme and savage exhibitions of religious fanaticism, where heretics and witches were burnt at the stake, where torture was a normal method of judicial procedure, where thousands of peasants lived in a state of serfdom deprived of the most elementary economic and social rights, where the African slave trade even as late as the beginning of the nineteenth century was regarded as legitimate, not to say highly profitable trade and carried on by the most respectable persons, where Jews and all those who did not conform to the State religion, whether Protestant or Catholic, were subject to continual persecution and all manner of disabilities, was hardly in a position to throw stones at the people of Islam in general and the Turks in particular.

"As for the exterior criteria of civilization such as literature, the arts and polite living, these were by no means lacking from the Turkey of those times. Islamic civilization, however much it might differ
from that of contemporary Christian Europe, was certainly not a thing to be despised. The unprejudiced student who compares social conditions in Turkey during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, both among the upper and lower classes, with those prevailing at the same date among the peoples of Southern Europe - in Italy, Spain, Portugal, etc. - will come to the conclusion that, mutatis mutandis, the Turks were not behind the latter in the arts of living; further, if we take the conditions prevailing at the same date in a country like Russia, the comparison is all in favour of the Turks.

"It is true that, in the domain of certain fine arts, such as painting and sculpture, the Turks had very little or nothing to show. The reason for this is to be found not in any innate lack of artistic taste, but in the uncompromisingly iconoclastic spirit of the Moslem religion, which by condemning the reproduction of the human form as idolatrous, prevented the development of the arts of portraiture and sculpture in all Islamic countries. Calvinism and Puritanism produced very much the same effect in certain countries of Europe.

"But in other branches of the arts, such as architecture and the decorative arts, we find a great deal to admire in the Turkey of the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries. The superb faience of Iznik and the other Ottoman potteries; the flowered brocades of Bursa, those masterpieces of the weaver's art; the carpets and embroideries of Anatolia; the metal-work and jewelry, are equal if not superior to anything produced in contemporary Europe. The splendid monuments of Bursa, Istanbul, Adrianople and other cities of the Old Ottoman Empire bear witness to the genius of the Ottoman architects as well as to the munificence of their patrons." 7

Character - Tolerance

The Turkish character did not change essentially with respect to its aspects of sympathizing with the victim and

aiding the helpless. The words of the Swedish King, Charles XII, in the letter to his sister Ulrigue Eleanore, show this clearly.

"I was going to be a prisoner at Poltava; that would have been my death. I was saved on the shores of the Bugh River. Then the danger became more imminent...again I was saved. But today, I am a prisoner of the Turks. What fire, steel, and floods were not able to do, the Turks did. I don't have chains on my feet. I am not in jail, either. I am free to do whatever I like. But still I am a prisoner – a prisoner of affection, of generosity, of nobility, of courtesy. The Turks have tied me with this diamond chain. Oh! if you knew how sweet it is to live as a free slave with people so affectionate, so noble, and so gentle!"

In the respect, one should stress the tolerance the Ottoman Turks had, by basing one's claim upon non Turkish sources. Alphonse Lamartine in the "Voyage en Orient" wrote as follows:

"Istanbul fell and Mehmet II entered the city. He got off his horse in front of the main entrance of Santa Sophia and, with his yatagan, cut off the head of a soldier who was busy wrecking the holy altars. The Turkish Sultan refused to destroy anything. He did not abuse his victory. Turkish religious tolerance became evident right from the beginning; he left the Christians their churches and the freedom to worship in their own way. He kept the Greek patriarch in his functions, free from any interference. The Turks, as a race and as a nation, are among the most honorable on earth. Their character is noble and towering. Their heroism is like an unalterable power. Their religious and patriotic virtues would inspire respect and admiration in every impartial

Ibid, p. 16.
soul... They are generous and sensitive. Their country is that of gentle, heroic people. I think that to be the foe of such a people is like being the foe of humanity. God preserve me from such a sin."9.

Tomasso Campanella in a letter to Cardinal Pierre de Berulle wrote the following interesting passage:

"I yearn for a "Sun City" where there would be no night and where human being would not know of darkness. Is it possible to find on earth such a "Sun City"? the existence of the Turkish people, so tolerant, so respectful of freedom of thought, of freedom of religion, and of other people's language, leads me to think that, at least in the future, a "Sun City" will become a reality. This is highly probable, since we have today the courageous and just Turks, who do not jail free thinking and do not chain the love for truth. Yes, there is hope; why shouldn't there be in the future a "Civitas Solis" (Sun City) where only justice, truth, and freedom will reign."10.

The brilliant French writer Chateaubriand in the "Journal des Debats" stressed the Turkish tolerance, a character which the Ottoman Turks inherited from their patriarchal ancestors.

"If the blood that feeds the olive tree branch of Christianity is that of the martyrs, we must admit that those who prevented the destruction of that branch right where it grew are the Turks. This people are truly merciful and tolerant. They let live truths in which they do not believe—side by side with their own beliefs. This, even if it is the result of proud self-confidence, is still magnanimous."11.

9 Ibid, p.16.
10 Ibid, p.16.
11 Ibid, p. 16.
The Ottoman Institutions were, no doubt, a perfect example of democracy, in an era of injustice. As Edson Clark pointed out.

"The Turks were far better men, and far abler rulers than the wretched tyrants whom they superseded. As a rule, they were grave, serious, honest, and straightforward, while their vigor and energy in the conduct of affairs made them the wonder of the world...It seems to be conceded that for the first century following the fall of Constantinople, the Turkish dominions were better governed and more prosperous than most parts of Christian Europe; that the people, both Mohammedan and Christian, enjoyed a larger measure of private liberty and of the fruits of their labor than fell to the lot of their contemporaries under the confused and too often tyrannical governments of the West... In education and intellectual culture the Turks were in advance, not of their Christian subjects alone, but of the greater part of Christian Europe."12.

Moreover, as stated by Arnold Toynbee;

"The Ottoman institution came perhaps as near as anything in real life could to realizing the ideal of Plato's Republic, but it is certain that Plato himself, when he conceived his Utopia, had the actual institutions of Sparta in mind; and in spite of the difference in scale between Ottoman and Spartan operations there is a close resemblance between the 'peculiar institutions' with which each of these peoples equipped itself for the

12 Edson L. Clark, Turkey N.Y. Nations of the World Series., p.84, 87. 1900.
accomplishment of its tour de la force."\(^{13}\).

The following, reality is not denied by western sources as well;

It is probable that under the early Ottoman rulers the administration of justice in Turkey was better than in any other European land. The Mohammedan subjects of the sultans were more orderly than in most Christian communities and crimes were rarer."\(^{14}\).

One of the consequences of the adoption of the Islamic religion was the change in the concept of law. As emphasized in the previous pages, the laws in the patriarchal Turkish society were regarded as man made laws and not divine made. However since the adoption of Islam, the laws were regarded falsely as God made laws. After noting that the western concept of law is rather Aryan and that its primary characteristic is man made, Halide Edip points out that "Christ apart from the question of marriage made no attempt to lay down a temporal law. Render therefore unto Caesar the things which belong to Caesar, and unto God


the things that are Gods."\(^{15}\). The Christian religion in this sense is, according to the same author, unsemitic, as the dominating trait of the trait, of the Semites is a mixture of the spiritual and temporal, the attempt to regulate man's temporal actions through religion." On the other hand however, the Arabs have a Semitic conception of law. The law is God made. Why?. The law for the Arab was the solution of the problem of certitude in the matter of good and evil. They called it Husn and kubuh, beauty and ugliness. What is morally beautiful, that is to be done, what is morally ugly, that is not to be done. That was the basis of Islamic Law.

However, a question arises here. Who shall decide whether a certain thing is evil or good? The question was answered by the Arabs with the concept of Divine Law. As human beings would be unable to agree, and as they would interpret the matters according to their interests, the laws were considered as God made and unchangeable. They used to be applied to every Moslem. Here it should be noted that the Prophet of Islam died in the 7th century, but the codification of the Islamic law was not done until the 9th century.

\(^{15}\) Halide Edip, Turkey Faces Wost, New Haven, Yale University press, 1930, p. 22.
It could not be said, however, that the Moslem bound by his religion cannot accept any reform. The Sheriat was interpreted by men, and if it has been so done, why could it not be done once more? This was actually the thought of the pro-reformists, the so called Mujtehiddin. However, their opponents, the Traditionalists, held the view that the Sheriat is forever binding to the adherents of the Islamic religion, and cannot be changed. As they pressed harder, and as, a consequently, the liberal ideas of the Mujtehiddin could not be realized, they are responsible for the failure of reform in Islam, and for the stagnation in the Islamic World. They are also responsible with their fanaticism to for the decay of the Ottoman Empire. That is to say, had the Ulema spread enlightenment and science as well as the true meaning of the religion, the Ottoman society would have remained a more healthy society in the world. It was only during this century that the top Arabic Moslem theologians codified the Islamic law, the so called sheriat and declared it unchangeable. Certain western scholars such as Count Leon Ostrogog, a lecturer in Mohammedan law and Turkish Land Law in the University of London had this to say about the Sheriat.

"The code is a monumental moral and judicial structure. In it the four great Jurists of Islam
laid down the principles of the rights of man, including individual liberty of person and property. They elaborated a law of war which, in its humanity and chivalry, surpassed all western codes for nearly a thousand years. They also laid down a doctrine of toleration of non-Moslem creeds such as did not exist in Christian countries for several centuries."

Nevertheless, the men who codified the Islamic Law, no matter how loyal they stood to the Koran, and no matter how wise they were, could not have been aloof from the influences of the past times. Two centuries passed since the death of the Prophet. Secondly, they were Arabs and were surely under the influence of the Arabic traditions. The Sheriat was not declared has having unchangeable rules forever, neither by God nor by the Prophet. They were so declared by the four theologians. Therefore the Sheriat was absolutely not God made but man made. Why the Sheriat was so declared is not an aspect which attracts the concern of our subject. Nevertheless, so much could be said that these theologians might have feared that too many further basic interpretations might cause harm to the religion. It should be accepted that, a law organizing the political or social activities of the people cannot be static. Every state, every community from time to time reorganizes its

16 Ibid, p. 22.
laws whenever it is deemed necessary. Secondly, the very same law could not be applied to each community which already has its own tradition and custom. A law may be useful for one community while it might not prove so for another. If an alien law, a so called imported law, shall be imposed on a certain community, it would be obliged to make certain sacrifices in deiration from its own tradition, and custom, and way of life, in general from its conciousness. The case of Turkey was this. A non Turkish law opposed to the Turkish character, and falsely called a Divine Law was adopted by the Turks. After having observed the ancestral Turkish laws it can easily be concluded that these new laws were essentially Islamic inspired Arabic la 17 ws, and were in contrast to the Turkish national conciousness. Regarding the laws as God Made, the "Turks consequently created a formidable Turkish Moslem Judicial class, the Ulema, and invested it with immense authority." 17. Without its consent, no change or innovation could ever have taken place both regarding the State or the individual. Thus, although there is no clerical class in Islam, such a class came into being. The Head of this system was the Sheik-el-Islam, a title which corresponds to the Minister of Justice. The Mufti (Juris-consuls) and Kadi (Judge) and mollah (theologians)
were under his jurisdiction. The Sheik el Islam was the legal adviser to the Sultan. After the Sultan became the Calip as well, the power of the Sheik el Islam increased and he became the aid of the Sultan in the religious matters. The Sheik el Islam, after the Grand Vizier, held the third rank in the Government status. "The all powerfull interference of Islamic canon law was not an assumed property, on the contrary, it was the most essential part of its spirit". The Sheik-el-Islam used to give his consent with the so called Fetwas. Without his consent no religious or social activity could ever be realized. Because of his inner nature the Turk, however, did not become as fanatic as the Arabs or other Moslem people, The Turks, to a certain extent were able to modify the Islamic laws, during the Sixteenth century. Nevertheless, this broad minded and liberal spirit, though existing still, was undermined to a large extent in later centuries. Classes other than the religious class, that is to say, the Ulema, the so called Ganizaries, the tribute children and the palace women should be mentioned Ganizaries though in their early years educated under rigid military discipline, later

18 Ibid, p. 27.
became a rather burdensome mob more active in the political field than in the military one. Moreover, the class working behind the scene there was a group of successful palace women. Regarding the crisis in which the Empire found itself, and thus pretending that only they could be the saviours of the Empire, the powerful theologians began to demand increasing powers and claimed that they should be consulted on every state activity. These religious demands were not enjoyed either by the Janizaries or by the palace women, naturally for quite different reasons. Consequently, so, the religious teachers were advised that they should stay to their books and do no meddling with state affairs. During 1602, there were quite serious clashes between the military and religious powers. But despite the strong opposition, all real power began to pass into the hands of the Ulema. The Ottoman Empire, once the abode of freedom and thought, and the embodiment of the complete victory of reason over authority, became a blind theocracy; that, too, just at the time when Europe was beginning to free herself from such bonds, and develop as seemed best to her. The Mollahs, blind with all worldly activities, reforms and progresses in all the

19 Ahmet Emin, Yalman, Turkoy in World War, New Haven, Yale University, Press, 1930. p. 15.
fields of civilization were dealing with rather non-essential topics and trying to answer them. Moreover,

The mollahs who ruled in the area of decline were against every sort of innovation. Every new invention, every project or idea that was new, had been welcomed in the time of the Empire's growth and greatness. Only such tools and such ideas as existed in the time of Mohammed, and were spoken of in the Koran, were sanctioned, all later developments being held to the product of heathenism. Even things that had been a part of the life of the former generations were at best only tolerated. A gun of an old style could be used, but not a new one. Galleys might be used as warships, but anything of more recent date was tabooed. Nor could there be any discussions of priestly decisions, the "door of controversy" was declared to be closed 20.

In general, it could be said that no human being with a liberal thought could believe that any religion would oppose any sort of innovation. In fact and in reality, Islam is sympathetic and enthusiastic to all useful innovations. The Koran itself preaches that the man should walk with the time, and the Prophet himself declared that any person should find the civilization no matter where it is, even if it should be in China. Fatih the Conqueror, conquered Istanbul because he used new methods, new guns and weapons. A very small number of Turks defeated the large Persian army at Chaldiran in 1512, because they used heavy cannons.

20 Ibid., p. 15.
In this respect an Italian, Giogio, wrote that "such willingness to use artillery is criminal, it is unworthy of men." But by time, the progressive spirit faded away. The result was that the Ottoman Empire continued to make war, but the forces it brought to the battlefield were always less equipped in comparison to the enemy.

"Even if the heads of the government saw the value of progressive, material equipment in the national struggle for existence the power of theology opposed every sort of innovation, and the Janizaries had the introduction of new weapons to be an interference with their long established rights. Uncompromising to everything else, the Ulema had little to say against any form of debauchery. Indeed many of them were themselves steeped in it, and they made no attempt to interfere with the private life of the Sultan. The selling of Fetwas also became common.\textsuperscript{22}

**Fatalism**

Fatalism is another concept which was introduced into the Turkish society, and was unfortunately taught falsely that it was regarded as a religious element. These principles which had nothing in common with the religion undermined ipso facto the moral and spiritual characteristics of the Turkish intelligentsia. These principles were essentially mystic and taught submission. It is true

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid, p. 16.
that Islam is essentially a religion teaching submission. Originally "submission to the Will of God is entirely different from the concept of fatalism, and it especially would not mean the renunciation of all activities". The essence of Islam is not fatalism, as thought by many western scholars and even believed and taught by previous Muslim theologians. If no act of a human being would change the belief in fatalism, it would have no constructive use and would only tend to have mob forms. The misinterpretation of this thought led the active Turkish people to become mystic. The active Turks with time turned out to be fatalists, that is to say, "believing that nothing which the individual can do in any way affect the fate to which he is destined". People in time forgot all their worldly activities and gave themselves to the sole study of theology. However, in reality, The Koran states the existence of two different wills. The first, the Absolute Will, the Will of God, which cannot be changed whatsoever. It includes certain destinies of the man such as his death or birth. The second one is the Partial Will, that is the Human will. These are activities which can be realized with the judgements of the men themselves.

23 Tekin Alp, Turk Rubu, p. 145.
During the reign of Suleyman the Magnificent, Ambassador Dubesque, French envoy to the Sublime Porte, gives us some interesting information about the Turkish fatalist conceptions. When Ambassador Dubesque, due to the widespread plague cases, requested the permission to transfer his residence to another quarter of the capital, the Sublime Porte, in view of political circumstances rejected the plea. In his answer, Suleyman the Magnificent said that: No person could escape the Will of God. If God wants, the Ambassador will catch the disease. In spite of several cases I am safe in my Palace. If God desires that I should catch the disease as well, I shall be ill too, and running away would not change my fate, as well as his.

The way in which the Ottoman Army was defeated by the rebel Egyptian forces is no doubt a tragic event for Turkish history, not because of the military defeat, but because of the way of thought which led the army to defeat. Von Moltke, a Prussian officer under Ottoman command, reported that at Nizip (Syria)/ Hafiz Pasha, the commander of the Ottoman army, refused to attack the enemy in spite of the continuous advice of his general staff. He refused to attack on the grounds that the astrologers claimed that it was inauspicious to attack on Fridays. Secondly, it was considered unreligious and against the Turkish character to attack at night. Von Moltke was right...
in stating that

"When the astrologers shall be expelled from Turkey, when it shall be believed that the stars do not interfere in the human activities, the Turkish spirit will shine again, and the Turkish nation which is created to use arms, will find its ancient splendour again."25

Leon Cahun, in his 'Introduction to the History of Asia, reports that the Chinese Emperor Kiyen - Long was asked about the reason of the mysticism of the ancient Mogols. The Emperor answered that those active warrior Mogols do not exist any more because the Buddhist clergymen have made them domestic. They are unable to do anything but to think of their after life. 26. It could be added that the only difference between these two cases is that the Mogols were made mystic purposely, while the Turks were made so through ignorance. However,

"From time to time the debauchery of the palace led to temporary returns to decencies. At such times the influence of religion began to assert itself, the general feeling being this: the country is going to ruin. It is hopeless to seek to stop it by the forces of this world. God must be our refuge". And the representatives of religion were, of course, ready to play their part. But they put a heavy price on their intervention."27.

26 Mustafa Hakki Akansel, op.cit. p. 51
27 Ahmet Emin, Yalman, op.cit. p. 15.
They stubbornly insisted on being consulted on every detail of state activity. Although facing strong opposition, in time they succeeded in doing so. It is a sad state that these theologians did not actually see that it was they, themselves, who caused the real trouble, and led the Empire to ruin.

Literature.

In the Ottoman era, the Turkish literature was influenced by Arabic mysticism. More and more Arabic and Persian, i.e. non Turkish elements were borrowed and finally these alien elements almost predominated the Turkish language.

"Just as English have enriched their meagre Tetonic vocabulary by loading it with a wealth of borrowed French, and Latin and Greek words and phrases, so the Osmanlis have encrusted their plain Turkish with innumerable jewels of Persian and Arabic speech."²⁸

The Seljuk Turks even went so far as accepting Arabic as the official language of their State. The Ottomans did not accept any foreign language as their official language, but their language in creasingly entered under Persian - Arabian influence.

²⁸ Arnold, J. Toynbee, op. cit., p. 510.
Arabic being the original language in which the Koran was written influenced the Turkish language so much that it almost became a fashion, if not a rule, to write the treatises in Arabic instead of Turkish. Ziya Gokalp in one of his most acknowledge poems, the Red Apple 'Kızıl Elma' wrote that:

"We succeeded in conquering many places.
But spiritually we were conquered in all of them.
The Turks who conquered so many places did not care to impose their language on the natives. Instead they adopted the language of the natives. The Arabian influence was twofold as it influenced Turks both through religion and during the Turkish rule of the Arabic lands. Many Turkish scholars surely lived during the past centuries. However we are unable to find their treatises written in Turkish as most of them wrote their articles in Arabic or Persian. Many Turkish scientists, poets lived in the past are incorrectly considered Arabs, Fuzuli the poet, Ibn-Sina (Avicenna) the well known medic were among them. Consequently in the domain of culture and especially in regard to the Turkish language and literature the Ottoman Turks became quite artificial. The written language, which took the name of Ottoman, was a conscious and synthetic arrangement instead of an unconscious growth. The new language, i.e., the Ottoman language was not merely composed of
Turkish, Persian and Arabic words the last two predominating, it also adopted the grammar and syntax of these two alien languages side by side with Turkish. So, a period came where three nouns existed for the very same object, and also three different adjectives defining it and where three different verbs defining the very same action.

"The richness of a composite language, if it is an outcome of growth, is due to its scope of nuance and subtlety to the way each foreign word, taken into it brings not merely a noun, a verb, or adjective which means the same thing, but a richness and variety of mood. English, the greatest composite language, because it was an outcome of growth, possesses the infinity of mood. The strange elements have blended more naturally, and have become Anglicized....While in the Ottoman language there is a masterly technique but none of this subtle blending. 29"

The important part is, however, that the adoption of these two alien languages did not only harm the Turkish language but more important than that it became a heavy blow to the ancestral Turkish spirit. It is evident that whilst these linguistic forms and expressions were faithfully adopted, the alien Arabic thought too was adopted to a large extent. Thus,

"if the form was conscious and artificial, the choice of subject and the style were still more so. The pompous and artificial style with which the Persians expressed their achievements, the conventional phrases with which they described nature, and their all dominant love of allegory were faithfully copied. The individual, everyday life,

29 Halide Edip, *Turkey Faces West*, op. cit, p. 32.
simple nature and especially women, all of them favorite subjects of the common Turk, disappeared from the Ottoman literature—the former as unworthy of literature the last as indecent. The Persians could make out of artificiality masterpieces which have a tone of personality. The Ottomans had perfect technique but little originality.30

The Turks hence failed to form a Turkish philosophy, a Turkish Law, and even a Turkish literature.

The adoption of the new language was very harmful to the original character of the patriarchal Turkish language, and the Turkish mentality as it should be always be kept in mind that, "behind every national language, a national psychology exists." Thus, the new spirit as an outcome of the linguistic change did not serve as a useful factor in promoting the Turkish national culture, but instead caused its decay. It is quite evident that the adoption of these non Turkish words, expressions and terms in such a large scaled was harmful to the language and to the national spirit and national psychology as well. Moreover, people who were not quite well acquainted with Arabic were naturally accepting blindly everything which was taught to them by the mollahs.

30, Ibid, p. 32.
In reality, many of these teachings were false, either because of the ignorance of these theologians, or because of their narrow mindedness, and also because of using religion as a tool in politics. A common language is an inevitable factor in forming a nation. The discussed adoption of words, terms phrases, were heavy blasts to this essential factor with which is one of the main foundation stones of an independent national unity. The Imperialist Turks in time turned their backs to the old traditions. The sultans who during the wars used to attend at the battle field now preferred to stay in their palaces while their soldiers were fighting far away from the homeland. The rigid rules and traditions began to be continiously disregarded since the Empire reached its peak of power. The Janissares who formerly were trained under a strict military discipline were not even trained, in the ordinary sense, from now on. People who pleased the sultan were accepted into this organization, a case quite impossible in the former years. The conception that, military service was a profession was abandoned. By time magigians, musicians and other persons who were not aware of any elementary military rule were taking part in the battles. The Janissarsed, who were not permitted to get married untill the 16th century were permitted to do so. They began to have professions outside the army
as well. More severe than this "bribery replaced talent and law, personal interests replaced state interests and injustice replaced justice".31

Ozans

The Ozans too, lost their respective position in favor of the religious caste. However, it should be stressed that Islam has no clergy in the original sense, and the caste are the so-called theologians, the Ulema, Mollahs. It would not be accurate to think that this change affected the Ozans only, but it affected the thought of the people who practically were students of these Ozans. From now on, people were preached solely theological aspects, dealing with after life, instead of earthly events. The teachings were not dedicated any more to the Khan, and tribe. The Ozans, who used to travel all around the country explaining and reminding the people of the heroic activities of the ancestors, reading the Oguz-names, as well as preaching unity, activity, sacrifice for the country, Khan, left their respective places in the favor of the Dervishes, who preached loyalty to the religion and theology. Loyalty to the Khan was almost forgotten. Although two of the essentially Turkish characteristics, loyalty and sacrifice did not disappear,

but they changed shape, and aim. The people, did not hear anything from the dervishes, relating to their national pride. National pride, was more than being undermined. Thus the people began to forget, or rather did not attach as much importance to their ancient culture as they used to do. The people did not fight any more for their tribe, for their fellow companions, or land but only for religion. A conception of believers and non believers was artificially created. The voices of the Ozans dried away, as the preachings of the Mollahs became more effective. "People who forget their ancient culture, and history, would also lose their national conciousness."32. Examples in history relating to this aspect are numerous. For instance, the Etrusks, the Lydias lost their political independence, as well as their national conciousness, and culture. They forgot their mother tongue, and were assimilated by their invaders. People who did not forget their mother tongue, their ancient culture and civilization, were able to liberate themselves from foreign rule and form again national unities.

EVOLUTION UNDER ALIEN INFLUENCES

Amongst the best examples history has shown is the one of Greece and Polaud. The Greek people liberated themselves from Turkish rule, because they still spoke their own language, continued to their own schools and churches and consequently were taught their own national history. As a matter of fact this case clearly proves the democratic way of government the Ottoman Turkish State had. Consequently, the Greeks remembered, their history, culture and language and were able to show a tendency toward the principle of "national freedom." It should be kept in mind that

As long as the national culture is not forgotten a nation's national consciousness would live, and not die. As long as Iliade and Odyssey would live the Hellenic spirit would live too. As long as the Shahname would live the Persian nation would live. As long as the statues of Orkhon, the Kudadcubilik and the Turkish mitologies, the Uygur and the Chagatay would live the Turkish spirit would live."33.

However, the case was entirely different in the Ottoman Empire. In the West the Churches taught faith in God as well as national independence whereas in Islam the case was entirely reverse. Forget everything about your nationality, but work for Islam was the motto. Thus, while Europe was undergoing the Renaissance and the Reformation this Islamic motto was receiving more and more

33 Ibid, p. 189.
strength in the Ottoman society. It would be an exaggeration to claim that the Turks definitely forget their past, but it is also hard to state the contrary, in regard to the Ottoman Turks. There was a medley of everything, religion, rememberances of the past etc, but in general everything was in favour of theorracy. The Ozans who used to prove useful, used to teach the ancient victories. In this age of theorracy they lost their respective position, and consequently the Oguznames, the heroic activities of the ancestors were not taught to the people any more. It should be borne in mind that this is the fulcrum of nationalism. Consequently a vital factor which forms a nation was forgotten.

Position of Women

After remembering the social position held by the women in the patriarchal Turkish society it would be easy to mark the dramatic changes which occured in the following periods. Unlike the early Turks, the Arabs and the Persians regarded the women as an inferior sex to men as well as "tabu". Thus partly because of the false interpretation of the Islamic religion but mainly under the influence of the Arabic tradition people began to believe that women should withdraw from the society and should not have an active part in it. In general the common Turk, that is
to say the real Turk was less influenced in this respect than the Imperialist Turk. Polygamy was included as a custom but in a very restricted sense. The seclusion of women, although a fact in the palace and among the outer-garment which was introduced to the Turkish society since the late years of the Selcuki Turks is another sad example. However it is surely interesting that the introduction of this garment as a religious necessity was even criticized by certain theologians, such as the international known Turkish theologian Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi, who in his Fif Mafih wrote: "People would be more anxious and keen to see something which is hidden from them. Consider a man, who would hide a loaf of bread under his coat. People who under normal conditions would not even notice that this man carries a thing, now, if hidden, would be quite anxious to see what he carries. The same applies to the females." Moreover, if covered, by nature the women would be quite anxious to show herself. In the Ottoman society, the women by time were almost imprisoned in their homes. Even with the consent of the husband a woman was still practically unable to work at any public place. Public places for the enjoyment of the women were such places which were only far away from the sight of any man, of if indoors, where a division existed between
the male and female sections. A wife was unable to travel in the same compartment even with her husband. However, these restrictions were not deeply rooted among the real Turks as the Government was obliged to issue public orders relating to the style and kind of dresses the women had to wear. During the 18th century the Government repeatedly ordered the women to veil themselves. Among these orders the most and interesting ones are these of Selim III, though he was a reformer. However he was the first man who believed that unless women were on an equality with men and enlightened as to national ideals, the empire could not be saved. A period came when the colour of the dress worn by a woman, was dictated by the religious authorities in view that certain colours were too attractive. (Even under the outer garment.) Girls were unable to attend the schools, except the primary ones where they were hardly taught any modern science. Beside these facts the husband was endowed with vast rights. He was able to divorce his wife any time only by repeating his decision thrice to her. These facts prove that the women in general lost their respected social position which their mothers held in the previous centuries. The new era was completely non Turkish and in complete contrast with the ancestral Turkish character and tradition. Ignorance in theology naturally increased
these misunderstandings. As a consequence an important factor inevitable for the national survival of the nation disappeared. Under the rule of the Young Turkish Party, which seized power in 1908, and under the inevitable necessities of World War I, the women gained certain rights. However in those periods this was not considered as a right but as a privilege. Therefore the rights granted were far from being basical and were actually artificial...

Thus, as has been observed, with the acceptance, of Islam a distinction of sex showed itself which by nature was contrary to the Turkish thought and tradition. However, it is needless to study the Arabic culture, to conclude that although the juristic part of the Koran, made a distinction between the males and females, it had a considerable effect on changing these rules into fanatic ones.

Byzantine influence

It is an interesting point however, to note that the Arabic civilization which under the cover of religion, influenced the Turkish mentality had a strong relation with the civilization of Byzance. Ziya Gokalp claimed that "the eastern civilization is not, as some scholars pretend, a product of the Islamix, but actually originates from
from Byzantine roots. In this respect the origin of the western civilization is not Christianity, but it is a continuation of the Roman Empire. In general the Ottoman Turks were not under the direct influence of the Byzantine civilization, but they were influenced indirectly by the Arabs who long before the Turks had adopted certain elements from the decaying Byzantine Empire. However, despite this fact it could not be denied that the Turks were influenced to a certain extent directly from this source.

The Ottoman Turks, since their early years were a neighbour of this decaying Byzantium Empire which was involved in internal strifes, upheavals, and intrigues. Thus, Byzantium influence over the Turkish society was not always positive as the seeds which caused the moral decay of that society, besides their ill ideas, customs, mainly lavish expenditures and excessive luxury, quite alien to the former Turks, were introduced to them. The Byzantine society at the stage of the conquest had already been fatally mauled by the Western Christian invasion, impiously masquerading under the name of the Fourth Crusade, which deprived Byzantine of the presence of a Byzantine Emperor for more than half a century (AD 1204-1261).

35 Tekin Alp - op., cit. p. 137.
EVOLUTION UNDER ALIEN INFLUENCES

The Orthodox Christian Civilization in its Byzantine political embodiment......was not destroyed by the Ottoman Turks......the Muslim Turks only gave a coup de grace to a society which already was mixed with vice. Thus it was such a society with which the pure, honest patriarchal Turks were faced, if not mixed. It is therefore quite accurate to agree with George Young who gave the following account of the historical developments,

"It was an evil day for the Turkish race, when the Crescent replaced the Cross over the dome of St Sophia. When their feudal chieftains entered the palaces and the private mansions of the Byzantine reeks, the simplicity and severity of their society became exposed to an infection it could not resist......After, but two centuries the Ottoman society was no longer Turkish."

George Young was no doubt correct in making this statement. For example the process of the influence in a negative manner began soon after the historical conquest. "The Turkish ladies adopted the diapanous Yaskmak or veil. The Harem was reorganised on the exact model of the Gynaeca of the Empress of Helen.... The Seraglio of the Janissaries.....

36 Arnold J. Toybee, op,cit. p. 269.

37 Halide Edip, op,cit, p. 34.
had grown very like a Byzantine Court and its Imperial guard." It is a rather unfortunate event to observe that in a later stage the ulama pretended that the veil was an essential principle of Islam. The Ulema set forth the same kind of argument on the "fez", an essentially Greek cap. These two cases show that the Ulema was not quite well furnished with the true reality of the Islamic religion. Although they seem unimportant at the first glimpse, the royal marriages between the Imperialist Turkish rulers and alien women had a considerable effect on the circumstances. It was these women who formed palace cliques, causing bloodshed with their intrigues. Marrying women from alien descent throughout the centuries continues. The common people who used to see the wife of the Khan as a woman from their own descent from now on saw women from alien descent who carried a different blood in her veins. In State affairs most of these women, served in the negative manner rather than in a positive one. Their interferences were contrary to the interests of the Ottoman Turkish State. Rozana (Hurem Sultan) - wife of Suleyman the Magnificent is one of the notable women in this category.

38 Ibid, p., 34.
However the fact should not be overlooked. The community which was mostly influenced by alien influences in this respect was essentially the Imperialist Ottoman Turkish people whereas the real Turk lived, as far as possibilities permitted in the same manner as he saw it from his ancestors. In his family life and in his attitude toward the women the common Turk was less influenced than the Ottoman by Byzantine or even Islamic ways. The seclusion of women, although a fact in the palace and among higher classes was practically unknown up to the eighteenth century.  

The misfortunes of the Turks partly lay in the fact which Grenard pointed out "The Turks were unable to apply the same rules which the British did in India." We have already noted that the early patriarchal Turks were strong and powerful as long as they do not mix with the natives of the conquered lands. The early Ottomans were governing successfully the alien lands and their heritage was not influenced by alien elements as long as they stood away from the non Turkish subjects. However, in a later stage the Ottoman Turks saw no harm, or rather were unable to prevent

---

40 Mustafa-Hakki Akansel, op.,cit., p.55.
such an intercourse. The Turkish rulers could be blamed once more for not exercising an efficient policy, if they did ever, of Turkification.

By time the Ottoman Empire lost most of its old prestige. While the western countries, since the Reformation were changing radically and rapidly the Ottoman State was practically unable to keep up with the progress. Even if the statement desired to incite the progress their efforts resulted in failure due to the reality that they were, opposed by the Ulema, Janissares and other fanatical elements. Internal riots and upheaval, for various important or sometimes even ridiculous cases kept the Empire from its progress. One of the other major reasons which kept the Empire from a radical progress and reform, were the nefarious activities of Russia, a country quite keen to weaken her neighbours. This country, the hereditary enemy of Turkey made it a policy to strike the Turkish State whenever she intended to reform herself. Moreover, several Ottoman dominated Christian peoples, incited by Russia and other countries were causing troubles as well. If the matter would be studied from a liberal point of view it would not be hard to conclude that these Christian minorities were continuously invited by foreign powers amongst whom Russia and the Austrian Hungarian Monarchy played a major role,
England from time to time according to her need and interest defended the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, naturally not because she had a special sympathy toward the Ottoman Turks, but to avoid Russian influence in the Near East which was a menace to her colonies in the East. This was not denied by Palmerston, a friend of the Ottoman Empire, in one of his realistic speeches. If the Dardanells might fall into the hands of Russia the British interests would be seriously damaged. In 1839 the British Minister Chatham refused to talk to anyone who would not admit the vital importance of the Ottoman Empire to England. 41. Lord Palmerston during the same year (March 31, 1839) said "we are aiming to keep Turkey from falling into the grasp of Russia, to prevent the civilized world from lying prostrate at the feet of a single power, to defend the liberties of Europe and the independence of nations." 42. However despite these flowery words England too, joined the western powers in creating unrest amongst the Christian minorities of the Ottoman Empire. England did not hesitate to give her material support to the Greek revolution.


Thus, when the Greek insurgents were unable to realize their national independence by fighting, they were quite successful in procuring the aid of the western countries who embraced the Greek cause with great enthusiasm.

Arnold Toynbee, in one of his early work, not quite favourable to the Turks, was unable to refrain himself from stating that "this questionable art, which is unfortunately characteristic of western culture....has been acquired by the Greeks with uncommon virtuosity..." 43. Moreover, a Western statesman, Lord Salisbury did not fail to criticize the British Government's pro Turkish policy through his famous sentence: We have backed the wrong horse." It is worth to note that, Halide Edip had accurately answered this pretence in the following and interesting manner: "What it means to gamble with human beings is known only to those who have been the pawns in the game."44.

The Greek insurrection was the first Christian rebellion which aimed at a nation sovereignty and consequently a separation from the Ottoman Empire. Thus the matter bears particular importance for twofold reasons. First it has a vital importance for Greeks as they became the

43 Halide Edip, op.,cit., p. 51.
44 Ibid., p. 51.
first ethncal group who with the Russian aid achieved their independence and secondly as this insurrection was the first symptom of the decay of the Ottoman Empire was overlooked by the Turkish rulers.

It is rather interesting to mention what a western political historian wrote in this respect

"When we consider the terrible events by which the Greek wars of independence were marked, the ruthless massacre and mutilation of Turks by Greeks in the Morea, the extermination of the whole Greek population of Chics and of most of the inhabitants of the Greek quarter of Constantinople by their enemies, and further reflect upon the long series of savage encounters by which alone the national principle has, at last in our days, been established in the Balkans it is natural to ask whether Balkan nationality has been worth that price. If it be remembered that the position of the Greek population under Turkish rule was in the eighteenth century by no means intolerable, that the Greek Church under its Patriarch was allowed to a full measure of liberty, that the commerce of the Levant was in the hands of the Greek merchants, that the Greeks monopolized certain branches of trade and industry and were accorded four of the great offices of the state, it is clear that without the ferment of the national idea, Balkan unity might have taken another turn which would have been entirely compatible with the material comfort of the Christian subjects of the Porte".45

Greece was tempted to the newly reemerged nationalist ideas and hopes while the tide definitively had turned against the Turks. "The Greeks having been the first of the subjects of the Ottoman Empire to enter into intimate relations with the West, were also the first to become infected with the new Western virus of nationalism." Moreover a more direct importance lays in the historical fact that "the first explosion of Greek nationalism kindled the first spark of its Turkish counterpart". The second spark will be the Greek attacks to Anatolia, and which will cause the War of Independence, the active rising of modern Turkish nationalism.

In her whole course of history Turkey was obliged to fight continuously at her frontiers with many countries but especially with Russia the hereditary enemy of Turkey. Since 1683, the second siege of Vienna the Ottoman Turks fought eleven major wars with Russia, out of which ten were declared by that country.

46 Arnold Toynbee - op., cit., p. 132.

47 The Ottoman Turks fought since their foundation - 1299 until their collapse, -1922 that is to say in 623 years 216 wars, and were only defeated in 21 of them. Roughly speaking the Ottoman Turkish State passed nearly 300 years in state of wars.
Czar Nicholos I, in 1844, during a talk with the British Ambassador to Petersburg, Sir Hamilton Saymour told that: we have a sick man in our arms who might die any time. If we would not divide his goods at the present, future conflicts might come out. The British Government, considering the vital importance of Turkey stood aloof to the Russian proposals, and consequently fought side by side with Turkey during the Crimean War. Nevertheless, despite this alliance a pamphlet entitled Russia, issued by Richard Cobden laid down the permanent foundation of a policy opposed to the continuance of a Mohammedan Empire in Europe, and adhering to those ambitious of Christian Russia, which called for a forced death of the Sick Man, and a partition of the estate in a way to make Russia the chief heir.

While the outlook of the Empire was such, the internal situation was not quite satisfactory. The army was hampering every state activity, demanding arbitrary changes, and depositions of Ministers. During the reigns of Murat II (1574-1595) the Jannisaries rebelled for a larger claim of pay. During the reign of Osman II (1618-1622) the Jannisaries rebelled against his progressive ideas,. During the reigns of Mustafa I (1622-1623) and Murat IV (1623-1640) the Jannisaries rebelled as a consequence of their intrigue with the mother Queen.
Another revolt broke out when the Sultan Mehmet IV was forced to handle 33 of his statemen who demanded reforms. The state was more or less in a situation of anarchy. "By the middle of the seventeenth century these human watch-dogs had returned to nature by reverting into wolves who harried the Padishah's human cattle instead of watching over them and keeping them in order." The need for a basic reform was an absolute necessity.

Partly due to these facts and partly by observing the success of the French trained Egyptian armies, who under the command of Mohammed Ali rebelled against the Sultan a few Ottoman rulers at last realized the bitter truth i.e., the Janissares were nothing but a useless mob and that radical reforms had to take place especially in the army. Damahy III, young in age, paid his progressive ideas with his life. It is true that the uprising of the Janissars was caused by the provocation of the Ulema who accused the Sultan from intending to establish a new army and abolish the Janissares, supported by the Ulema. Abdulhamit I, good in heart, gave more importance to the field of education.

48 Arnold Toynbee, op., cit. p. 177.
Selim III, a public spirited and enlightened man, understanding the necessity to change the whole structure of the armed class planned to form another military unite, the Nizami Cedit. (New Organization). Provoked once more by the Ulema, with the very same pretence that Selim was acting unreligious in his intentions as he was accused to abolish the Janissances and having the intention to introduce weapons made by the unbelievers. The revolt broke out. A sincere admirer of Selim, Alemdar Mustafa Pasha, rushed from Ruschuk with his military guards, however it was too late when he arrived as Selim was already slain. Mustafa IV, who was declared Sultan by the Janissares was deposed and Mahmout II replaced to the throne. Alemdar became his Prime Minister. This revolution, which in reality was a counter revolution, is especially important in the Ottoman history as it was the first revolution for the cause of progress and not for condemning any progress. Soon the Sultan planned to form a new military unite the so called Sekbani Cedit. (Soldiers of the New regime.) As a consequence the Janissares surrounded the Sublime Porte but Alemdar committed suicide. Thus after the downfall of the so called Comrades of Ruscuk the reactionaries became so completely dominant that for 28 years the young Sultan had carefully to hide his zeal for westernization and seem to be a partisan of the old regime, which was the composition of
the Janissares, Ulema and other fanatical elements. Mahmout was prepared, when the Janissares blind with their political success revolted once more but he was able to secure the aid of the riders - Sipahi - and the people and the Ulema which by now became anxious about the increasing power of the Janissares. So, the whole Janissares were killed. This act could be named as the first stage of the Tanzimat era, reforms, ie the Tanzimat Declaration. The fanatical elements although opposing the bloody reforms of Mahmout were unable to rise their heads. Mahmout secured the loyalty of the new army and consequently was able to put his plans into practice. Primitive schools, Faculties war colleges were opened whole European dresses were adopted. Instead of the turban the fez was adopted from the Greeks and although quite unpopular at that time "it is strange enough that the demand a century later for the retention of this same fez should become the fiercest rallying cry of the cohorts of religion".⁴⁹. In later years during 1832 Mahmout himself published a weekly paper with an aim to explain his reforms. However, when he died in 1838 " the people still regarded his reforms with a complete lack of understanding."⁵⁰.

⁴⁹ Ahmet Emin.. Yalman, op..cit, p. 24.
Nevertheless, as reported by an American missionary Mr. Goodsell, (on the death of Mahmout II):

"Many of the Christians wept, as, indeed they had reason to for all his measures were for their good.....There are few events in the history of nations more remarkable than these attempts at reform, and these constitutional guarantees emanating not from the demands of the people, but from the throne of the most despotic governments ever existed, and steadily carried forward in opposition to the wishes of the official forces of the Empire".  

The once powerful Ottoman Empire stood aloof from that rapid western progress, if it did not go to the opposite direction. A few statesmen, in different periods, did not hesitate to save the Empire from decline. Abdul Mejid successor of Mahmout II, had a sincere desire to westernize the country. He was cooperating with Reshid Pasha. Being aware of the western ideas, Reshid Pasha took the advice of the British Ambassador Sir Stratford of Redcliffe, to whom tribute should be paid for the role he played in the reformation of Ottoman Turkey. The right of legal equality granted to the non Muslim minorities is due to his efforts. Thus, influencing the Sultan, Reshid Pasha instituted the famous political and social reform known as the Tanzimat (1839). The Declaration of

---

51 Ahmet Emin Yalman, op. cit, p.24.
of Gulhane Hatti Humayun solemnly declared the principle of "lawful government and securing equality before the law to all subjects without distinction of race and religion." By abolishing absolutism and establishing law above individual caprice, a commonly used factor, it also secured the liberty, life, right of property and honour of the individuals. From the Gulhane Declaration onwards the fundamental change of Turkey from the old system based on nomadic principles to that of a modern state. It also emphasized that all the changes and innovations were in conformity with Islam. This Declaration was the first Ottoman official declaration regulating the relations of the Ottoman ruler and his subjects. However it is a curious thing to note that the Christian minorities were not pleased by this Declaration as until now they had a superior position among the Turks in Turkey. The Christians never served in the army, had their absolute freedoms in religion and as the Turks were constantly busy at the battlefield and as they considered the economic business an inferior one, it was these Christian minorities who held this task in their hands and consequently were quite wealthy.

52 Ibid, p. 25.
However the Christian minorities were bound to obey to certain laws which did not apply to the Muslims. The Christian's word at a court was not valid whatsoever. He was supposed to wear special dress according to the religion of his belief and was practically unable to carry any sort of arms. The Tanzimat in general was "evolutionary and progressive in spirit rather than radical and it is the sole reform in the history of Turkey which was not only pacific but constructive and effective"\(^\text{53}\). As the Tanzimat "abolished absolutism and established the validity of principles and laws above individual caprice"\(^\text{54}\). These phenomena quite often exercised in the former Empire, new laws on the European pattern were adopted. In 1840, and in 1859 a new civil code was introduced side by side with the Sheriat. However, it was not for the first time in the Ottoman history that reformatory steps were taken in the judicial field. Suleyman the Magnificent created the embryo of a criminal code which gradually replaced some of the texts of the Sheriat in penal matters. Such primitive measures as the cutting of thief's hand, the stoning of


\(^{54}\) Hans Kohn, A History of nationalism in the east op.,cit. p. 233.
adulterers, and the flogging of wine drinkers were replaced by imprisonment and fines.\textsuperscript{55}.

Under the pressure of the European Powers the Ottoman Empire was obliged to reform the previous Declaration. During the Crimean War, 1856 the Government issued the Khati - Humayun reaffirming the Gulhane declaration and certain new reforms were promised. The decree, however, swept away the conception of Sheriat as the sole source of legislation. Several schools were opened among which the Lycee of Galatsaray, built on French models, the most important ones. The death penalty for apostasy from Islam and slavery were abolished and free practice of all religions was reaffirmed. On the other hand at the Peace Treaty of Paris - 1856-Turkey was admitted into the Concert of Europe, and thus became the first non Christian State, entering into this Concert with equal rights.

However it would be only untrue and unjust to claim that the Ottoman Empire was an Empire with no characteristics of its own. The Ottoman Empire, despite having been influenced by various alien factors, reserved to a large extent a character and nature of its own.

\textsuperscript{55} Halide, Edip, \textit{Turkey Faces West}, op.,cit. p. 76.
"It seems that a deep and mysterious instinct led the Turkish people to its destiny. That instinct, confronted with many obstacles had to fight, to subdue everything that came its way. It was this instinct that led the Turkish race to the Pacific and to Gaul; that had spread the Turkish way of thinking all over the world from the Indus to Novgorod, that three times in the same millennium, had built three intercontinental empires - the mightiest that history has ever recorded. This expensive spirit has always been the normal pattern in Turkish social life. None of these early Turkish Empires allowed, in its social order the system of caste and class that flourished in India, Egypt and China. - and yet their contacts with those countries and those people have been very close. They never let the slightest religious intolerance take hold among themselves, nor did they advance the superiority of one faith or of one sect over the other".56.

There are many aspects which should be credited in favour of the Ottomans who throughout the centuries created masterpieces in several fields, whether cultural, military or state or anization. Despite its negative influence, the Turco-Arabic synthethic spirit, as mentioned previously was a cause of progress in its early stiges. The combination of the Turkish and Islamic culture ended with many masterpieces in the field of architecture and literature who are all the property of the Turkish spirit.

"The Turks are very ancient people. A valour that smarts under oppression, a tremendous spirit of initiative a desire to mold the environment characterize the history of that people for centuries... the Turks are masters in destroying as well as building states... They upset not only countries but whole continents, and their domination, once established was hard to brake down. History has learned a great deal from the Turks. Some of the works of Turkish hands are today the flower of our civilization...". 57.

Moreover, as confessed by another scholar

"European history books are full of stories of how the barbarous Turks invaded the east and the west and destroyed peoples and cultures. Myths and tales recount the Turks as supernatural and terrible forces... Even today, fear of the Turks vibrates in half the hearts of humanity. And yet modern science reveals the mysteries of pre history and studies and traces of long disappeared peoples. Suddenly we see the Turkish race in the light of history and learn how she formed the bridge between the East and the West and how she created brilliant cultures and powerful states.". 58.

The Ottoman Turks thus following a completely humanitarian policy, a trend rarely found in most of the parts of the world in those ages, did not impose in any manner their own believes, whether religious or not. However the excessive tolerance, that is to say the lack

57 J. de Hammer, Histoire de L'Empire Ottoman (1835) Pusgstall, Turks in Retrospect, N.Y., Turkish Information office publication.,1955.,p.16.
of a policy of Turkification, led finally to the separatist tendencies of the minorities, a policy which caused the failure of Ottomanism, and Pan Islamizm. The Ottoman rulers may be acknowledged, as well as criticized for their excessive tolerant activities. However despite this humanitarian policy and activities several western authors, under certain influences, did not hesitate to attack and to criticize the structure and kind of rule of the Ottoman Empire.

Reforms and changes follow two different courses in different countries. The first type of reform realized by means of revolutionary ways and by using force was realized by the French people in 1789. In this sort of reformsations innocent blood might be shed as well other, useful institutions might be torn down along with others. Sometimes such means are inevitable where peaceful means might prove inefficient. The second way is the way of evolution in which England proved to be the supreme example. Changes are not rapid but more safe. Mahmout II who was an admirer of the French revolution and its means of success. What Peter I did in Russia Mahmout tried to do in Turkey. His chief aim was to reorganize the entire organism of the State. His successors in contrast followed the second pattern but were far from being able to reach to the core of the problem. The leaders of the Tanzimat thought that
if they would be dressed like the Europeans, eat and talk like the Westerners they too would become Europeans. They failed to consider the civilization as a matter of time, and therefore their reforms were nothing more than a change on the surface. Their reforms were rather an important idea not stamped with native characteristics. In spite of this superficial change it could be admitted that this superficial change was even something important. Therefore the leaders of the Tanzimat could be acknowledged as well as criticized. In the field of politics they failed to believe that the Treaty of Paris (1856) was going to last forever. Although the historical events did not hesitate to show the contrary they still were not aware of the bitter reality. Reshid Pasha was one of the sincere leaders of this movement. Imbued in London and Paris with liberal and progressive ideas, he insisted that instead of trying to change the whole structure of the corrupt state organization, and consequently do everything superficial, at least a few major problems should be solved in a serious manner. While Reshid Pasha was working on the practical field Shinassi was working on the linguistic field. This simple man, who once was fired from Government service because he shaved his beard, could be named as the first Turkish writer who wrote in the real Turkish
language and who opposed the use of non Turkish phrases. The core of his thought was "each community could be judged according to its thought. As thoughts could be expressed only though the means of language, the necessity of a linguistic reform is essential and should be realized at the first stage." At his time he was unsuccessful. Shinassi was the first Turkish author who wrote on the aspects of Nation, Nationality, Fatherland, Civilization, President, politics and who gave constructive elements to Namik Kemal. In general the Turkish society had long to wait to see another liberal writer walking on the lines of Shinasi Efendi. He was Ziya Gokalp, the spiritual father of modern Turkish nationalism.

As stated by Halide Edip,

"The most significant trend of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was toward the new conception of nationalism. This Nationalism which had come into the life with the Reformation had received a fresh impulse through the French Revolution. It brought in its wake ideals of equality, political unity and independence and it signaled the doom of the empires."59.

These new ideas were naturally welcomed by all the minorities in all the Empires and in the Ottoman Empire as well. However, the unrests which were a result of these

59 Halide Edip, Turkey Faces West, op.,cit. p. 50.
revolutionary ideas were not understood by the Ottoman rulers, and they tried to solve the problems by applying temporary and artificial methods. Besides facing external dangers, internal fanatical oppositions, intrines of palace women, the rulers were facing these uprisings as well. The Ottoman rulers had a superiority complex, and believed that the Ottomans "were a race of rulers and that there was a vast difference in culture and outlook upon life between the Ottomans and the western nations."60. The Ottoman Empire in general during the 18th and 19th century was called the sick man of Europe. This so called sick man tried to recover from time to time and was successful in a way. Lord Beaconsfield the British Prime Minister who usually followed a realistic pro Turkish foreign policy, said during the Berlin Congress that: the sick man proved that he is still alive with all its power." Lord Beaconsfield accurately added that

"I do not refer to the Ottoman Empire whose power has been nilled but I refer to the Turkish nation. I would like to stress that the sick man is not the Turkish nation. A bad rule, internal and external ambitions give this noble nation an impression of a sick country. But this nation proved by its notable heroic acts that it still holds its strength and its determination to live"61.

---

60 Ibid, p. 50.
It is a reality that the sick impression was given by the Imperialist Turk, while the real Turk was still aware of his past.

The Tanzimat aimed at saving the country from decay; it aimed at the unification of all its subjects, regardless of their descent. However, most of these good ideas stood on paper, and hardly turned out to be realized.

Thinking about the Tanzimat reforms and the Imperial Declarations, it would not be quite accurate to claim that the leaders of the Tanzimat aimed at a formation of an Ottoman nation, as they themselves were deprived from a modern national consciousness. They were acting more or less under an Islamic inspired spirit. Even Namik Kemal, the era's most fierce patriot, based his themes first on Islam, and secondly on the Ottoman people. Forming an Ottoman nation in which all the subjects were to be free and equal took root to a certain extent among a few writers. But the Christian minorities were not enthusiastic about such a state of affairs. Their aim was nothing but an independent state. As aforementioned, they were affected for a long time by the growing influence of nationalism. Nevertheless, it was quite hard to repair or remodel an
incubus which was already thrown out of gear. The Tanzimat rulers aimed at saving the country from the general catastrophe which seemed quite near. This evolution was carried on half-heartedly and inefficiently. As stated previously, the Tanzimat was evolutionary and progressive rather than radical in spirit. Thus, as progressives rather than radicals, determined to carry out the reform without the usual method of terror, their difficulties were enormous. Besides internal resistance from privileged classes, they had to face the external dangers caused by Russia and Egypt, as well as the internal upheavals. To crown it all, the sultan, although sincere in his desire for progress, objected to the transfer of the power to the Porte, in which the negative influence of the Pashas and the palace women was deeply felt.

The Tanzimat did not save the country from the incubus. It merely delayed the collapse of the country by realizing certain limited reforms, and by so doing, it paved the way to the emergence of the Young Turk Movement.
While closing the chapter of the Tanzimat, it would be impossible to overlook a study regarding the efforts of Namik Kemal, the great Turkish poet and patriot.

Namik Kemal (December 21, 1840 - December 2, 1882) was representing a thought which prevailed in the following years. He began to write articles in the Tasviri Efkar as early as his twenty-second year, and was an Ottomanist and Islamist as well. Many of his thoughts shall be actively followed in the Young Turk era.

From his youth, he saw the corrupt state organism and sought to find a remedy to cure the deep-rooted illness of the Empire. Following the steps of his master Shinasi, he openly defended the ideas of Liberty and Equality.

Thus, Namik Kemal became the most prominent of the group of outstanding men who, in a medieval environment laid the foundations of a new era. He aimed at a literary, political and social awakening, and through his essays, poems, historical novels, prose and history books tried to awaken the patriotic feeling of the people, and consequent­ly to give them a new interpretation of their past, and a
new idea of their destiny. - As aforementioned, Namik Kemal was one of the first persons who formed the Young Ottoman Secret Society. When the secret meeting place of this society was discovered, he fled to London where he published the paper Liberty. Following the general amnesty, he returned to Istanbul (1870) and took part in writing the first Ottoman Constitution.

However, following the first performance of his patriotic play Vatan Yahut Silistre (Fatherland), Namik Kemal was exiled to Crete. Receiving amnesty in 1882, he returned to Istanbul, where he died after a few days.

This is a condensed portrait of Turkey's first patriotic poet.

Turkish patriotism, as existed before the Young Turkish Revolution of 1908, did not include any element of social solidarity among individuals. It meant an attachment to land and religion, a pride in Ottoman and Mohamedan history, and a collective consciousness of not being like foreigners. Namik Kemal is the typical poet representing such a thought. As a matter of fact, he worked on two types

of patriotism. His patriotism first of all concerned an Ottoman Union. Accordingly, the whole Empire was the Fatherland and all the citizens - no matter what their religious or racial origin might be - were its subjects, and were compelled to save the Empire and work for the Empire. His second kind of patriotism was a more radical one, a kind of patriotism in which the history, religion, traditions and customs played an important role. The first kind of patriotism concerned the mentality, while the second one concerned the consciousness of the people.

During this stage, the country was called the land of the Ottomans and the state the Sublime Porte; the language was called the Ottoman Language. The term 'Turk' was used in the Turkish language only as a translation from foreign languages. The old people felt themselves to be Ottomans and Mohamedans, while the younger generation was rather a cosmopolitan one. These rather snobish people tried to teach their children a foreign language before teaching them Turkish. A family without a foreign governess was not considered a family living in harmony with the era's fashion.

Namik Kemal lived in such a society, and represented the old generation: the Ottoman and Islamic spirit. However,
he was a progressive and broad-minded poet dealing mostly with the following aspects: Constitution, Liberty, Islamic Unity, Ottomanism, Patriotism and Courage. As did the other Ottomanists, he mainly followed and advocated the Pan-Islamic policy in order to save the Empire from being partitioned. Secondly, he advocated the Pan-Islamic policy for the very same reason, thinking that the Ottoman Empire in so doing could defend itself against the dangers of Pan-Slavism, Pan-Germanism, and Pan-Latinism. Thus he hoped to reach a balance of powers. Speaking of liberty, he defended the ideas set forth by J.J. Rousseau. Similarly, he defended the idea of individual freedom and argued that the human being is born free and has the right to live so.

In general, "the ideas of Namik Kemal were not deep ideas"\(^63\), and had already been expressed by several Western thinkers. Nevertheless, Abdullah Hamet Tarhan, another poet, criticized the critics of Namik Kemal who had defined him as being primitive. Accordingly, Tarhan\(^64\) claimed that

\(^{63}\) Ibid.

"Namik was not primitive but eternal. However, if primitive he was, he was as primitive as Homer and Virgil were". However, whether the ideas of Kemal were already expressed or not, the naked reality was that the ideas were quite new for the Turkish public and intelligentsia.

Kemal's patriotism was not a patriotism for Turkish nationalism. As Yaha Kemal Beyatli had stated, "although Kemal lived in an era when Europe was deeply agitated by nationalist tendencies, Kemal did not defend such a patriotism because our intellectual level had not yet reached that perfection. Nevertheless, if his writings shall be deeply studied we shall observe that he unconsciously understood our present nationalism".

Namik Kemal was the last representative of the Tanzimat, the last preacher of the Islamic ideas, but equally one of the first initiators of atavism.

He wrote many poems (Vatan-Hurriyet Kasidesi) and many plays which agitated the pride, the Ottoman pride of the people, and which no doubt proved to be useful in those years. Among them - Vatan Yahut Silistre, Gulnihal, Akif Bey and Zavalli Bey - were all patriotic plays.

---

65 Ibid., p. 47.
Kemal was pessimistic for the time being while he expressed the following idea:

The enemy has thrust his knife into the breast of our country,
And it seems there is no one to defend our mother.

However, it was to take a few decades to produce a man who was able to answer Kemal. It was Ataturk who later said that

It is true the enemy has plunged a knife into the breast of our country,
But there will always be found some men to save her.

---

CHAPTER IV

PAN MOVEMENTS

"The sword of the Turk and likewise his pen, 
Have exalted the Arabs, Chinese and Persians; 
He has created a history, and a home for every people; 
He has deluded himself for the benefits of others."

Ziya Gokalp

Young Turks

Hardly twenty years had passed since the Tanzimat reforms, when, in 1859, a new generation, far from being satisfied with the previous reforms, went a step further and demanded a constitution. Under the leadership of Namik Kemal, Nuri Bey and Mehmet Bey, they formed a secret society called the 'Young Ottomans', which later became the core of the Young Turks. They directed their efforts towards the westernization of the Ottoman society in sociological and cultural fields, and they started to express their ideas in rather prolific literature in the historical works, novels, poems, plays, essays, and newspaper editorials. These were the means by which they sought to incite
the retarded Ottoman society so that it might adjust itself to the Western civilization.

In 1365 the newspaper Musbir first appeared, edited by Ali Suavi, who advocated radical and not superficial reforms, such as those exercised by the Tanzimatists. Despite the limited freedom of the press, the paper was suppressed by the government in 1367 and Suavi fled with a few other intellectuals to London, where they joined other liberal Turkish writers who had left the country before. The paper Hurriyet (Liberty) was published in London by those who had left the country before. Nevertheless, the Turkish press in Turkey developed rapidly between 1870 and 1876.

Thus, the Turkish press was one of the most important factors in the transformation of the Turkish life and thought, for it promised a practical spirit. People no longer accepted what came with oriental submission and fatalism as the decree of destiny. Consequently, for the first time in the Near East, a public opinion and a public spirit came into existence. Although the circulation of the papers was quite limited, their influence was considerably wide. The circulation increased quite rapidly over a short period of time, and while in 1860 there was only one
official and one semi-official paper, by 1872, forty-one independent papers and periodicals, and by 1876, forty-seven independent papers were published. Speaking for Istanbul alone, it could be noted that while in 1872 only three dailies were published, this number increased to seven in less than a four year period.

The Young Ottomans were still working secretly until their secret meeting place at Sancta Sophia was discovered by the Government. Some of their members were arrested and sent into exile. Among those who were arrested was Shinassi, a serious man, interested more in cultural uplift than in politics. He was exiled thrice, in 1859, 1867 and 1871, each time to remote regions of the Empire. But the majority of the leaders succeeded in fleeing the country, and in Paris they joined certain other pioneers of the Young Ottoman movement who were already living there in voluntary exile. The newcomers were sincerely welcomed by the French youth which was discontent with Napoleon III. Thus, many French and other foreigners joined the society, henceforth to be called the 'Young Turkish Society'. However, it should be pointed out that the term 'Young Turk' was attributed not only to a specific society, but to all those who worked for a constitution. Unfortunately, the society
lost part of its political and idealistic nature as certain persons intermittently joined this organization, with the aim of blackmailing the Sultan or the Government leaders. While the external branch of the Young Turks was in such a situation, in Turkey, Young Turks, headed by Mithat Pasha, played an important and active role in the course of the history of Turkey. The proclamation of the 1876 Constitution is mainly due to their efforts. Owing to his inefficiency, Abdul Aziz was deposed, and Murat V, a man upon whom the Young Turks depended profoundly, was enthroned. However, Murat V, a man with progressive ideas and the only member of the dynasty who really favored the patriotic Young Turkish movement, had to be dethroned after three months of office, as the news of the suicide of his uncle, Abdul Aziz, bereft him of reason. Thus, Abdul-Hamit, the future despot who affected a liberal attitude, and who promised a liberal constitution as well as a national assembly, was enthroned. The Young Turks who had escaped to Paris and London returned from exile with great hopes and ideals. Namik Kemal, whose dream was always a liberal constitution, had satisfaction in taking part in the committee which, under the inspiration of the French model, prepared the first Ottoman Constitution.
On December 23rd, 1876, the first Ottoman Constitution was proclaimed, and Mithat Pasha became the Grand Vizier. Following the accession of Abdul-Hamit, energetic and efficient men occupied all important offices; a free press made itself a vigilant guardian of democracy against possible machinations of the Palace. The revolutionary movements in the Balkans were successfully suppressed.

However, it did not take long for Mithat Pasha and the other Young Turks to realize that they had trusted a sheep to a wolf, as Abdul-Hamit took advantage of the Turco-Russian war, suspended the Constitution, and dissolved the Parliament after its first and only session under a pretense of security measures. All progressive leaders were dismissed and exiled. Thus the war was used as a pretext to silence all the voices of opposition. Abdul-Hamit, who never believed in a constitution, in a lawful state organization, proved that he was not in accordance with the liberal ideas of the Young Turks. He had acted so in order to become the Sultan, and because he had no other alternative under the increasing pressure of the Young Turks.

Thus, Abdul-Hamit became the sole master, a real despot with a single purpose in mind. His aim was to enjoy his autocratic power without any sort of restriction or
hindrance. A strong secret police and a spy system which had the task of detecting every inclination to oppose or to criticize was established. A period of terror and a dark age commenced, which lasted for thirty-three years. Hamid was displaying more cruelty to his Turkish subjects than to his non-Turkish subjects, the Armenians, Albanians, etc. He believed that the menace to his position lay chiefly in the Turkish element of the Empire, and hence, he made it his business to drastically and continuously suppress any expansion of idea, any corporation amongst which the ideal of a constitution could be revived. Unable thus to trust his own citizens, the Turks, he chose his body guards and most of his statesmen from among those who were not of Turkish descent. Moreover, he did not hesitate to take severe measures to suppress the liberal press, and to exile its authors and readers.

Certain expressions such as 'liberty', 'constitution', 'fatherland', 'nation' and 'republic' which, no doubt, express a great moral value, were erased from the dictionaries.

However, a general amnesty in 1878 brought back most of the Young Turks who had previously fled the country. Nevertheless, it was not long before Mithat Pasha was
charged with the murder of Abdulasiz, who had actually com-
mitted suicide, and sent into exile in Taif, where he was
murdered by order of Abdul-Hamit. Thus died the Mithat, the
first martyr for liberty in Turkey. Namik Kemal, too, was
arrested and sent into exile for his patriotic play called
Nation, which provoked the national sentiment of the people.

Thus ended the first phase of the Young Turk politi-
cal movement. Their ideals were high, but the political
and social circumstances were not sufficiently receptive to
them to insure their success. The following political move-
ment, the second phase of the Young Turk's activity, came
into being in a short time. These new young Turks who formed
the core of the eventual Party of Union and Progress were
the real Turks, while the original Young Turks are usually
regarded as the 'old' Young Turks.

Union and Progress

However, it was not long before certain other intel-
lectuals began to work for the restoration of the suspended
Constitution. It was with this aim in view that, in 1892,
the Union and Progress Party was founded by Ibrahim Temo,
Abdullah Cevdet, Ishak Sukutu and Mehmet Reval, all of whom were medical students inspired by the liberal ideologies. However, we should note that there is a certain disagreement among some authors regarding the year in which the Party was founded. According to Ahmet Bedevi Kuran, and Ahmet Emin Yalman, the Party was founded in 1892, while certain other authorities, among them Halide Edip Adivar, Donald Webster, and Hans Kohn, pretend that it was founded in 1906. However, in the light of the interesting documents published by Ahmet Bedevi Kuran and the facts given by Ahmet Emin Yalman, a well known authority in Turkish political history, it would not be false to take the year 1892 as the year of foundation. It is true that the Party did not play a very active role until 1906.

Another cause which led to the formation of the Union and Progress Party is explained by Ahmet Emin Yalman as follows:

2 Ibid.
3 Ahmet Emin Yalman, Turkey in World War, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1930, p. 33.
4 Ibid., p. 85.
From 1877, the year when the Constitution was suspended, until 1890, a certain limit of freedom existed. However, Hamit regarded it a better policy to abolish all individual liberty, which act brought more opposition to his rule. To achieve the desired results, he exiled many liberal authors to various parts of the Empire, and who never returned. The result was the increase of secret agitation and the tendency to flee to Europe. In 1894 and 1895, world-wide indignation was aroused by the Armenian massacres. For them, much of the responsibility must be laid upon the Sultan, a responsibility shared with Russia and the Armenian revolutionaries. Enough that they stirred the Turkish patriots to action, and caused the formation of the Committee of Union and Progress.

Two years later, in 1894, in view of the Armenian revolution, the Committee considered it a patriotic duty to declare to the Western world that it was not the Armenian subjects who suffered under the rule of Hamid, but that it was rather the Turkish population. The government in the first appearance underrated the leaflets distributed by the Party. But after having observed the great support that the Party's ideas gained, some of the members were arrested and sent to exile, while some others fled to Europe. In time, many students from the Military Academy joined the organization and several conspiracies were planned. Among the various conspiracies executed, the one of 1897 resulted in thirteen students being hanged, and eighty-one sent into exile.
The Union and Progress Party became active only after 1906, while the external dangers were threatening the existence of the Empire. Russia, very keen to destroy the Turkish State, instigated Pan-Slavic revolutions in Bosnia, Montenegro, Serbia and Bulgaria. In the meantime, in order to force the Sultan to accept the introduction of the Muersterg program of reforms, the Island of Mytilene had to be occupied in November 1905. As a result, foreign inspectors, officers of the gendarmerie and experts of police reforms were entrusted with the task of making Macedonia a safe place in which to live. This was the normal method of liquidating Turkish sovereignty in the given area. The final effect in this case was, however, quite an unexpected one. Abdul-Hamit had felt obliged to send well educated and efficient officials and army officers to Macedonia.

Thus, it was these men who, stimulated by the clash of the Balkan nationalist aspirations, developed a new sort of Turkish nationalism. These were the men, the intellectuals, and the young army officers who joined later and took charge of the Union and Progress Party, and deposed Abdul-Hamit, the despot who ruled the country for thirty-three years. With this explanation, we are able to understand why most of the revolutionary and nationalist movements emerged in Macedonia, and not in other regions of the Empire.

---

5 Ibid., p. 40.
In this connection, we would likewise note that the non-Turkish elements in Macedonia were not satisfied with the Muersterg Program of reform, as its success would have meant retaining the Ottoman citizenship, which factor was in contrast with their supreme goal - national independence.

In 1906, the Union and Progress Party realized that there was danger of foreign control in Macedonia from the time of the Austro-Hungarian Conference at Muersterg, and that speedy action was necessary. At this Conference, the Austrian Foreign Secretary A.L. von Aehrenthal, and the Russian Foreign Minister A.D. Izvolski agreed on the partition of the Straits. The Straits were going to be Russian territory, and Bulgaria a Russian sphere of influence. This is an interesting example of Russia's expansionist and Pan-Slavic policy. On the other hand, Austria was receiving Macedonia and Serbia as a sphere of Austrian influence.

In the same year (1906), certain young officers of the Macedonian Garrison joined the secret organization. Among them were: Enver, Cemal, Talat, Ismail Hakki, Fethi, Niazi, Kazim (Karabekir) and Mustafa Kemal who, previously, during his military office in Aleppo, had organized another secret society (Vatan). The Party enlisted a woman member as well, Emine Semie Khanum. When these young officers
joined the secret organization, they brought an active military force under the command of the Party, which was working with great secrecy following the example of the Freemasons and the Italian Resorgimento, the well known secret society of the time. No Party member knew more than three of his party companions. The liaison between the Party in Macedonia and the Young Turks in Paris was to be maintained by Dr. Nazim. On his arrival, the name of the society was changed from 'Liberty' to 'Union and Progress'. It is rather believed that the Party members adopted this title from a lecture of Herbert Spencer, who had recommended such a name to an Italian society.

In the meantime,

the conference at Reval in 1907, of the British and Russian rulers, during which the Middle Eastern affairs were discussed, gave the Young Turks the impression that the country would be treated as a lifeless prey unless quick action was taken. As a result of a decision by a secret committee, which still called itself the Union and Progress, various military formations declared open revolution against the state of affairs maintained by the Sultan, and demanded the re-establishment of the constitutional regime suspended since 1877⁶.

---

⁶ Ibid., p. 40.
On July 4th, 1908, Niazi Bey, a young officer moved with two hundred soldiers from Resna to Macedonia, where he began to organize volunteer bands with the motto of 'Constitution and Liberty'. Troops sent by the Court to punish the rebels refused to fire, and some of them did not hesitate to join the opposite party. On July 13th, Enver Bey joined the movement, and on the very same day the Third Army Corps placed itself officially at the head of the movement. Throughout Macedonia, the suspended Constitution of 1878 was declared in force. The Sheik-el Islam, however, refused the Court proposal for a fetwa in order to obtain permission to send more troops against the rebel officers.

In July, the officers of the Union and Progress Party in Macedonia threatened the Sultan with marching over the Capital unless the Constitution were to be reinstated. Hence, after vain attempts to resist, the Sultan granted the demands of the revolutionaries on July 10th, 1908, and for the first time in thirty-two years issued a call for general parliamentary elections.

The new Constitution provided for individual liberty, freedom of press and speech, and liberty of association, and equality. All the subjects of the Empire were made eligible to enter government services.
"The Young Turks went even further in moderation and self-denial. They refused all offices, and left the conduct of the affairs to those relatively honest and capable statesmen and officials who were a part of the government's machinery."\(^7\)

The new Parliament, a rather riotous debating society, opened on December 17th, 1908. The Young Turks still did not hold offices, but had only a majority of friendly deputies. Nevertheless, in time, discontent increased for several reasons. All those elements who had lost their privileges began to show their anger. The population of Istanbul which, up to this time, was exempt from serving in the army and paying taxes, could not tolerate the new laws which forced them both to serve in the army and to pay their taxes. The minorities were not pleased either, owing to the fact that the Young Turks professed Ottomanism.

During this period, Hamid was secretly preparing "his counter revolution, relying on the adherents of the old regime and reactionaries. Even fair-minded people felt their own disappointment, for the Constitution had not proved to be a panacea"\(^8\), as had been previously propagated.

---

\(^7\) Ibid., p. 42.

\(^8\) Ibid., p. 41.
by the Young Turkish Unionists. The Unionists in their early years declared that "the breakdown of despotism and the establishment of a Constitutional government meant a panacea for changing everything at a single stroke". As shall be seen in the following pages, they professed an Ottoman Unity as the remedy for the unhealthy situation in which the Empire was. Thus, taking advantage of the aforementioned disappointment, Abdul-Hamit, a despot in mind and heart, provoked the clergy who had formed a 'Mohammedan Union' opposing the Unionists.

The Mohammedan Union was criticizing every step taken by the Union and Progress Party, and in doing this, it was openly exploiting the ignorance of the people. They demanded that the Koran and the Canon Laws be obeyed and applied with absolute strictness, and insisted that the sultans should obtain the greater power which they had previously enjoyed. They even insisted that the Young Turk Progressive Unionist Party be outlawed, and that its officials in the government resign from office. Even "the well drilled and model regiments which the Unionists considered a faithful bodyguard, were won over by money, and

---

9 Ibid., p. 41.
worked upon by religious suggestion”¹⁰, headed the Mohammedan Union, initiated by the clergy. Thus, the once powerful Unionist Party lost its great support and consequently its entire influence.

Taking advantage of this situation, the Grand Vizier Kiamil Pasha, a Liberal Unionist, (the party formed by the minorities and consequently representing the forces of discontent), and a man enjoying the protection of Great Britain, dismissed the ministers friendly to the Unionist Party. He received a strong vote of confidence. Taking strength from this vote, he tried to step still further, and sought to remove certain military units which were loyal to the Unionist Party. However, the Unionist Party did not hesitate to respond with a powerful military and naval demonstration. Under such circumstances, Kiamil Pasha was forced to resign, and the Unionist Party received a great majority vote (198-8). The next cabinet tried to suppress the voices of those who opposed the Unionist Party, and it is rather strange to note that even Hamid joined in doing so. A period of terror started. When a fanatically hostile journalist from the opposition party was openly assasinated by the Unionists,

the greater part of the population revolted against the Party and the Government (April 13th, 1908). In response, several young officers were murdered and the Unionists had no alternative but to flee the Capital. However, it did not take long for them to assemble in Salonique, Macedonia. Under the command of Mahmut Sevket Pasha, the Hareket Ordu-su, in which Mustafa Kemal was the Chief of Staff, marched over the Capital.

The Liberals fled while the street fighting was going on, fighting in which "the theological students were foremost in offering resistance"\(^{11}\) to this army. Consequently, on April 24th, the Unionists established their authority without any check and resistance. Hamid was deposed and sent into exile, while the other reactionaries were severely punished. Mehmet V was proclaimed the Sultan. However, discontent showed itself once more during the War of Tripoli. During this time, the Party had split into several wings. On one hand were the Extremist Unionists, the fanatical partisans.

However, shortly after achieving their victory, the Young Turks split into sections, the ones who would maintain the integrity of the Ottoman Empire and the principle of centralization. "They thought that the complicated problems arising from the existence of a mixed and unassimilated population could be settled by their formula of unification of races, on the common ground of equal Ottoman citizenship". Their leaders were Ahmet Riza and Halil Ganem. The other section, the League for Decentralization, clung to the opposite belief and worked more or less for the independence of the minorities. Needless to say, this group was formed by non-Turkish people of the Empire. Nationalism was already a growing aspiration among the non-Turkish citizens, especially among the Christian subjects. "Its branches in those parts of European Turkey where the Revolution of 1908 had originated, assumed an independent attitude, and defended the Orthodox political faith against the miserable Byzantine influences of Constantinople".

---


13 Ibid.
The group of the Centralists was divided into sections as well. The first group was a revolutionary group ready to destroy everything which presented an obstacle to its objective.

The second group was formed by the Moderates, advocating a conservative rule. Composed mostly of office seekers, they formed the left wing of the Party.

The third group, formed by the various groups who were dissatisfied with the rule of the extremists, looked upon the extremists as usurpers, enemies and rivals. Dissatisfied with the rule of the extremists continued and received greater support, while the conservative moderates and the third group of the opposition formed the Second Division of the Union and Progress Party. They published a ten-article program in which they strongly demanded a moderate rule.

The extremists were unable to refuse these demands, as they did not feel strong enough. However, the conflict did not end. The moderates came into power. The election

---

14 The nature of the ideas represented in this group were published in papers which bore such fierce titles: The Sword, The Gun, The Bullet, The Weapon, The Bayonet, The Thunderbolt. Even the titles show the nature of the ideas represented in this group.
results, under unfavorable conditions, yielded great support for the Moderates. However, on June 11th, 1912, the young Army officers revolted against these results with the claim that they were not representing a free vote.

Following these events, the 'Great Cabinet' came to power. It was, however, a short-lived Government, as the outbreak of the Balkan War (November 8th, 1912), compelled this 'Great Cabinet' to resign.

A cabinet formed by the Liberals, a group of purely opposition members, came to power. Nevertheless, this cabinet did not survive the coup d'état led by Enver Pasha who, leading a group of demonstrators, attacked the Sublime Porte, assassinated the Minister of War Nazim Pasha, and consequently brought the Union and Progress Party back into power. Enver became the Minister of War and Chief of Staff; Talat Pasha, a former telegraph clerk, became the Premier, and Cemal became the Minister of the Marine, and the Governor of the Arabian Provinces. The real power was seized by these three men who practically formed a triumvirate.

All idealistic men, looking forward to the survival of the country, they tried their utmost despite the unfavorable political conditions. But World War I broke out and gave them no chance to look to the internal situation.
The important decisions were made either by this triumvirate together, or by each man independently in matters which concerned his separate sphere. Cemal Pasha, who became the dictator of the Arabian Provinces, believed that the Ottoman Unity could be preserved by force, and to this supreme end he did not hesitate to take severe measures in punishing the rebellious Arabs. However, it was too late when he realized that Ottomanism and Islamism were failures.

Talat Pasha tried to be a moderate who aimed at saving the Turkish people before the others. However, he was unable to find any specific policy with which to attain such an end.

Enver, who became the Minister of War and Chief of Staff, took the first place among his friends because of the political circumstances.

Larcher\textsuperscript{15} defined this triumvirate in the following manner:

The three chiefs formed a sort of triumvirate. Of humble origin, they had won their own way of life, and were remarkable, above all, for these characteristics - audacity, energy, tenacity, presence of mind in the most desperate situations, and belief both in their own destiny and the destiny of the Turkish people.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 100.
PAN MOVEMENTS

Ottomanism

The policy first followed by the majority of the Young Turks was the policy of Ottomanism in which they thought that all the complicated problems arising from the existence of a mixed and assimilated population could be settled by their formula of unification of the races on the common ground of equal Ottoman citizenship.16

This movement, as could be observed, was in its nature anti-nationalist, as it was the antithesis of nationalism advocated by the non-Turkish minorities. This thesis was anti-national, because in such an Ottoman unity, all the racial elements had to forget their origin and descent. However, in contrast to this anti-national character the policy of Ottomanism was considerably a national policy, as it aimed at uniting all the various racial and religious elements under a common Ottoman citizenship. The Young Turks, in supporting such a policy, must have dreamt about a strong centralized Ottoman State in which all these elements were to be wholeheartedly united for the common goal of Ottomanism. Therefore, this policy could be named a 'neutral nationalist' policy.

16 Ibid., p. 41.
As mentioned previously, the supporters of Ottomanism thought romantically that all the ill-wills expressed against Turkey by the European Powers undoubtedly resulted from the Hamidian despotism, and that the European Powers would, in all likelihood, become close friends and allies of Turkey if the suspended Constitution of 1877 were to be re-proclaimed, and if such a strong centralized Ottoman Union were to be established. By this we see that the Pan-Ottomanist Young Turks were still unable to notice the strong nationalist forces which were guiding the minorities, especially the Christian subjects. Thus, as a remedy, they hoped to save the multinational Empire by granting equal rights to all its citizens, regardless of their differences in race or religion. Nevertheless, these Young Turks found it difficult to understand why their ardent appeals to Great Britain and France, whom they idealized as creators of liberal institutions, met with cold reception; why their requests for material and moral help were politely refused, and why these Powers were indifferent to Turkey's ambitions to make herself like them.  

Recalling a passage mentioned previously with respect to the differences between the Imperialist Turks and the real Turks, we can add the following:  

---

17 Ibid., p. 42.
When Vambery, the noted Hungarian Orientalist, visited Constantinople, he found that the word 'Turk' conveyed to the Turks and to the dignitaries of the Empire a meaning akin to barbarism and rudeness. He tried to interest these Turks in the question of their racial and cultural affinity with the Turks in Central Asia. They all felt insulted at this suggested relationship to a nomad people. They thought of themselves as Mohammedans and Ottomans, and used the term 'Turk' only in connection with low class people, particularly peasants.

It is curious, if not tragic, to note that even these peasants now disliked the idea of being called Turk, and regarded the inference a humiliating one. "They used to say of themselves to explain their lack of urban manners: We must be excused. We are only Turks."

While Ziya preached nationalism to the intellectuals, Mehmet Emin (Yurdakul), a well-known poet, projected himself to the people by reading one of his poems in which he started with the following catchwords: "I am a Turk, my religion and my race are noble". But, except on a minor scale, Mehmet Emin was unable to note any success in his


early years. The poems of this nationalist poet who used the pure Turkish language in his articles, and who voluntarily labored for Turkish nationalism, were hardly read by any Turk, while they were eagerly translated into foreign languages. Among the Turks, he was considered rather a man "who was trying very hard to be original".

It is true, however, that in that era people had no alternative other than Pan-Ottomanism. Even those who were nationalists in their hearts and minds refrained from expressing it, as they thought it dangerous in view of the possible practical results. The Turks formed only a third of the entire Ottoman population, but controlled a vast territory inhabited with a vast non-Turkish population. A nationalist policy, followed by the Turks themselves, would mean nothing but cutting the branch on which the man himself was sitting. It was rather too late to Turkify the Moslem and Christian minorities; therefore they thought that the only alternative was the policy of neutral nationalism, that is to say, Ottomanism.

But, during this period the non-Turkish elements, among them more particularly the Christian minorities in the Balkan Peninsula, were already caught up by the attractive and most promising trend of nationalism. As a
consequence of being in closer contact with Europe than were the Arabs, the Christian minorities were the first in assimilating the theory and practice of nationalism. They became aware of their national consciousness, of their own historic past, their separate language, religion, literature and music. These Christian minorities received a great deal of moral and material support from certain European Powers - among whom Russia and England had the lead - in order to rebel against their Ottoman Turkish masters. In order to secure the independence of the Christian minorities, these European Powers did not hesitate to turn down the repeated Ottoman demands for moral and material aid. It is no doubt clear that the Christian minorities were supported partly because they adhered to the very same faith to which the European Powers adhered, while the Arabs, the non-Turkish Moslems, were provoked and were offered material aid simply in order to cause the decay and partitioning of the Ottoman Empire. It would be rather false to pretend that the European Powers granted moral and material aid to all non-Turkish minorities because of that high ideal, i.e. nationalism.
It is a fact that the Ottoman laws regarding the Christian minorities were based on extremely tolerant principles, on a tolerance which is perhaps responsible for causing the decay of the Empire. Even during the most despotic and arbitrary as well as the years of religious fanaticism of Abdun-Hamit's rule, the Christian schools alone enjoyed a complete freedom, whilst the Turkish and Moslem schools were under a strict government control. Naturally, the students who followed courses at these schools did not graduate as Ottomans or people who had a particular sentiment towards the Sultan or the Empire, but as sincere and ardent patriots aiming at the liberation of their country.

In the first phase of the Ottomanist campaign, certain minority groups took a spontaneous part in the joyous occasion, and heatedly frenzied with the Turks. However, this joy did not last very long as they were warned by their secret leaders, secret organizations and churches that equality and freedom in the Ottoman State would be only temporary, and that their real independence, their real prosperity both as individuals and as a group rest in achieving the national independence of their ethnically different groups.
Thus, as reported by Ahmet Emin Yalman\textsuperscript{20}, "the great mass influenced by its churches or by treacherous secret propaganda of foreign governments cherished the idea of breaking away from the Empire".

The fact that the churches in the Ottoman Empire dominated the Christian Provinces was one of the causes which kept the national subconsciousness alive, is not denied in the West. Regarding this, a Greek author wrote that

\begin{quote}
it must be borne in mind that since the fall of Constantinople up to the War of Independence of 1821, the Church was the only rallying point. Hellenism and Religion and the cause of national survival have become one and the same\textsuperscript{21}.
\end{quote}

On the other hand, the treacherous activities of certain countries in inciting the separatist aspirations, is an undeniable historical fact. Thus, in contrast to the ideas of the Union and Progress Party, the Party of Liberal Union was formed by the minorities, forming thus a party advocating a separatist tendency. In time it became quite clear that such separatist tendencies were not confined

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., p. 43.
\textsuperscript{21} George Vlassis, "Letters from Our Readers", in the Gazette of Montreal, issue of April 6, 1956.
\end{flushright}
solely to the Christian subjects, but to the Moslems as well. The Christians, wherever their number and geographical position made it possible to form a state or to join a state already formed by their race, fought against the idea of a common Ottoman Unity.

Besides the Christians, neither did the Moslems hesitate to take an active part in a movement aiming at attaining their national independence. Albania, a territory where the Moslems are in majority, was as eager as the Arabs to establish its own national State. The Kurds and Circassians, too, expressed the very same ideal, while the Turk was the only one who still clung to the utopia of Ottomanism, an ideology rejected by all non-Turkish subjects.

Under these circumstances, the Young Turks awakened from their rosy dream and realized that they were in a 'cul de sac' - in a deadlock. Seeing that cooperation with the Christian subjects was impossible, they thought it more realistic to substitute the policy of Ottomanism with that of Islamism. However, in this turn they were idealists to such an extent as to expect support from the non-Turkish Moslems. As aforementioned, the Moslem subjects were already aware of their distinct origin and had no desire to live within the Empire whether Ottoman or Islamic.
Pan-Islamism

Those, who saw no hope and no way out of the impasse, turned to advocating a Pan-Islamic policy, a policy which was ended by the coup d'état of 1908.

Since the defeat of the Egyptian Mamluks in the battle of Ridaniye (1517), the Ottoman Turkish rulers acquired ascendancy over the entire Moslem World simply by the assumption of the Caliphate. Sultan Selim became the first Ottoman Caliph. However,

it was not until towards the end of the 18th century that the Turkish Empire fell into decay and it became necessary to devise some means of resisting the increasing pressure of the European Powers that the Turkish Sultans began to call themselves Caliphs.22

One of those means was Pan-Islamism.

Mohammedans must eject every European and Christian from their countries. Europeans call fanaticism in the Orient everything which at home they might well term nationalism and patriotism. Conceptions held high in the West, such as self-respect, national pride, and national prestige are looked down upon in the East as Chauvinism. An exclusive national consciousness is encouraged in the West, but it is given the name of xenophoby when it is found in the East. We should not be fooled by the Europeans; they are united to destroy Mohammedanism (...) Mohammedans must awaken, they must unite and have faith in knowledge and economic

---

activity. The loss of Constantinople stimulated the people of the Western World to fresh efforts (...) They (the Mohammedans) must do away with their theological differences, reform their religion, improve their way of writing (...) The Europeans wish to get hold of our wealth, to make colonies of our territories, and slaves of ourselves. They do not look upon Mohammedans as human beings; we have no rights in their eyes. They call us Barbarians, try to discord among us and are set upon destroying Turkey as the principal pillar of Islam.

A Pan-Islamic policy aiming towards a union with all the Moslem people regardless of their sect was followed, and reached its zenith before the end of the century. It would be accurate to name Abdul-Hamit as its patron, and Djemaled-din Afghani as its philosopher and preacher. The latter sought to "use Pan-Islamism as a weapon against military and economic imperialism of Europe". Pan-Islamism was therefore a defensive ideology and not an aggressive one.

Djemaleddin Afghani, the non-Turkish Mohammedan intellectual, founded the principles of the Pan-Islamic policy as mentioned henceforth:

Certain European countries disliked the idea that Turkey should recover from her illness, and certainly many

---

people in the West were unable to digest the fall of Constantinople. Moreover, many Western scholars particularly enjoyed attacking Turkey because of religious and political reasons.

It was therefore for the reasons stated that the Pan-Islamic policy, as interpreted by Djemaleddin Afghani, was considerably anti-Western and anti-European. His statements were no doubt a response to the enmities shown continuously by the Europeans, and they reflected the common ideas of the majority of Ottoman Turks.

After Afghani's death, in 1897, the whole Islamic World had been missionized; Turkish warships sailed to distant places such as Japan and the Philippines. Pan-Islamic centers were opened around the world, in Java, Japan, the Philippines, Bombay, Shanghai, Tunis, etc. However, one of the most interesting centers was the Pan-Islamic Society in London, founded by Abdullah Sutrawardy in 1903, whose journal, The Pan-Islam, "took color from the circumstances - lavishly using humanitarian and even socialist phrases to characterize Asiatic virtue as opposed to European vice."

25 Ibid., Vol. 11-12, p. 543.
While Abdul Hamid was planning to build a railway from Hidjaz to Palestine, the Sunni and the Shii sects ended their long conflict, and joined forces against the so-called 'European Imperialism'.

All these and similar activities ended with the coup d'etat of 1908, and left ground to the Pan-Ottomanist policy. In the light of the catastrophic failure of Pan-Ottomanism, the Young Turks remembered the considerable popularity gained by Turkey among the Moslems during the period of Pan-Islamism. They believed that Islam, that is to say the religious phenomenon, was a strong tie and would contribute to a strong unity which the Pan-Ottomanist policy could not achieve. They thought that Pan-Islamism could always become a powerful weapon against European aggression. Thus Pan-Islamism originated "from the collision of occidental and oriental nationalism and imperialism". Consequently, as argued by George Young,

defenders of the Islamic social system seeking security against the invasion of Western scientific industrialism, imperialist capitalism, and political nationalism turned naturally to 'the sword of Islam', the Ottoman Caliph. It was obvious of course that

26 Ibid., p. 542.
27 Ibid.
this sword had been beaten back from Vienna to Con­stantinople, from Cairo to Khartum, and from Cal­cutta to Kabul, but the weapon of Pan-Islamism was
to be a pen that might prove mightier than the sword.

In this second stage, Pan-Islamism was as defensive
as it was in its first stage during the reign of Abdul Ha­mid.

Although the superstructure of the modern
Islamic state had become ruinous there were, never­theless foundations more solid than those of any
Western state born out of industrial revolution, rationalist individualism, and representative in­stitutions. Pan-Islamism, however, was not an at­tempt to rebuild on sound foundations, but a hope­less effort to rebutress the collapsing cupola -
the Caliphate\textsuperscript{28}.

That is why Pan-Islamism was bound to become a
failure. Anyhow, under the awakening of Arabic nationalism,
and under the increasing political gravities the Ottoman
Empire lived, this policy, no matter how strongly it might
have been advocated, was bound to turn into a catastrophe.
Even if the policy of a common religion had been aimed at
promoting the social position of its adherents, or rebuild­ing on sound foundations, the collapse was bound to come
sooner or later.

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Ibid.} p. 542.
PAN MOVEMENTS

In this second stage Germany sought great advantages from the Pan-Islamic policy and, as a consequence, the Kaiser systematically continued to do all he could to impress the minds of the Moslems by stressing that in his person and in Germany they would always find a friend, and a supporter of their aims. Following the outbreak of World War I, the Kaiser declared in an Imperial Proclamation that Germany did not consider Mohammedans as belligerents and that Mohammedan soldiers taken prisoners by the Germans, would be sent to Turkey and be put at the disposal of the Caliph.

After Turkey was tricked into war against the Triple Entente, the Sultan Caliph proclaimed a Holy War. It was thus hoped to increase the military strength of Turkey by enlisting more Mohammedan soldiers, and causing insurrections and upheavals in the British and French colonies.

The Holy War was proclaimed in Istanbul, on November 23rd, 1914.

The Proclamation reads as follows (abridged version)²⁹:

Central Europe has not been able to escape the calamities let loose by the Moscovite Government in the Near and Far East with the object of enslaving humanity and annihilating the benefits of freedom, a divine gift to nations and peoples. Russia, for centuries so cruel and infuriated enemy of human happiness has now dragged the Governments of Great Britain and France into the World War. The national pride of these countries delights immoderately in enslaving thousands of Mohammedans. (...) The oppressive group known as the Triple Entente has not only robbed during the last century the Mohammedans of India, Central Asia and most of the African countries of their political independence, of their governments and even of their liberty; but it has also owing to the mutual help extended by its members, caused us to lose the most precious parts of the Ottoman Empire. (...) The Servant of the two Holy Cities the Khalif of the Mohammedans and the Commander of the Faithful has considered it as the greatest duty of the Mohammedan Khalifate to call all the Mohammedan people to a general Holy War in accordance with rulings of the sacred fetwas (...)

Consequently, in accordance with the terms of the sacred fetwas, all Mohammedans living in the territories exposed to the persecutions of the above mentioned oppressive powers, such as the Crimea, Kazan, Turkestan, Bukhara, Khiva, India, China, Afghanistan, Persia, Africa and other countries must consider it, in concert with Ottomans as their most supreme religious duty to participate in the Holy War, with their bodies and goods.

Except for an unimportant group of fanatics, mostly the Ulema, no one really believed in, or expected any concrete results from the Pan-Islamic policy. Among the supporters of this policy, chiefly for political reasons, was Enver Pasha, the Minister of War. However, the appeal of the Sultan Caliph, which has been declared with considerable hope, brought no reactions, and ended in a complete failure,
if not catastrophe, thus proving that at the present time we can rightly attribute to religion only a limited influence as an incentive to spontaneous and voluntary sacrifice.

The main reason of this catastrophic failure was that the Sunni and the Shii sects were unable to compromise, and that their discord took ground once more. Secondly, the ideas of nationalism and local interests advocated by Great Britain proved to be more potent than the purely religious appeal made by Turkey.

Nevertheless, we should not pretend that the Arabs, who were partly aware of their distinct nationality, opposed Turkey only because of the ideological differences. They fought her mainly because their leaders - Sheiks - were promised high offices and were generously bribed. Moreover, as General Ali Ihsan Sabis, a former commander on the Arabian front reports, the Arabs were interested mainly in looting the defeated side, no matter who it was. Therefore the Arabs were changing sides according to military circumstances. It is evident that under such circumstances, while certain Arabs were aware of their nationality, the Sheiks

---

working for the interests of foreign powers, and the common man more interested in looting, the Holy War, which appealed to the moral values rather than material interest, would no doubt end in failure, which was the case.

England and France stirred the patriotic sentiments of the Arabs in order to weaken the Ottoman Empire. Thus, as Ahmet Emin accurately stated, the idea of nationalism proved to be more potent than that of religion. Thus, instead of responding their Caliph's appeal, the Arabs and North African Moslems, acting rather treacherously, did not mind to strike the Turkish armies which were defending their territories against the enemy, from the rear. The British and the French were successful in using Moslem soldiers in their armies even on the Turkish front. In 1915, France enlisted 2,500 Algerian soldiers, while in 1918 this number increased to fifty thousand. The British, too, were able to use Indian Moslems in their armies.

As for India, the following could be stated:

The common people were sympathetic towards Turkey, but this did not necessarily mean that it brought an agitation in favour of the Caliph's appeal. Moreover, the common people were unable to understand the essence of the Holy War Proclamation. Until that time, the native Indian Moslem
theologians gave Fetwas approving the rule of a non-Moslem state (English). However, these people were now rather embarrassed to hear that the Caliph, after such a long time, did not approve of such a rule.

General Ali Ihsan Sabis, the one-time commander of the Russian front, reported in his memoirs that he had asked the Russian Moslem prisoners of war why did they not respond to the Caliph's appeal. Accordingly, most of them answered in the following manner: "This is not a fight for religion, but a struggle for existence. This has no relation with the Proclamation of the Holy War. Today, there is no Moslem Union, and there is no Moslem regime"\(^31\).

Thus, the results of this policy were deeply disappointing for the Turks. In fact, the defection of Sherif Huseyin of Mecca meant the failure of the Pan-Islamic strategy since its very beginning.

Cemal Pasha, the dictator of the Arabic Provinces, and one of the strongmen among the Young Turks, who was a sincere defender of this policy, was unable to refrain himself from stating:

\(^31\) Ibid., p. 331.
Although I never believed in the honesty of the Sherif of Mecca, I could have never conceived that in a war, upon which the fate of the Khalifate depended, he would ally himself with the states which desired to thrust the Slav yoke upon the whole Mohammedan world, and indeed, would go so far, as to sow the seeds of discord in the whole country to gratify his personal ambitions.

On another occasion, Cemal Pasha stated the following:

Unfortunately, the course of the Holy Djihat has been blocked by a mean individual who in the very heart of the Holy Land of Islam had allied himself to those Christian Powers whose object is to despoil the World of Islam and Constantinople, its capital.

However, it is rather interesting to note the Emir's idea on the subject. According to the reports of T.E. Lawrence, the well-known British agent, who echoed Emir's point of view in the Arabian deserts. Accordingly, the Holy Djihat could not be considered a Holy War, when the country (Turkey) itself had declared war. Secondly, it could not be

---


considered a Holy War, a religious war, as the Ottoman Empire has allied itself with a Christian bloc.\footnote{Hikmet Yusaf Bayur, Op. cit., p. 330.}

Thus, when Sherif Huseyin, the Emir of Mecca, a descendant of the Prophet, allied himself with the enemy Powers, the Caliph deposed him, and replaced him by Sherif Ali Haydar Pasha (June 18th, 1916). However, the matter was not that simple, as the remedy could not be found only by changing a mean individual. As a matter of fact, any remedy was fruitless and hopeless, and the Djihat was more than a failure. The Djihat, as shall be seen later, proved useful only in one aspect, as its failure taught the Turkish intelligentsia that Pan-Islamism was forever dead, and that no help could be expected from such a policy.

The common man understood the matter in a different way. He understood that Turkey could depend on the Arabs no more, if she wanted to survive. Turkish common people expressed the same idea in a proverb: "It is unsafe to descend a well with an Arabian rope".

It was a reality that the Unionist Party did not have a common policy, a clear and defined program. The leaders agreed only on deposing Abdul-Hamid, and on establi-
ishing a Constitutional Government. As aforementioned, they thought that this was a panacea which could change everything. They only defended their ideas with the very same motto as used by the French during their Revolution of 1789: "Equality, Liberty and Fraternity". However, this motto used by the Unionists did not bear the marks of the Turkish spirit and was nothing but an imported idea. The phrase was used by all the Ottoman subjects, both Christian and Moslem. The sense and significance of this watchword, when used by the minorities, was not the very same as when used by the Turks. When advocating the principles of equality, liberty and fraternity, the non-Turkish people meant a future nationalist independent state, which they hoped to establish or to join their racial brothers who already have formed such an independent state.

According to Hans Kohn\(^{35}\),

the bitterest enemy of the new Turkish nationalism was not European Imperialism but the simultaneously rising nationalism of the other races inhabiting the Turkish Empire. Two courses were open to the Young Turks: they could transform Turkey into a decentralized State of composite nationality offering to its various people free autonomy and opportunity of fulfilling their national aspirations, or they

\(^{35}\) Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, Vol. 11-12, p.234.
could attempt to subdue other peoples by force and so erect a predominantly Turkish Empire. The Young Turks chose the second solution, yet, it was doomed to failure.

However, as history has, no doubt, clearly proved, it would be quite difficult for any government to grant self-determination or autonomy to its minorities as soon as certain nationalistic aspirations cause some disturbances. The Young Turks, for the time being, had no other alternative, though Ottomanism was a cul de sac. Under the rule of Hamid, the autocratic monarchy and the Islamic religious faith became a binding force, but it did not include the Christian minorities. The following years proved that this religious policy was a reality neither for the Moslems, nor for the Christians.

While Turkey was practically wriggling between Pan-Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism, a new ideology - Turkism - set forth by Ziya, came into being. It was not a purely nationalistic doctrine, but it was the best policy for the time being. Nevertheless, while Turkism replaced the two previously mentioned tendencies, Islamism was not abandoned completely, though Ottomanism was. The Unionist leaders were "unable to see that a totalitarian ideology, such as theocracy, could not be combined with nationalism, another
totalitarian ideology. However, we should not be too skeptical about the Unionist Party and government leaders, for riding two horses at the same time. All its members, especially the triumvirate, were quite anxious to save the multinational Empire from the grave calamities which were endangering its very existence. The Western Powers were rather disturbed by the speedy recovery, which the 'sick man of Europe' was making since the Young Turkish Revolt of 1908. These Powers did not give the Young Turks any respite, any chance to deal with the internal problems of their country. Their only aim was to destroy the Ottoman Empire forever, and they did not hesitate to attack it continually since 1911.

The above study of Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism can easily be summarized thusly:

Throughout history, the Turks formed different and vast Empires, occupying territories from the Yellow Sea to Byzantium. They wasted thus much of their energy on alien people, a handicap for the real Turk.

Ziya Gokalp claimed this with accuracy in his poem entitled *Red Apple*\(^{37}\):

>The sword of the Turk and likewise his pen,
>Have exalted the Arabs, Chinese and Persians;
>He has created a history and a home for every people;
>He has deluded himself for the benefits of others.

History proved to be a bitter lesson for the Turks. Now they were receiving the 'prize' for their efforts.

Pan-Turanism

The country of the Turk is not Turkey nor yet Turkestan;
Their country is a broad and everlasting Turan.

Ziya Gokalp

While the policy of Islamism, a religious policy demanding a Moslem cosmopolitan union was still favored by a limited group of fanatical minds, another policy of a completely different character emerged. Following the defeats in Tripoli and in the two Balkan wars, the national feelings and the national pride of the Turks, the real Turks, were highly stimulated and came into existence in a rather extreme form.

The era of Pan-Turanism and later Pan-Turkism could be considered as a stepping stone to modern Turkish nationalism. Turkish nationalism emerged from two distinct sources, both of which moved toward the same goal.

The first source came from the awakening of certain young Turkish intellectuals who saw the bitter results of Pan-Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism, the former openly rejected by all racial elements, and the latter by the non-Turkish Moslem elements.
The unexpected and catastrophic failure of Pan-Islamism taught the newly awakening Turkish intelligentsia that the Ottoman solidarity was unreal, and the only kind the Turkish state could depend on was the Turkish national solidarity.

Although in their early stages the nationalists were ridiculed and laughed at as if they were trying to act funny, in time they became able to form a small unity, though a minority, "and almost suddenly both Turkey and the outside world found themselves facing a strong movement called Pan-Turkism or Pan-Turanism".

While the above movement headed by Ziya Gokalp was receiving greater support, another movement, which had rooted in Russia itself, was gaining equal support.

Another factor which highly stimulated the national feelings was the vast number of Turkish soldiers, civilians and Turkish Balkan subjects, the refugees who poured into Istanbul and Anatolia "with their lurid and sinister tales of martyrdom and suffering at the hands of Balkan Christians, the indifferences and even the apparent joy of the

so-called civilized outside world at their sorry state\textsuperscript{\textit{39}}, a factor, which naturally aroused sympathy for everyone who was a Turk and everything that was Turkish. Moreover, this case once more proved that Ottomanism was merely a utopia.

Under these conditions, Turkism and Turanism came into existence and consequently the leaders were rather pessimistic about the Western world which was so much idealized.

Following the Balkan disasters, the real Turk felt sorry for himself, as he accurately considered his non-Turkish subjects ungrateful people. He remembered that while he was fighting for them, while he was busy on the borders, these non-Turkish subjects lived in a great prosperity, and now, in harmony with the well-known story of Lamartine, were striking him. Even the Rumanians, in one of their proverbs, expressed the reality well known to all the Turks, "The Turk pays for everybody". How well this proverb harmonizes with the aforementioned poem of Ziya Gokalp.

Under all these conditions, and especially under the continuous treachery of the Moslem Arabs, the Turkish intelligentsia found the sole remedy, their only hope, in

\textsuperscript{\textit{39}}

\textit{Ibid.}, p. 115.
uniting with their racial brothers living apart from them. It is curious enough that Pan-Turanism, the racial ideology and the extreme form of nationalism, took root before nationalism did.

Pan-Turanism, the extreme form of Turkish nationalism, aimed at establishing a union of all the Turks in the world, and secondly, it meant a fraternization with all races of common Turanian origin, including Hungarians, Finns and Bulgarians.

Turanism, which in its early stages fought romantically for closer relations among the Turks, should not be regarded solely as an aggressive ideology. Although its goal could only be realized through aggressive means, it was essentially a defensive ideology, as it was mainly considered a defensive weapon against the increasing danger of Pan-Slavism.

Starting in the mid-nineteenth century as a Western Slav movement aiming at national independence and Slav unity, Pan-Slavism turned into Pan-Russianism (Pan-Slav Congress at Prague in 1848, and in Moscow in 1867). As such it became a serious menace to the Ottoman Empire.

Thus, the Turanists aimed at striking Russia, the traditional enemy of Turkey, from its heart - Turan -. They
believed that the success of Turanism would weaken Russia's power, and the Pan-Russian idea. However, besides the Turanist movement, the remembrances of the Pan-Islamic movement existed as well. The leaders of the government tried to use these two opposing ideologies side by side, and the success of either one became a more difficult task.

Both the Islamists and the Turanists thought it necessary to join a powerful foreign power in order to realize their dreams. In doing so they thought to avoid the direct dangers which threatened the very existence of the Empire. Thus, feeling too lonely, Enver Pasha, the War Minister and Chief of Staff, of the Union and Progress Party, proposed an alliance to the Russian Military Attache in Istanbul, Leontiev. The proposal included the following stipulations:

The Turkish troops in the Eastern part of the country shall be transfered to the west, where they will fight with the allies and consequently neutralize any Balkan state.

Turkey shall attack Bulgaria if she attacks Russia.
A ten-year alliance shall be signed with Russia.
In retribution, Turkey shall receive:
A territory in Thrace up to the 220 meridian.
The twelve islands in the Aegean Sea.

Although the Russian Foreign Minister Sazonoff tried to avoid the matter, under the pressure from his Ambassador Izvolsky, he decided to consult the Governments of France and England. The French Foreign Minister Ponceau did not hesitate to turn down the proposal by saying that "it might be advantageous for us to draw Turkey to the number of our enemies in order to make an end of her". 40

Moreover, Cemal Pasha, who went with a good-will mission to Paris, was not received by any French official.

Under these conditions the Ottoman Empire had no alternative but to join the German-Austrian group. 41 Germany was also considered a more favorable ally, as she was not regarded a direct danger to the very existence of the Empire.

The first awakening of nationalism thus started in a rather extreme form and was a revolt against Ottomanism,

40 Harry Howard, The Partition of Turkey, Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1931, p. 98.

41 However, it is believed that Enver signed a secret alliance with Germany on August 1st, and made the offer to Russia the next day.
a cosmopolitan conception, which was condemned by all the non-Turkish elements.

The Convention held by the Union and Progress Party in 1909, the delegate from Diaribekir, Mehmet Ziya Gokalp, advocated his theory of Turkish nationalism and soon became the intellectual leader of the nationalist movement. However, in a direct parallel with the nationalist movement as advocated by Gokalp, a second movement, advocated by the extremists, began to organize mainly under the influence of the Turkish fugitives from Russia.

These emigrants, who came in large numbers, turned the faces of the Turks to their old homeland. These Asian Turks were nationally conscious, long before their racial brothers in Turkey became so. The Central Asian Turks, living under the Russian yoke, suffered deeply from the policy of Russification which began with the rule of Ivan the Terrible (1552), and which featured the imposition of the Russian language and Orthodox Christian religion. "In 1864, one hundred and sixty thousand Turks were obliged to become Christians. After 1876 the Russification took a general character"42.

Thus, although under increasing pressure some Turks lost their identity, the majority became increasingly conscious nationally, aware of their historical past. The years following the Balkan wars were suitable for these Turks to flee to Turkey, and thus they started to profess Turanism.

Accordingly, "while scientific and aesthetic Turkism owed its origin to Western influence, political Turkism was brought into being through the efforts of a number of Turkish intellectuals from Russia". Among those who could be named here are Ismail Gasprinski and Huseyinzade Ali.

It was a reality that even Ziya Gokalp was unable to refrain from joining the Turanist tendency. He did not hesitate to write articles of Turanist nature in the weekly review Turk Yurdu (Turkish Hearth), published from December 1st, 1911. Nevertheless, Pan-Turkism or Pan-Turanism were advocated by Gokalp not as a political, but as a cultural enterprise.

Pan-Turanism, which started as an intellectual movement, was favored and protected by the Union and Progress Party, and especially by Enver, the Minister of War.

---

Many students, especially those from the Medical Faculty in Istanbul, in cooperation with many other youthful intellectuals, formed a non-political society under the name of Turk Ojagi (Turkish Hearth). It was founded entirely on a cultural basis. Although the Unionist Party attempted to alter the society into a political organization, its attempts failed.

The Turk Ojagi had the character of a Turkish Academy of Learning, and among the notable sponsors were Halide Edip, a woman author of note, Mehmet Emin, and Hamdullah Suphi. Although these circles tried to confine nationalism to cultural and social spheres, there was a widening circle of nationalism in Turkey outside the Ojagi, which closely resembled the old political organization and ideals of the other races on the same lines which had started some hundred years ago.

The motto of Turanism was taken from the last couplet of Ziya's poem entitled Turan:

The country of the Turk is not Turkey nor yet Turk-estan,
Their country is a broad and everlasting Turan.

This Society became a political party in 1924, with a nationalist and non-Turanist character.

In another poem entitled *Hayat Yolunda (Way of Life)*, Ziya wrote:

> Whilst I was looking for the Beloved up in Heaven, 
> I did not find Him there but on earth in Turan⁴⁶.

Pan-Turkism

After a time, the idea of Turanian solidarity and Turanian fraternization began to be neglected as something unreal and impractical. However, this should not imply that a great number of people did not cling to this ideology any longer. But the fact is that more importance was attached to the idea of Pan-Turkism, an ideology founded by Ziya Gokalp, which more or less aimed only at a cultural unification, with the Turks living outside the Empire. This second stage was a moderate form of racialism and could be described as *Ogpuçculuk-Turkmencilik*.

Consequently, the Turks looked now only to Central Asia, and not all around the world.

With relation to the number of Turkish people living in Central Asia, certain authorities give the figure of as high as sixty to seventy million; certain other conservative estimates run between thirty to forty million.

Unlike the Pan-Turanists who first intended to keep the movement more or less on an intellectual basis, the Pan-Turkists, besides studying the racial origins of the Turks and trying to awaken the Turkish national sentiments, tried to revive the olden-day traditions, customs, and even the language. They almost became a new sect with a distinct social identity; it became fashionable among them to find the original Turkish for all the Arabic and Persian words used in Turkish. Consequently, new salutations which derived their origin from the ancient Turks were introduced and old time usages were revived. Horse meat was eaten and the ancient and traditional Turkish drink was consumed.

Important steps were taken in order to purge and to purify the language. Thus, in nationalizing the Turkish language many Turkish writers, poets, and prose writers used old Turkish words and phrases instead of Ottoman words. Even if the equivalent of an Arabic or a Persian word did not exist in old Turkish, it was now practically created.

The new language, although difficult and almost impossible to understand, became a fashion. Even Ziya Gokalp was refused publication of one of his poems because of its extreme purification. In these days, Ziya wrote his well-known poem entitled The Turan. Shops and restaurants were
renamed with similar names. Instead of calling the children with the customary Mohammedan names, children were named with the long forgotten Turkish names. The new history teaching in the schools followed the trend of glorifying the nation's own achievements. The ancient customs and steps were to be revived. Festivals that had never been celebrated, such as the anniversary of the capture of Istanbul, were declared, as the Young Turkish Government decreed an order that these days should be observed as official holidays.

A thousand demonstrators marched in procession to the grave of Constantinople's (Istanbul) great conqueror in order to invoke his hallowed spirit and to lift up and inspire their hearts in preparation for the strenuous task before them. The crowd felt as though Constantinople had been captured again. They had never had the opportunity of cherishing the memory of their heroes. Now, for the time, they began to look back upon them with pride and to pay them homage, for the people had only just began to realize their Turkish nationality.47

While Huseyinzade wrote a song called Turan, Halide Edip produced a work of fiction with the same title. The spirit of this new nationalism, which ousted the earlier Turkish patriotism of the romantic poets (Namik Kemal) and reforming statesmen under European influence,

47 Hans Kohn, A History of Nationalism in the East, p. 239.
The hero of the novel is the type of an Attila or Jingis Khan evolved into a civilized man.

First, besides the remarkable efforts in purging the Turkish language, the problem of the alphabet arose. A certain group of intellectuals, led by Huseyin Cahit, advocated the adoption of the Latin alphabet, while Milasly Hakki Bey created and sincerely advocated a new Turkish alphabet based upon the old Turkish one with which the Orhon Statues were inscribed. However, as has been aforementioned, the Unionists attempted to ride two horses simultaneously, that is to say, while dreaming about Turanism, they did not abandon completely the policy of a religious unity. On this
account, Huseyin Cahit's idea of adopting the Latin alphabet was severely and ruthlessly criticized on the basis that such an act would be a heavy strike on the Turco-Islamic Unity. However, it is needless to repeat that such a unity was practically if not completely non-existent. The compromise resulted in a slight modification of the alphabet already in use.

Secondly, attacks were directed towards the social position and inferiority of the women. Certain authorities did not hesitate to blame the religious phenomena as the cause of their social position, and demanded the adoption of western laws. Another group clung to the belief that attempts to westernize the Turkish laws were practically needless, as the Turks were, originally, in their historical past, democratic in this respect. Ziya Gokalp therefore demanded that instead of adopting the western laws, the old Turkish laws be revived.

Although respecting them and paying homage to their memories, the Turanists even went so far as to deify the great Ottoman rulers such as Murat II, Yildirim Beyazit, Yavuz, Suleyman the Magnificent, and even Fatih the Conqueror, and tried to replace them by Jengis, Tamerlane, Attila, the other ancient Turkish rulers. Ziya, the intellectual, wrote on this occasion:
The feelings pulsing in my blood are the echoes of my past. I do not read of the glorious deeds of my ancestors in withered, yellow, dusty pages of history, but in the blood flowing in my veins, in my heart. My Attila, my Jingis heroic figures, the pride and the glory of my race, are no less in stature than Alexander and Caesar. Still more familiar to my ear is Oghus Khan, an obscure and mysterious figure to historic inquiry. He still lives in my heart and pulses in my veins in all his greatness and glory. Oghus it is that delights my heart, that inspires me to shout exultantly: The Turkish people's fatherland is not Turkey, it is not Turkestan; it is a far flung land and eternal: Turan49.

In fact, the Pan-Turanists tried to replace the epics of the Islamic period of the Ottoman Turks by the older, non-Islamic era, and they advocated that "Islam had been uncongenial to the Turkish nature and that it prevented progress; hence they urged a return to the old gods and the old Turkish religion, 'Shamanism'"50. Although these arguments were not favored by the great mass of the people, it would not be false to claim that they served as useful elements for the secularization of the country. Therefore it could be concluded that the origins of Turkey's secular policy, as realized by Ataturk, dated from these activities.

49 Ibid., p. 239.
A revival of the ancient customs which came into being meant nothing but a tendency of atavism. However, the attempts to reform the unhealthy organization were not studied as a whole case. The 'atavist activities' were followed by many people, not because they really knew their historical origin, but rather as they enjoyed the new fashion. It was only a small intellectual minority which really knew what it did. However, the very same case may be brought against Pan-Islamism.

Under the long theocratic rule and under the religious dictatorship of the Ulema, the common mass really became falsely informed and ignorant in these affairs. Pan-Turanism sprang up especially among the young people, while the older ones were still too religious to leave Islamism in favor of a racial ideology. It is because of this internal factor, and also because of the other non-Turkish Moslem subjects that the Unionist Government had to follow two distinct courses, that it was practically obliged to ride two horses at the very same time.

While Turanism was preached rather on the intellectual field, certain extremists brought it out of bounds, and made it a part of the State policy. The outbreak of World War I, and Turkey's entry into the war was deeply welcomed
by the Turanists and Turkists, including Ziya Gokalp. The conquest of Baku and Batoum confirmed the Turanian activities and prospects. Thus, when the routes to Central Asia seemed open, a clash between the imp forces of the Turanists and the rather democratic forces of the Turkists opposed each other. The Turanists believed that the time to act had come at last, and consequently they encouraged young men to go among their racial brothers as teachers, engineers, and physicians, that is to say, as Nationalist missionaries.

On the other hand, the Turanists were active in the military field as well.

Enver aimed at conquering the Turanian lands and freeing all the Moslems who were living under foreign yoke. He thought to reach this goal by conquering the Turan (Caucasus, Azerbeyjan and all Central Asia), secondly, to occupy India. Persia and Afghanistan were to be liberated from alien rules. General Kazim (Karabekir), and Colonel Halil were sent to the East with such intentions.

The orders given to these commanders were rather interesting. In his order to General Kazim (December 14th, 1914), Enver wrote:

1. Your duty is to occupy Teheran and nullify the Russian influence in the zone. If possible, try to raise upheavals in Turkestan and try to provoke the people of the areas you pass against Russia and Great Britain.

2. Declare that you did not come as a conqueror, but as a liberator, to save the people from Russian yoke. Declare that the Russians are losing battles on all fronts.

3. Occupy the Caucasus.

A similar order was given to Colonel Halil.

It is interesting to note that Enver Pasha, the military champion of Turanism, defined this movement as follows: "It is the policy which shall lead us to the Yellow Sea".

Despite certain victories and the conquest of Baku and Batoum - a rich territory in oil fields - the tragic results at the Sarikamis campaign hampered most of the racialist ideas and hopes.

The campaign provoked by the Turanian dreams ended in disaster.

Three Army Corps, totalling 100,000 soldiers dropped to 15,000 within two weeks, the loss of more than half of the guns, ammunition and transport vehicles, the abandonment of tens of thousands of frozen, badly mutilated martyrs on the roads.\(^{52}\)

Following the defeat in World War I, Enver, Cemal and Talat Pashas left the country and started to work abroad.

---

\(^{52}\) Ibid., p. 283.
Gemal and Talat Pashas were assassinated by Armenian comitajis, while Enver reached Central Asia with the intention of raising revolts against the newly established Bolshevik regime. Although successful in a minor scale, the adventures ended when Enver was killed in action while fighting the Bolsheviks (August 22nd, 1918).

The Soviet armies ruthlessly suppressed all the Turkish peoples, and practically ended all further hopes. The Turks now, at last, became nationalists, in the sense of true nationalism, as they began to think in terms of their own country, to look for remedies to save their own land - Anatolia. They did not bother further to unite the Moslems or Turanian brothers.

Halide Edip, a former Turanist and the era's woman author of note, expressed the democratic Turkish point of view in one of her articles published in the daily Vebit on June 30th, 1919:

---

53

The forces of Pan-Turkism seek to induce us to interest ourselves in the welfare of all Mohammedan Turks, and of Turanians as well. Our young men now engaged in war are coming more and more to the conclusion that ideals do not mean anything in themselves, that they have a right to existence only as instruments to save this country. (...) This country has been declining in population, health and standards of living. By the disaster of the present war, the Ottoman Turks have been reduced to numbers so small that even their continued existence in our wide territories has become a matter of doubt. The occupation of the Caucasus has awakened ambitious aims. There, Turks are asking for our guidance. This is surely very charming for our national pride. We must not forget, however, that we have not doctors enough for our provincial capitals, to say nothing of our smaller towns and villages. All our teachers would not suffice for the schools of Constantinople. Our engineers are insufficient to meet the proper needs of a single province. To work in those lands outside might be very attractive, but it would be work done for an unrealizable Utopia. Races are mere theories, nations are realities. Our brothers are calling upon us because they think we may be of use to them.

Do you really think they will decide to trust us with their destinies, if they learn the bitter truth as to the real Turkey, lying behind our small and vociferous set of visionaries? A Turkish brother who sees a village in Turkey or hears of it, cannot feel love and respect for the physician, teacher, engineer or state official who abandons his own sick country: he will only have a feeling of distrust for him. We can give the most help to our brothers beyond our borders by concerning ourselves solely with our own home country. We should not deceive ourselves and other people. Every Turk who carries into foreign countries his energy and capacity puts himself in the position of one robbing his own mother, his own home.

Halide Edip was criticized by many writers and even by Fuat Koprulu, who equally rejected the Pan-Turanist ideas.
In an article published in the following days, this notable scholar wrote:

I also reject Pan-Turanism; it has no practical value. I have a feeling of solidarity only for those who share both my language and my religion. But this great group must be united. We may be a backward people in relation to the West, but we are very advanced as compared with the East. Our brothers are awaiting us impatiently. We cannot let ourselves dwell upon the interests of the Turks in any single region, but we must meet the interests of the entire Turkish world between the Mediterranean and China. Our maxim is 'One for all and all for one'. If some of us adhere to the dangerously selfish theory of reserving our whole energies for our own field, the primary task of Turkism is to correct such wrong conceptions. The great Turkish world of the future cannot be built in any other manner54.

At present, we are in a better position to judge the Turanist ideology from a more rational and objective point of view, rather than from an emotional one. Turanism and Turkism should not be considered mere Utopias, and it would rather be too harsh to claim that these ideas were completely out of bounds.

Turanism and Turkism, both extreme forms of Turkish nationalism, served as a springboard for modern Turkish nationalism. They proved useful, as they brought hope and charity to the pessimist souls of the Turks. People are bound to believe in something. When Ottomanism was practic-

---

54 Ibid., p. 199.
ally rejected by all the racial elements, and when the Turks saw only themselves as the advocates of that policy, they turned to Islamism. However, this policy brought hardly any good to the Turks. Turanism emerged under these conditions. As Goksel had put it forward, the Turanist motto written by Ziya Gokalp "turned our eyes from the Kaba (Mecca) to the Turkish land".

It is rather curious to note that the extreme form of Turkish nationalism came into being long before modern nationalism emerged. This could be explained by the political circumstances of the era. It was thought that Russia's defeat was rather certain, and that the Central Asian Turks were expecting the liberating Turkish armies with great anxiety. However, the former did not materialize. On the other hand, Turanism was an impractical idea because Turkey, at the time, was militarily not strong enough to defend continuously the Central Asian territories, even had they been conquered.

As has been mentioned in our previous chapters, there are mainly four different elements which would form a

---

nation. These elements (language, religion, history and land) could easily be considered four different consciences. Thus, if the nature of these four different consciences in Turkey were to be similar to those in Central Asia, a Turanian unity would not be considered a utopia, but a reality. Had the religious, historical, and linguistic consciences been alike in both territories, the Turanian Unity would have been a desirable thing. However, as aforementioned, the Central Asian Turks were forced to change their convictions and their language; though both of the same origin, their Turkish language differed from that spoken in the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman language was under the influence of the Arabic and Persian, while the Central Asian Turkish underwent a Russian influence. A long history, approximately a period of over ten centuries had passed since the separation of these two large racial groups. In view of these sociological obstacles and realities we could do nothing but condemn a racial policy, especially for that time.

Turanism, at the present stage, is condemned by Nationalist Turkey, and the various reasons for this shall be discussed in detail in the next chapter.
Ziya Gokalp

The most salient characteristic of the period of the Turkish history that is generally known as the "Era of Constitutional Monarchy" was the rise of a school of letters called "National Literature" (Milli Edebiyat), and whose central figure is, no doubt, the great Turkish thinker and sociologist, Ziya Gokalp.

This school was sincerely convinced of the absolute necessity of making national literature more Turkish. Ziya Gokalp, an inspired poet, was also an idealist with a wonderful gift for formulating and expressing moral and social principles. It was he who had promoted the dynamic review of Geng Kalemler (Review of Young Pens), and this time he concentrated his energies and his great political prestige on the review which owed its inception to his inspiration, the Yeni Mecmuu (New Review).

This review and the already existing Turk Yurdu, the organ of the Turk Ocagi (Turkish Hearth), a centre of national culture were the two sources from which derived immense benefits in the field of national literature and cultural studies.
Apart from Ziya Gokalp, there were quite a number of modern Turkish pens which contributed to these works: Halide Edip Adivar, the woman novelist, Falif Riki Atay, Ahmet Emin Yalman, Huseyin Cahit Yalçen, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoglu, Ahmet Refik Altinay, Omer Setfettin, Fuat Koprolu, Mehmet Emin Yurdakul and Refik Halit Karay could be mentioned.

However, due to the importance of the place held by Ziya Gokalp, we would likewise devote a limited study to his ideas.

As he was the father of modern Turkish nationalism, it is necessary to study his ideas before dealing with present Turkish nationalism.

Ziya Gokalp was the intellectual idealist and nationalist who, in his early years, caught up with the Turanian tendencies, but later, finding Turkism a more radical movement, advocated this moderate form which is a product of his own works. Certain authors such as Hilmi Ziya and Urial Heyd, argue that Ziya Gokalp, in his early writings, showed a tendency towards Turanism and later changed his ideas. However, another group, among them Tekin Alp, claims that Ziya never changed his political idea in this respect and that he was always a Turkist and never a Turanist. According to the pre-tense of Tekin Alp, Ziya Gokalp used the Pan-Turanian ideas
as a means to a Turkism which was always his ultimate objective.

Being almost the intellectual dictator of his era, as well as of the Union and Progress Party, Gokalp had many followers who knowingly or blindly accepted the theories he set forth. The importance of studying the ideas of Ziya Gokalp does not lay in the fact that he was solely interested in his ideas, but because his ideas also expressed the point of view and the feeling of a great majority. He usually refrained from taking extreme steps, and preferred to suggest ideas which might be accepted. In many other aspects he echoed the feelings of the people and founded them on a sociological basis. However, his real power was that he never showed himself on the stage, and rather preferred to act behind the scenes as sultan of the Unionist Party. Being a sociologist, he handled sociological matters with great ability.

In his writings dealing mostly with sociological concepts, Ziya Gokalp aimed at liberating the Turkish language from Arabic and Persian influence, which, as the result of the long domination of these territories, entered into the Turkish language. He therefore tried to discover the ancient Turkish words which had not been used for a
long period of time. Such an attempt was, no doubt, an im-
portant tone, as the Turkish language by that time became
a medley, a mixture of everything.

Ziya Gokalp, on the other hand, never failed to
support his teachings with sociological concepts. For ex-
ample, echoing the ideas of Durkheim he stated that "the
society passes historically through four main stages: pri-
mitive or tribal society, society based upon ethncal af-
finity, society with a common religion, society united by
culture". Whether this was true or not, Gokalp's histor-
ical as well as sociological researches, were always based
upon these principles. Sociologically, he never doubted to
subordinate the individual to the society, to the State,
and always

regarded the society and not the individual as the
factor of prime importance in history. He never
fully agreed with the Western conception of inde-
pendent personality as the supreme aim of human de-
velopment. Even his ideal of freedom, which he pro-
claimed from his early years, consists in national
independence and democratic rule, much more than in
freedom of the individual, vis a vis society and
its institutions, such as State or Church.
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As Ahmet Emin Yalman wrote\textsuperscript{58},

Gokalp popularized western sociology in Turkey. He was inclined toward the teachings of Emile Durkheim, whose work on the sociological method (Les regles de la methode sociologique, 1895) became, through Gokalp's political prestige, a sort of bible for the Young Turk thinkers. He himself analyzed existing Ottoman and Mohammedan institutions in the light of the sociological method, and presented, as the ideal, the old Turkish institutions modified to conform with the modern technical achievements of the West.

Ziya Gokalp first adopted the doctrine of "idees force" as set forth by Fouillee; however, he later adopted the theories of Durkheim. During the first year of the war, the movement headed by Zia Goek Alp had already acquired a prophet and a Bible. The prophet was M. Emile Durkheim, the French sociologist, and the Bible his Regles de la methode sociologique. Among the other books idealized, the same author's De la division du travail social and Les formes primitives de la vie religieuse, could be noted. Besides these books, Zia was considerably under the influence of Hegel, Fichte, Nietzsche, Tarde, Gobineau, Lebon and Bergson, consequently his philosophy, his nationalistic ideas followed more or less a Prussian pattern. He "demanded complete subordination of the individual to the society, though

\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences}, Vol. 5-6, p.688.
this adopted from Durkheim, conforms with the Prussian ideal of absolute devotion of the citizen to the State, even to the extinction of his personality.  

As has already been stated, nationalism in Turkey during the early years of the twentieth century was more similar to the Prussian type of nationalism, rather than to the Western European (French and English) type. Although the Turkish intelligentsia was under the influence of the French schools, and the Turco-German collaboration was limited to the military field, the Turkish intelligentsia found the Prussian nationalism more close to itself. The German ideas echoed in the Turkish literature through the French channels. Gokalp was wise in understanding the social and political atmosphere in which the Turkish population lived. He therefore, as it should be done, began to spread his ideas with poems, articles, pamphlets, and other forms of literature.

As Donald Everett Webster states,

---


he was a populist (halkcı) and nationalist Turkist (Turkçu) with a strong coloring of idealism. His ideas prevailing on the people (halk) were new in Turkey, and one knows that important events were going to attach to them. It is known that national sovereignty - more exactly the sovereignty of the people - is the theoretical foundation of the Constitution in force in Turkey. Ziya Gokalp was an apostle of the national consciousness (güur - umilli) and the national ideal (mefkure).

From the study of his theories, we could conclude with some reservations that Ziya Gokalp was not a Turanist in the sense in which Enver or Huseyinzade were. His Turanism was an intellectual and cultural one, not a racial one.

According to Ziya Gokalp, the government was not the servant of the people, but the instructor and leader of the people, whose main task is to bring the necessary reforms into action. He promoted: Constitutional Monarchy, Ottomanism, reform of Islam, capitalism, liberal democracy and evolutionism, i.e. the principles followed by the Young Turks. However, Gokalp gradually turned away from those principles in favor of the six pillars of Kemalism: republicanism, nationalism, secularization, etatism, popular democracy and revolutionism, although he disagreed with the latter. He was never in favor of realizing his aims by revolutionary means, as carried out by Mustafa Kemal. According to his teachings, the objective could be attained only through a peaceful evolution:
"You know that radical change is not the work of a moment; All its hopes depend on time." 61.

In his analysis of the rise of Turkism, Ziya Gokalp pointed out to some positive and negative causes. The positive ones have already been mentioned. They were the failures of Pan-Islamism and Pan-Ottomanism. Gokalp's object in Turkism was to seek the real Turkish national culture. The new life was a national life. Here his sociological knowledge helped him deeply. He declared that "this movement was not philosophical or speculative, but that it was founded on positive scientific knowledge." 62.

Now he understood that it was impossible to create new values, a goal which aimed to achieve previously. Being able to reach the core of the matter, he aimed to find the Milli Hars (National Culture), which was buried from the creation of the Turco-Islamic Sentetik Spirit. Gokalp proposed to find this real Turkish culture among the Turkish peasants, the people living far from the cosmopolitan cities. In order to be able to discover this national

---

62 Ibid., p. 110.
culture and the national spirit, he advised the study of the language, and the history of the ancient Turkish life, customs, traditions, culture and civilization. Secondly, he strongly advised against considering these elements inferior, but rather, superior. It is here that acknowledgement should be given to Ziya Gokalp for being the first Turk to discover the real malady from which Turkey was suffering.

In his theory of Milli Hars he had a second goal in mind, and that was to bring the civilization to the common people. He accurately argued that the common people, the peasants, have no civilization, but that they possess a culture, the early Turkish culture. A culture in every nation would be a national property, and could hardly be transferred to others, while the civilization is an international property, and belongs to each nation.

Ziya Gokalp deemed it necessary to separate these different ways for political reasons. The Arabs, Kurds or Albanians were Moslems and they had to be satisfied with a motto.

For these reasons, his definition of the nation is something interesting. A nation is neither a racial, geographical, political, tribal, nor administrative body.
Accordingly, a nation is a body composed of those men who received the very same religious, linguistic and ethnical education. They are the same customs and traditions which form a nation. Nationality is not in the physical body, but in the mind, which is also true of culture (Hars). Here it should be mentioned that while condemning the racial elements, he did not believe that he refrained from Turanism, as his Turanism was not a racial, but a cultural one. He furthermore argued that the Anatolian Turks and the Central Asian Turks had common cultural ties.

In contrast with the ideas of Yusuf Akçaroglu who, in the yearly years of this century discussed the merits as well as the demerits of 'Three Ways of Policy', - Ottomanism, Turanism, Islamism - Gokalp published a book under the title of Yurleșmek, Islamlasmak, Modernleșmek (Turkification, Islamization, Modernization). It is a fact that he borrowed these terms from a previous article written by the well-known Turanist, Huseyinzade Ali who, in one of his articles published in his Baku periodical Fuyuzat, had defended the Ways of Turkification, Islamization, Europeanization. However, as already stated, Gokalp preferred to modify the term 'Europeanization' into 'Modernization'. Gokalp's motto
in this phrase meant that "We belong to the Turkish Nation, the Moslem religious community and the European civilization". While condemning the racial elements, he argued that man would prefer to live with people with whom he has a common cultural tie.

Here, a question might arise in any person's mind. Was the Turkism taught by Ziya Gokalp of a nationalist concept, or was it something different? It would not be false to consider Turkism and nationalism as two different outlooks of the same major ideal, that is to say, Turkism was the ideal, a large Turkish unity, and nationalism the reality. Moreover, if with the concept of nationalism, the present Turkish nationalism were to be taken as a criterion, we could conclude that Ziya Gokalp's Turkism was not very much alike to Kemalism. Apart from its basic ideas, his Turkism was rather a broad one, looking both to the homeland and to the motherland, while Kemalism practically and virtually disregarded the latter one.

63 Ibid., p. 149.

64 In this respect he showed the example of Alexander the Great who said that his real father was Aristotle his teacher and instructor, rather than Philip.
However, as mentioned in one of our passing notes, the 'Three Ways' defended by this sociologist were self-contradicting. Although Akşaroglu admitted the contradictions in his theory, Gokalp pretended that the basic elements of the theory are not only compatible with each other, but even mutually complementary. He bases this assumption on his distinction between national culture (hars), community of religion (ummet) and international civilization (medeniyet). In his opinion, "the Turks should accept from Western civilization only the maddiyat, its material achievements and scientific methods, and from Islam its religious beliefs without its political, legal and social traditions" 65.

Let us now analyze each 'Way' separately.

In one of his interviews with a daily paper, Vakit (December 27th, 1917), Ziya Gokalp, the prophet of modern Turkish nationalism, classified three different phrases of Turkism. Accordingly, "Idealistic Turkism had as its dream a splendid future for all the Turks in the world" 66.

---


Ziya Gokalp even went so far as to claim that the supra perfect people discussed by Nietzsche were none but the Turks. Accordingly, the Turks were the new peoples of all the centuries, and therefore new lives shall be born from the Turks.

Historical Turkism meant atavism, the revival of the ancient customs and traditions, while sociological Turkism studied the past with a view towards laying down main lines of future policy in accordance with real social ties.

The third kind of Turkism is the linguistic Turkism, which meant the use of words which were of Turkish origin. Before Gokalp attempted to Turkify the language, Huseyin Cahit took some steps. In one of his early articles he wrote:

How long are we going to imitate the literature of other people? When freeing ourselves from imitating the Persians, are we supposed to beg for atonement in the Arabian deserts? Our literature should become Turkish at last, we should strive for this. The Arabs might own a fine art of literature; it may be so, but on the other hand, the French too have a nice literature, the Germans, the British as well have a perfect and progressive literature. If we desire, we might read all of them, but if something should be taken from somewhere we would take this from our own spirit, from our Turkism.

---

From 1910, Ziya Gokalp developed this wish on a sociological basis.

Considering a linguistic sovereignty an essential factor for a national sovereignty, Ziya Gokalp demanded a reform in the linguistic aspect. However, it is curious to note that, he, unlike Fuat Raif, a writer on the İkdam daily, did not advocate an excessive linguistic purism. He argued upon the uselessness of the insistence of the old Turkish words, which became the property of history. Therefore, he advised that the Istanbul Turkish should be taken as an example.

The nice language is Turkish to us,
Other languages are night to us,
The Istanbul dialect,
Is the nicest to us,

was the theme in his poem entitled Language (Lisan).

Accordingly, the words which became of common use should stay in the language, though from non-Turkish origins. However, it is still curious to note that he, himself, wrote in such a manner that even the press refused to print his articles, as they were too impossible to understand.

Heyd, an author of note, summed up Gokalp's linguistic Turkism in an interesting and clear manner:
Modernization and Europeanization of the language in respect of notions, Islamization in respect of scientific terms, and Turkification in respect of all other words and of grammar, syntax and orthography. It is rather difficult to understand what Gokalp actually anticipated from such a linguistic Turkism, if it may ever be called so. As a matter of fact, a Turkism as suggested by him was not a Turkism at all. Secondly, it is quite difficult to change the course of a language if, at the very same time, a few goals are expected. The goals expected by Gokalp were surely contradictory and not supplementary.

The main theme of this aspect was that Ziya Gokalp continuously and unceasingly suggested that the Koran and other religious books should be translated into Turkish in a language which would be understood by all the people. Having originated among the Arabs, the Koran was written in Arabic, the religious ceremonies were exercised in Arabic, and the prayers were in Arabic. However, people who were not very akin to Arabic were able to understand the meanings of the prayers and commandments and, consequently, it became a tool of the fanatic or ignorant (hodjas).

Ziya Gokalp on these grounds, demanded a Turkification of the Islamic religion. Gokalp thus regarding Islam as well as any other religion, as a historical phenomenon subject to change and dependent on the social circumstances in which it developed, conclusively advocated a theory of Neo-Islamism which, in his era, received considerable support.

He believed that the change in the direction of progress and enlightenment in the West had come after the (Protestant) Reformation, and that Turkey or any other Islamic nation could not progress or live without a deep reform in Islam.

He criticized the Islamic canon law mainly because it gave a superior position to the males in regard to marriage, divorce and inheritance. It was true that the religious law's discrimination was quite harmful for the social and economic survival of the nation. He advocated the adoption of a Family Law on European patterns, which should be harmonized with the ancient Turkish customs. As aforementioned, the Turks should keep the religious beliefs of Islam and disregard its legal, social and political trad-

---
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tions. Gokalp became a member of the committee which, in 1917, considerably modified the religious laws. It is because of his ceaseless efforts that the laws were changed and that the modification took place. For him it was more important and vital to state what Islam does not imply, than stating what it did imply. He practically tried to eliminate all the aspects which were in contrast with the ancient Turkish culture and the Western civilization.

The ideas of Gokalp in this respect are clear. He was not a fanatic or an atheist. By defending a theory of Neo-Islamism, he wanted to get away from the fanatic and mystic situation, and to develop the religion on rational grounds. In other words, he wanted to give Islam a new course, while keeping the external form.

He wrote that

The lover cries for his beloved,
The soldier dies for his country,
The student strives for knowledge;
The aim of all is You, great God.

Moreover, he expressed his religious feelings in the following manner:

My religion is neither hope nor fear,
I worship my God because I love Him.

Gokalp always considered Islam an ethical religion, free from all legal and social principles. Consequently,
he attacked the canon laws (Sheriat) and the Caliphate as well. Although in his early years, following the outbreak of World War I, he considered the Caliph a high lawmaking authority, following the failure of the Holy War, he changed his concept and demanded the abolition of this institution as well as all other religious foundations, such as the EVKAF, and the Ministry of Pious Foundations.

In a report presented to the Congress of the Union and Progress Party (1917), he demanded the virtual abolition of all the religious institutions, basing his arguments on historical, sociological and legal basis. He maintained that institutions such as the Sheik ut Islam, office of the Evkaf and the Ministry of Pious Foundations were "imperium in imperio", and that

the existence of these endowments prevented the establishment of a central communal administration in the towns, since many schools, hospitals, water reservoirs, public wells, etc. were the property of religious organizations either Muslim or Christians. (...) In Constantinople, particularly, there had been continuous friction between the Municipality, the Ministry of Pious Foundations and the Christian Patriarchs. These prevented all progressive economic planning by the local authorities and the State71.

In practice, he was unable to abolish the Sheik ut Islams office, but nevertheless, he succeeded in placing the Religious Courts (Sheriat Mahkemeleri) under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Justice.

The Turks, unlike the other Moslem States, changed certain parts of the Islamic law since the time of the rule of Suleyman the Magnificent. However, after a period of fanaticism, the Young Turks brought the first secular attempts. Gokalp went even further, reorganizing the Turkish Islamic religious institutions on a new basis similar to those of the Christians.

The second goal of his 'three ways' does not necessarily mean a policy of Pan-Islamization. Accordingly, Ziya Gokalp claimed that the Turks should keep the religious beliefs of Islam, provided that their legal, social and political rules, traditions and customs be abandoned.

Gokalp never approved a policy of Pan-Islamism, because he believed that each nation had a right to form its own national government. Disapproving Pan-Islamism on political grounds, he approved Pan-Islamism so far as it provided a religious, cultural cooperation among the Moslems. He tried to match Turkism and cultural Islam. According to him, a reformed Islam could very easily be harmonized
with Turkish nationalism and the Turkish national culture. He tried to fill the gap with the ancient Turkish traditions and customs.

In his poem entitled *A Soldier's Prayer*, he wrote:

> My heart's desires are two: religion and fatherland;
> Our way is the Holy War, its end is martyrdom,
> Have mercy on Islam, take revenge on its enemies,
> Make Islam flourish, O God.

Besides this religious theme, in his *Chant for the Children*, written with the deep-felt hatred toward the Bulgarians, he said

> The Crescent shall not submit to the Cross, Amen,
> It shall not be said the Turks are lost, Amen,
> Give us a religion of light, a faith of fire,
> Let us bring back to Islam the people who have strayed from its path.

As has been stated by D.E. Webster

> In Western Europe, conceptions of religious association and national association are kept distinct from one another. In the East, where social development is still retarded, most people are not conscious of their social identity. They often give wrong answers to questions about their religion and their nationality. The only common bond among the members of a religious brotherhood consists in religion; while nationality has in common - and apart from religion - language, morals, laws, fine arts, economics, science, philosophy, and methods of procedure (...) Turkish society cannot escape the effects of the social evolution which Europe has submitted to. It must entirely separate its institutions from those religious institutions which are common to the whole brotherhood of Mohammedanism.

---

Despite his secular ideas, Ziya Gokalp was practically unable to divorce the Islamic concept from Turkish nationalism. Although he insisted upon the necessity of the secularization of the religious and national institutions, and stated that the only common bond among the members of a religious brotherhood consists in religion, it would be still difficult to call him a secular man in the modern sense of the term. He was almost unable to separate the two phenomena, both of which look to two different goals. It is, therefore, noteworthy to notice why this intellectual contradicted himself, and why Deny was obliged to conclude that "one sees that a Turk is and must be a Moslem". A German, an Italian or a Spaniard, while defining his nationality, would not deem it necessary to state his religion or sect. Then why should it happen with the Turks? The answer would be rather simple, but for the time being its solution was a great matter. It is clear that Gokalp was unable to break completely with the Islamic tradition, that is to say, he was still under the influence of the religious atmosphere which had dominated the Empire for centuries.

---

Ibid., p. 157.
In this last item of his 'Three Ways' of policy, Gokalp thought that the Turks should be able to build cars, trains, and planes such as the Europeans did. As aforementioned, he did not suggest a Westernization in the moral values, as he clung to the motto "Turkish in ear, European in head". By this he meant that the European is intelligent, while the Turk is sensuous. Consequently, he aimed at harmonization of these two aspects. However, this narrow point of view was not favored by the Kemalist regime, as it preferred to adopt the motto of Halide Edip:

We come from the East,
We go toward the West.

The hope of Ziya Gokalp in this respect shall be fully satisfied in the following Kemalist Era.
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CHAPTER V

EVENTS LEADING TO THE NATIONAL MOVEMENT AND THE REPUBLIC

"The Turks have only one love - justice and truth; they did no injustice and, yet, they were victimized."

William Pitt

As aforementioned, the Turkish rulers during World War I deemed it necessary to join a Power in order to realize the Pan-Turanian dream. Signing a pact with Germany, and seeing no hope from the Allied Powers, the Turkish Government had no alternative but to join the Central Powers. Besides these realities, certain political mistakes of France and Great Britain caused a general antipathy against these countries.

On the other side, Germany, naturally in her own interest, acted quite friendly to the Turkish Government and the people. The aforementioned declaration of the Kaiser is a typical example of the means of conquering the feelings of the general public. Due to the limitations of our space, we are unfortunately unable to deal with the interest-
ing events in detail. Only in summarizing the whole course, could we say that Turkey, despite ending the Second Balkan War in victory, was unable to recover when she was tricked into war by the German fleet.

The Turkish armies fought successfully on several fronts, but fate turned against Turkey and her allies.

When, following the October Revolution of 1917, Russia signed the Peace of Brest-Litowsk, it was needless for Turkey to continue to insist on fighting, as her fate became quite clear, and the chief motive which dragged Turkey into the war was the hatred and enmity to Russia. Thus, when the Turco-German communications were cut after the occupation of Bulgaria by the Allied and Associated Powers, Turkey began to seek an armistice. On October 2nd, the Minister of the Interior resigned from office, which act was followed by the resignation of the Talat Pasha Cabinet, (October 7th, 1918). In light of the failure of the external policy, and the internal mishandlings, Talat Pasha, after having given his resignation, delivered a speech at the Congress of the Union and Progress Party, which he concluded in the following manner:

---

Our policy is defeated. It is impossible for us to retain public power in any form whatsoever. Therefore, we have not only resigned from office but we also step down from the leadership of the party, and put this body at the disposal of the convention which is its real master.

The Congress voted for the dissolution of the Union and Progress Party, one which started with high ideals, but was unable to bring a desirable end. A few members who were not attacked and criticized for the illegal handlings of certain matters tried to form another party, called the Moderate Party, but were coldly received by the general public which regarded this group as the continuation of the Union and Progress Party under a different name.

Under these circumstances, a new non-partisan government stepped into office, this time formed by Izzet Pasha.

In this Cabinet, formed on October 9th, 1919, only three old Unionists held seats. The Cabinet soon asked for peace on the basis of the Twelve Points of President Woodrow Wilson. On October 31st, 1919, the Armistice of Moudros was signed on the battleship Agamemnon by Admiral Galthrop, who acted on behalf of the Allied Governments. However, this Armistice was not an armistice in its real spirit, but the first sign of a coming war. It was first violated by
the Allied Powers as the British forces, disregarding the terms of the Armistice, occupied Mosul, a territory rich in oil resources. Secondly, the Armistice was once more violated in context and in spirit as the French troops, collaborating with the Armenians, occupied the southern region of Anatolia (Mardin, Urfa, Antep and Diarbekir). It is therefore not surprising to mention that the Allied Powers had no desire whatsoever to apply the Wilsonian principles, as from 1916 they had agreed secretly on the partitioning of the Empire\textsuperscript{2}.

Although the Armistice of Moudros definitely did not imply an unconditional surrender, the Allied Powers included an article (Article 7) which explicitly showed their real intentions beforehand.

Article Seven of the so-called Armistice gave the Allies the right "to occupy any strategic points in the event of any situation arising which threatens the security of the Allies"\textsuperscript{3}. It is not surprising at all that the Allied

\textsuperscript{2} Sikes-Picot agreement, the treaty of St. Jeanne de Maurienne, exchange of notes with the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sagonov.

\textsuperscript{3} Elliot Grinnell Mears, Modern Turkey, New York, Macmillan, 1924, p. 554.
Powers disregarded the condition, and did not hesitate to occupy the country. As a matter of fact, the existence of the condition is a point which could be easily discussed.

Thus, following the Armistice, the enemy forces poured into Turkey and re-established the Capitulations, which were abolished during the war. With the close of the World War, Turkey was subjected to a series of humiliations by the countries which had been her victorious foes. The Allies, apparently believing that Turkey had come to the end of her rope and had no more strength or spirit left to offer further resistance, proceeded to partition the country, forcing disgraceful terms on the tottering government of Sultan Vahidedin with the Treaty of Sevres and causing the defeated Turkish armies to surrender their arms. Working hand in glove with the various Christian minorities who inhabited Anatolia, the Allies showed their apparent intention of leaving Turkey only a small section of territory in Anatolia. Agents of the British Government were working in the country seeking to create favorable sentiment toward England and to discourage any show of resistance on the part of the patriotic Turks.

In the meantime, Greece, occupied Izmir with the consent of the Paris Congress. Greece in the Mediterranean

---

4 Turkey renounced the Capitulations during World War I (September 8th, 1914). The Capitulations were first granted as a privilege to France by Suleyman the Magnificent, when France asked the Turkish military aid against Charlemagne. Since that period other Powers received the same privilege, which later became almost a right.

would mean a docile instrument in the hands of England and France. So in 1919, Greece not only obtained Turkish territory on the European shore from the Peace Conference, but also was promised that part of Asia Minor which had been allotted to Italy by the secret Treaty of St. Jeanne de Maurienne. Thus, the Greek forces under the protection of the Allied fleets occupied Izmir (May 15th, 1919), believing no resistance would be shown. Colonel Fethi became the first martyr; he was murdered as he refused to shout "Zito Venizelos" (Long live Venizelos).

An unquestionably impartial authority, Arnold Toynbee, in his work entitled The Western Question in Greece and Turkey, had this to say of this occupation:

On the 15th of May, 1919, a destructive force was let loose in Western Anatolia, as sudden and apparently incomprehensible in its action as the eruption of a volcano. One morning, six months after the close of the European War, civilians and disarmed soldiers (Turkish) were massacred in the streets of Smyrna, whole quarters and villages were plundered, then the rich valleys in the hinterland were devastated by further arson and bloodshed.

Another Western scholar, Lewis V. Thomas, wrote on the very same occasion the following:

---

Halide Edip, Turkey Faces West, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1930, p. 149.
On May 14, 1919, Allied ships landed a Greek occupying force at Izmir (Smyrna). In so doing, the Allied Powers fully betrayed their basic ignorance of the foundations of realities of the situation and of the area. What they were acting upon was the old, soft headed philo-Hellene assumption that the Greeks were a "superior" and "European people" who could bring law, order and light to the "barbarian Turk" and who could at the same time "redeem" at least those sections of western Anatolia which contained sizeable Greek populations. Every item in that assumption was proven false in the next four years.

Comment on this passage is needless, as the author himself gave it quite clearly.

In August, a few months after the Greek occupation of Izmir, the Allied authorities felt obliged to send an inter-Allied commission composed of Admiral Brutol, the American High Commissioner, one British, one French and one Italian general, to examine the Turkish grievances and get the real truth of the accusations.

The commission came to the following conclusion:

that the Greek occupation of Smyrna bore resemblance to a conquest and a crusade than to any civilian mission; that it was contrary to the principle of nationalities, since, with the exception of Avakam, everywhere the Turkish element was more numerous than the Greek; that Turkish national sentiment would not accept the annexation, that it would yield only

---


to force, that the Greeks alone could not conduct a military expedition with any chance of success, and that they should be replaced by Allied troops.

No comment shall be given on this report which was never officially published, but only kept in the files.

It is tragic enough to note that Mr. Lloyd George was persuaded by M. Venizelos to suppress this paper. However, successful in procuring a copy, the Parisian paper Eclair printed it in one of its issues of October 1919.

Thus, from this date onward, a local resistance was shown the invaders. The resistance was formed either by ex-Army officers, or by local landlords who formed Robin Hood-like bands and fought a guerilla warfare. The local landlords known as the Yoruks-Efes, received great support from the local people. Many students studying in Europe returned to Turkey and joined these bands knowing that, in a future non-independent Turkey, their professions would be useless, and that the supreme ideal should be, first of all, the liberation of the country. However, these semi-political bands were thinking mostly of the liberation of their own towns and villages, and not of the country.

In 1918 it seemed as if Turkey's end had come. That she exists today as a strong, independent and progressive Republic, is due to the fact that she produced, at the
critical moment, a great leader, the founder of modern nationalist Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk.

Prostrated, and at the end of its resources, the Ottoman Empire was unable to oppose any resistance. Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia and Arabia were lost. British warships menaced Istanbul. Since the departure of the leaders, the machinery of the government broke down completely. Allied officers supervised the policy of the Port, the dismantling of the forts, the demobilization of the army and the railways. Soon it became evident that the dismemberment and destruction of Turkey had been agreed upon. Turkey was to become little more than a shadow of her former self.

While the minorities were sincerely cooperating with the Allied and Associated Powers in Turkey, the general public in Europe was definitely against Turkey. Turkey was the only country which was not forgiven for fighting the Allies. A French newspaper wrote in the meantime that "of all our enemies, the Turks are the ones we shall not only hate, but despise with a deep feeling of disgust".

Worst of all, the Sultan himself, in the very domain of his country, became a puppet of the Allied Forces, willing to agree to everything proposed to him, only to save his throne. Damat Ferit, the Premier, was specially cooperative in serving the Allied demands.
But, despite all these handicaps, there was one man who sincerely believed in liberating the country. This man was none other than Mustafa Kemal, who came to the scene in the most critical moment of his country.

Ataturk

Mustafa Kemal was born in 1881 at Salonica, at that time a Turkish territory. His father was a minor official in the Custom House, and died while Mustafa was quite young. His death forced Kemal and his mother to take refuge in his uncle's home where he used to work on his uncle's farm. As H.E. Wortham wrote,

his first recorded occupation was scaring birds in the bean fields, - a nice piece of symbolism for the future Ghazi Pasha, who was to climb to power by driving away more dangerous birds than the world thought, from the corpse of Turkey.9

In spite of his poverty, he was extremely sensitive in matters of honor. As his mother opposed Mustafa's entering into a military career and tried to make him a hoca - Islamic theologian, - he secretly entered the Military Cadet School, in which he made rapid progress. He was very

good in mathematics, and one day his teacher told him: "your name alike mine is Mustafa. In order to avoid any confusion let us name you Kemal", (a term meaning 'perfection'). From that day on, Mustafa was called Mustafa Kemal, a term which suited the future leader perfectly.

Finishing the Military Cadet School while only seventeen years of age, the brilliant officer entered the Military Staff War College, where he met several revolutionary and broadminded officers, who all strongly criticized the corrupt Hamidian despotism.

During his youth, Mustafa Kemal frequently read Voltaire and Rousseau. The liberating scepticism of Voltaire must have been congenial to Kemal, who regarded with fierce impatience the whole clumsy machinery of the Ottoman Empire, and that obscurity in which religious and secular elements were mingled, and which was intended to confirm the total allegiance of the ignorant masses of the Sultan.

With the above mentioned revolutionary officers, Kemal formed a secret society called Vatan - Fatherland. But the young and energetic officer, revolutionary in soul and in spirit, was literally unable to remain quiet. In Damascus, where he was fighting the rebellious Druses, he formed a branch of the Vatan Party. After staying two years
in this part of the Ottoman Empire, he secretely returned to his native city Salonica, where he joined the Union and Progress Party. However, he always disliked Enver Pasha and was unable to trust him. Taking part in the Harekat Ordusu (Army of Mahmut Şevket who marched over to Istanbul), he came to Istanbul, but following the outbreak of the war in Africa, he went to Cyrenaica where he successfully resisted the enemy. Without any regular army, Kemal succeeded in stopping the Italian advance to the coast until news came that the First Balkan War was declared. He at once rushed back to take part in the defense of Turkey itself.

During the First World War, Mustafa Kemal successfully resisted the Allied attacks at Gallipoli, a campaign initiated by the British First Sea Lord, (Minister of the Navy), Winston S. Churchill. Mustafa Kemal defeated the Allied Powers at Ariburnu, and at Anafarta, thus causing the Allied retreat (December 1915).

With the Gallipoli campaign ended, and Mustafa Kemal hailed as the hero of the Dardanelles, he was now sent to the East, where he successfully conducted the Turkish forces against the Russians and Armenians.

Following his return from the Berlin Mission, he was appointed commander of the newly formed "Thunderstorm
Army Corps", which was resisting hopelessly against the British. Kemal insisted that the Arabian Provinces should be evacuated and the defense line should be established from the Tauros Mountains, giving its rear a territory inhabited by Turks. The Armistice was signed while his strategy was under consideration.

Mustafa Kemal returned from Syria and spent winter in Istanbul thinking about the dark days which were approaching rapidly. He had tried to persuade the former Crown Prince Vahiddedin, now the Sultan, to show some spirit.

Seeing no hope from the Sultan, Kemal sought another way of liberating the country. He was therefore deeply pleased when he was appointed the Inspector General for the Third Army. The Sultan, under the protests and menaces of the British, sought to check the efforts of the nationalist bands. Someone, as the representative of the Sultan, had to go and deal with the situation on the spot, enforce the delivery of arms, the disbanding of troops, and stop the meetings of the local nationalist committees. Mustafa Kemal's fierce pride as a Turk had been torn down to the quick. Until, now, he had no chance to act, but now there was a good chance. He left Istanbul the next day after the Greeks landed in Izmir, an occupation realized in accordance with the decision of the Paris Congress.
Kemal landed at Samsun on May 19th, 1919, and at once called his ex-army friends and army officers to join him in liberating the country. Mustafa Kemal, instead of checking the resistance, instead of stopping the local nationalist committees, organized the forces of resistance, that resistance which he was expected to suppress.

Thus, May 19th, 1919, was definitely the turning point in the history of Turkish nationalism.

The intentions of Mustafa Kemal were following:

1. To join the various local semi-political bands.

2. To try to teach that the country is a unit, and that everyone should think of the land as a whole and not as a particular region.

At once he set out to arouse the country. He toured the villages, harangued the officials, collected the officers, preached resistance. It was heavy work, as the people were worn out, utterly crushed, and they had sunk into a dull lethargy after years of decimating wars.

The circular letter sent by Mustafa Kemal to all the military and civilian authorities reads as follows:\textsuperscript{10}

The territorial integrity of the Fatherland and our national independence are in danger. The Central Government is incapable of carrying out its responsibilities. A national body must be set up, free from all outside interference, to bring to the ears of the world the nation's cry for its rights. It has been decided to hold a national Congress at Sivas in the near future, to which every province is to send delegates, who must, wherever necessary, travel incognito.

The Ottoman Turkish army, since the armistice, was practically disarmed. However, the only force not yet disarmed was one of General Kiazim Karabekir on the Russian front. In the following days, he reached agreement with General Kiazim Karabekir, Ali Fuit and Refet Pashas, all well-known commanders. The Amasia Protocol signed by them (June 19th, 1919) which agreed on the above mentioned articles, urged the necessity of calling a representative body of the people.

As far as the Amasia Protocol was concerned, there was no apparent desire to break away entirely from Istanbul.

Thus, the first representative body, in which Mustafa Kemal was elected unanimously the President of the Congress, (July 23rd, 1919), was gathered at Erzerum.  

During the time the Congress was taking place, the Istanbul Government received another ultimatum from the Allied Powers, ordering General Kiazim Karabekir to arrest Mustafa Kemal. Kiazim Karabekir was appointed the
At the Congress of Sivas, "The Anatolian and Rume­lian League for Defense of National Rights" was established on more solid foundations than it was done at the Congress of Erzerum. Most of the ex-Unionists joined this League.

At this time, the Istanbul Government took a different step. The Minister of the Interior issued a circular communique (June 23rd, 1919) that no official correspondence should be carried with Mustafa Kemal. Moreover, on July 8th, 1919 the Sheik ul Islam denounced Kemal as a rebel to the Porte, and the Sultan revoked his appointment. Mustafa Kemal responded on the very same day by declaring that he not only resigned his post, but from the Army as well. From now on, he was working for the people and with the people.

Third Army Inspector General, thus replacing Mustafa Kemal. Nevertheless, General Kiazim Karabekir refused to obey the order and declined the appointment.

A month later another Congress, this time at Sivas, with a longer preparation and larger representative body, was to take place.

The Allies in Istanbul, as well as the Sultan's Government took various steps in order to prevent this second Congress. French officers called on Reshid Pasha, the Governor of Sivas and declared that the Allies would occupy Sivas in five days if the Congress of Sivas would ever take place. Immediately following this ultimatum, the British began to land at Samsun four battalions brought from Batum. Colonel Refet "immediately marched with his military and nationalist forces to Samsun, and asked the British to withdraw at once, which they did."
Orders were sent to Ali Galip, the Governor of Malatya to the effect that he should march to Sivas and arrest all the nationalist representatives. The plot was learned beforehand, and the Congress demanded the dismissal of Damat Ferit\textsuperscript{12}.

When the demand was refused by the Sultan, the Congress of Sivas decided to break away from Istanbul. This act had a special importance. As far as the Amasia Protocol was concerned, there was no particular desire to break away from the capital, but the discovery of this plot and the information that Vahiddedin secretly signed a treaty with England, accepting a full-scale British mandate led to the breakdown of the relations.

It is rather curious to note that England, while promising a certain Turkish region to Italy, later promised

\textsuperscript{12} In this respect Mustafa Kemal had sent this telegram to the Grand Vizier:

"Your reckless attempts to tread the nation's right underfoot and to compromise the honour of H.M. the Sultan, are known. The nation has no confidence in any of you apart from the Sultan, hence it is obliged to present its petitions to H.M. alone. Your Cabinet, fearing the perilous consequences of its unconstitutional actions, is coming between nation and Sultan. If your obstinacy in this matter continues for one hour longer, the nation will consider itself entitled to take any action it thinks fit, and will cut off all communications between the country and your unconstitutional Cabinet. This is our last warning." - G.L. Lewis, Turkey, London, Benn, 1955, p. 57.
it to Greece, but behind all that was trying to assure a full-scale British mandate over all of Turkey. Moreover, this decision carried a special importance "as it divided the country into two unequal forces and authorities"\(^\text{13}\).

The break seriously frightened the Sultan. The result was the downfall of the Ferit Cabinet which was replaced by Ali Riza Pasha, a man sympathetic to the Nationalists. Istanbul thus thought it useful to get in direct touch with Mustafa Kemal in order to understand what they actually demanded. Salih Pasha, the Minister for Marines from Riza Pasha's Cabinet, went to meet Mustafa Kemal at Amasya. Salih Pasha affixed his signature to the Erzerum-Sivas Resolutions.

The official communique read as follows:

1. The provinces inhabited by Turks shall not be ceded to the enemies under any condition; no mandate or protectorate shall be accepted, the integrity and independence of the Turkish Fatherland shall be safeguarded.

2. There shall be accorded to the Non-Muslim elements no privileges which undermine the national sovereignty or the social balance.

---

\(^{13}\) Harry Howard, *The Partition of Turkey*, Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1931, p. 256.
3. The Istanbul Government recognized the legality of the "Association for the Defense of the Rights of Anatolia and Rumeli".

4. Only delegates approved by the Representative Committee shall be sent to the peace conference to be held between the Ottoman Empire and the Entente Powers.

5. The impending session of the Chamber of Deputies must not be held in Istanbul\(^\text{14}\).

The General elections were held, the Nationalist candidates securing a majority. However, in spite of the Amasía Protocol, and Mustafa Kemal's insistence, the Parliament was opened in Istanbul. Nevertheless, in harmony with Kemal's will, the deputies passed from Ankara and talked with him before going to the capital. The Parliament was opened on January 11th, 1920.

Although the country was under a diplomatic foreign control, the Assembly declared the National Pact, another milestone in the history of the Turkish Nationalist movement.

The National Pact (Misaki Milli) declared\(^\text{15}\):


The members of the Ottoman Chamber of Deputies recognize and affirm that the independence of the State and the future of the Nation can be assured by an absolute adherence to the following principles, which represent the maximum of sacrifice which can be endured to achieve a just and lasting peace, and that the continued existence of a stable Ottoman Sultanate and society is impossible if we do not adhere to the said principles:

Article 1: Inasmuch as it is necessary that the destinies of the portions of the Turkish Empire which are peopled by Arab majorities, and which, at the conclusion of the Armistice of October 30, 1918, were under occupation by enemy forces should be determined in accordance with a free plebiscite of the inhabitants, all such territories (whether within or outside the lines of the said Armistice) which are inhabited by an Ottoman Muslim majority who are united in religion, in race and in aim, are imbued with sentiments of mutual regard, are prepared for individual sacrifice, and have an absolute respect for one another's racial rights and social circumstances, form a whole which does not admit of division for any reason in truth or in law.

Article 2: We are willing that, as in the case of the three Sancaks which united themselves by a general vote to the mother country when they were at first free, recourse should be had, if necessary, to a free popular vote.

Article 3: The determination, also, of the juridical status of Western Thrace which has been dependent on the Turkish peace, must be effected in accordance with a vote which shall be given the inhabitants in complete freedom.

Article 4: The security of the city of Istanbul, and likewise the security of the Sea of Marmara must be protected from every danger. Provided this principle is maintained, whatever decision may be arrived at jointly by us all and all other Governments concerned, regarding the opening of the Bosporus to the commerce and traffic of the world, shall be valid.
Article 5: The rights of the minorities as defined in the treaties concerned between the Entente Powers and their enemies and certain of their associates shall be confirmed and assured by us in reliance on the belief that the Muslim minorities in neighbouring countries will also be given the benefit of the same right.

Article 6: It is a fundamental condition of our life and continued existence that we, like every country, should enjoy complete independence and liberty in the matter of assuring the means of our development, in order that our national and economic development may so be rendered possible, that it should be possible to conduct our affairs in the form of a more modern and regular administration.

For this reason we oppose any restriction inimical to our development in political, judicial, financial and other fields.

The conditions of settlement of what our indebtedness shall be shown to be, shall likewise not be contrary to such principles.

Following this declaration, the Allied Powers did not hesitate to take more drastic measures, as if the present ones were insufficient.

On March 16th, 1920, the British Forces occupied Istanbul in full scale, deporting to Malta some twenty-four nationalist leaders, deputies, journalists and poets (such as Ziya Gokalp, who was considered a dangerous radical).

The Parliament was occupied and most of the predominant members were sent into exile as well.
The British Headquarters issued a proclamation signed by General Wilson, threatening death to everyone who should shelter a Nationalist.

Mustafa Kemal, being informed by the occupation, sent two remarkable telegrams; in one, he addressed the world, and in the other the local authorities.15

Following the military occupation, the Cabinet of Riza Pasha was forced to resign and a puppet government, formed by Damat Ferit, was established on April 6th, 1920. Five days later, the Sheik-el-Islam was made to promulgate a "fetwa", condemning all the Nationalists and denouncing them as rebels. Mustafa Kemal responded immediately by calling for new elections for a new Parliament which was to be opened in Ankara, Anatolia. The Grand National Assembly, composed of a body of three hundred and fifty deputies united in Ankara and held its first session on April 23rd, 1920, another milestone in the modern Turkish history.

The new Government established in Ankara at once took the following decisions:

---

15 For the text see Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.
1. The Will of the Nation represented by the Grand National Assembly should be recognized by all the Turks as the Supreme Power.

2. No other authority can supersede the Grand National Assembly.

3. The President of the Grand National Assembly will preside at the eleven member Cabinet formed among the deputies.

One of the first laws enacted by the Grand National Assembly was that of defining and punishing treason, (April 29th, 1920). The struggle for the national independence surely needed drastic measures. For this aim "Tribunals of Independence" which had extensive authority in punishing the people committing treason, were formed.

On April 30th, 1920, the Western Powers were sent official notification of the Ankara Government as the real representative of the people. All treaties, conventions and other agreements concluded by the Istanbul Government after March 16th, 1919, were declared null and void by an Act of the National Assembly of June 7th, 1921.

In the meantime, Damat Ferit Pasha became so arrogant that he took the liberty of condemning Mustafa Kemal to death - in absentia - (March 11th, 1920), a decision
signed by the treacherous Vahiddedin on May 24th, 1920. Moreover, ignoring the Nationalist Government, the Istanbul Government and the Entente Powers began to negotiate the peace terms (May 11th, 1920), at Sevres,

a place associated with things of beauty, and now to be connected in human minds with the great suffering and bloodshed. It was a cracked piece from the very beginning - but half a million human beings had to be slaughtered in order to break it completely and bury its pieces in Lausanne.16

Teyfik Pasha was replaced by Damat Ferit (June 25th, 1920), a man who literally was a servant of the Entente, a man of no honor or ideals except personal ambition. The Treaty of Sevres, a treaty which was nothing else than the combination of the secret agreements reached by the Entente, was signed by the Istanbul Government on August 10th, 1920.

The Treaty of Sevres was an embodiment of imperialism, and reduced Turkey to the status of a minor whose territory was small, and whose sovereignty was subject to limitations amounting to a virtual protectorate.

Simultaneously, with the Treaty of Sevres, a tripartite treaty was signed between Great Britain, Italy and France. It provided for the division of Turkish territory into spheres of influence. The French sphere corresponded

to the aforementioned Sikes-Picot Agreement, while the Italian zone covered the areas assigned to Italy in the two wartime agreements (London and St. Jeanne de Maurienne), minus the region of Izmir which was promised to the Greeks. It also extended somewhat beyond these wartime limits in the northwestern sector. Turkey was not a party to this agreement, and hence was not legally bound by it. Politically, however, the agreement affected her directly, since it represented an attempt to fulfill the wartime partition schemes. It could not, therefore, be divorced from the Treaty of Sevres and must be considered, consequently, part of a larger whole.

It is needless to point out that the Western Powers tried to apply the formula of Vae Victis rather than the Fourteen Points of President Woodrow Wilson.

In regard to the Treaty of Sevres, which was never signed by a real representative Government, the following comment can be given:

(a) It is rather superfluous to state that there was hardly one Italian or French inhabitant in the territories ceded to these countries.

(b) As Donald Webster wrote "the definition of
Kurdistan is vague. No such nation existed in modern times.17

(c) As for the Armenian Republic, the aforementioned author commented in the following manner: "The Armenian Republic of the U.S.S.R. is the only Armenian nation since the Roman era."

Professor Lybyer, a man sympathetic to the Armenians, said that

The Armenians asked at the Peace Conference for an Empire laid out generously from the Mediterranean in Cilicia to the Black Sea, from Samsoun to Batum, and even to the Caspian; not only Turkey, but Persia and Russia were to contribute to its lands (...). As a matter of fact, there never was an Armenian state ruling at one time the half of this area.19

Further comment is really superfluous. The Treaty of Sevres, condemned and torn down by the Nationalists from its very beginning, was a perfect expression of the Entente ambitions and hatred felt against the Turks. For the Entente Powers, the words of the French Foreign Minister, the ideas of Lloyd George and the suggestions of the aforementioned French daily were coming true.

18 Ibid.
Hence, Turkey became the only nation who refused to accept passively the humiliating peace terms, or rather the "death sentence" of Turkey. The Turks became the only people among the five defeated powers to take arms, again, against the victorious powers after less than a year of the Moudros Armistice, and successfully insisted upon a drastic revision of the peace treaty which the victors intended to impose upon them. In doing so, the Turks renewed their youth and changed their destiny. They were no longer fighting, under a decadent Ottoman dynasty, to preserve this or that province of a derelict empire. Deserted by their dynasty, they were once again waging a frontier war and following a leader chosen on his merits like their first Sultan Osman, and this not to extend their homelands, but to preserve them.

Mustafa Kemal declared in Ankara that "Our motto is Death or Freedom". Bismarck was right in saying once that "You can destroy and completely annihilate a nation if you have the requisite strength to do so, but beware of trying to dislocate it partly". It seems that the Entente rulers did not heed this advice.

Encouraged by the Entente victors, and receiving moral support from President Wilson, the Armenian subjects began to attack the Turkish villages. Hostilities continued

20 Arnold J. Toynbee, A Study of History, London, Oxford University Press, 1955, p. 120.
until December 3rd, 1920, when the Treaty of Gumru was signed, the first international convention the Ankara Government signed.

This convention had a great moral and material value. Morally, it encouraged the Nationalists, and materially, it gave them a chance to move forces from the east to the west so that the Greek advance might be stopped.

In the meantime, the newly established Bolshevik regime, which was fighting with the White Armies declared that it did not recognize the imposed Treaty of Sevres. On August 10th, ten days after the signature of the Treaty of Sevres, a Turkish Parliamentary delegation visited Moscow. On March 16th, 1921, on the first anniversary of the occupation of Istanbul, the Treaty of Moscow was signed between the Ankara Government and the U.S.S.R.\textsuperscript{21}.

For this treaty, the following could be said: The Treaty of Moscow, while safeguarding the Turkish national interests, was a great diplomatic success.

\textsuperscript{21} For the text see Appendix 3.
War of Independence

"Freedom for the just, our nation's right divine."

Mehmet Akif

In the meantime, the unorganized Nationalist attacks which lasted for three months, forced the French to evacuate Urfa and Maraş. On May 30th, 1920, the French offered an Armistice good for twenty days but fighting was renewed, however, in less than twenty days when a French force was landed at Zonguldak, the coal mining port on the Black Sea which was exploited by a French oil concessionaire. The French had considered the armistice applicable to the southern front, while the Turks interpreted it as limiting all conflicts

In the following year the French were repulsed from Antep (February 8th, 1921).

Following the way paved by Bekir Sami Bey, the Turkish Foreign Minister who met Franklin Bouillon at the Conference in London, talks were resumed in Ankara.

After the Turkish victory at Sakarya, the Ankara Accord, (October 20th, 1921), was concluded with France.

This was the Ankara Government's first treaty with a Western Power.

This accord ended the state of war between France and Turkey. The articles stipulated that the region of Cilicia would be evacuated by the French troops, that the Alexandretta zone, remaining under French occupation, would be granted a special regime, that no hindrances would be presented to the cultural developments of the portion of population which is of the Turkish race, and that Turkish would be one of the official languages.

As for Italy, this country preferred to evacuate the Turkish provinces without any serious combat. Later, a Turco-Italian Agreement was signed.

Thus, the only foreign armies left in Turkey, were the British ones occupying Istanbul, and the Greek army fighting on the western front. The Allied Powers had made it a matter of honor and thus gave Greece the green light to march into the Turkish lands. The Greeks, who had the idea of forming a Great Greece, were not aware of the resistance they had to face.

Lloyd George frequently called the Ankara regime "gangsters", and Mustafa Kemal a "bandit".
As we have already mentioned in our previous chapter, the first explosion of Greek nationalism in 1827 was the first spark of its Turkish counterpart. However, it is interesting to note that the Greek invasion of Izmir was the second stimulus to provoke the Turkish national sentiment, national pride and patriotism. The first one was only a small spark, kept more or less in the intellectual field; however, this second one was sufficient to cause a national Turkish uprising aiming at a motto of "Turkey for the Turks".

"The Greeks fought for the glory and the big idea (the idea of a Greek Empire), but the Turks fought for their hearts and homes." The first Greek attacks were stopped at Inonu (January 9-11, 1921), by Colonel Ismet, Commander of the Western front.

The battlefield of Inonu, on which the decisive action of the Greco-Turkish war of 1919-1922 was fought, lies in that original patrimony which the last of the Seljuks had assigned to the first of the Osmanlis six hundred years before. The wheel had come full circle.

---

24 The first stimulus, as mentioned before, was the Greek Insurrection of 1821-1829.


26 Arnold J. Toynbee, Op. cit., p. 120.
Following these events, Mustafa Kemal became the Supreme Commander, while Fevzi Çakmak became the Chief of the General Staff. Kemal accepted the task, provided that no limitation of power should be given to him for three months.

In the meantime, the Istanbul Government had sent an army called the Caliphate Army which was to suppress the Nationalist Forces. However, this army was defeated, and most of its soldiers joined the Nationalist forces. Consequently the Ankara Government announced the abolition of the Sultanate (November 1st, 1922). King Constantine, in the meantime, visited Izmir and issued a daily order saying "Forward to Ankara".

The following Order of the Day is a perfect illustration of the spirit of the Nationalists at the time.

Before the battle Mustafa Kemal, in one of the Orders of the Day, declared 27:

There is no defence line. There is a defence area, which is the whole country. Not one inch of it is to be given up, until it is wet with Turkish blood. Any unit, large or small, may be thrown out of its position. But it will face the enemy and continue to fight at the first point.

---

where a stand is possible. Units which see a neighbour­
bouring unit obliged to retreat cannot follow. They
must stay where they are and resist to the end.

The battle of Sakaria which continued for twenty-
two days and twenty-two nights, ended with the Turkish vic­
tory. Mustafa Kemal was rewarded, by the unanimous vote of
the Parliament, with the title of Ghazi (Conqueror).

The Nationalists knew that the matter could not be
solved before the Turkish territories were regained from
the enemy. Mustafa Kemal began to plan the final attack.

The first day of September, Ghazi gave his
stirring order: "Armies, your first goal is the
Mediterranean. Forward!" The next day, suprised by
the lightning swiftness of the Turkish attack, the
Greek Commander in Chief, General Trikoupis, with
some of his staff, was captured in his headquarters
tent in Uşak, by the Turkish Cavalry. Following the
victory at Dumlupinar, (August 30th, 1922), the
Turkish armies reached and liberated Izmir (Septem­
ber 9th, 1922). Many a Greek soldier arrived there
first, having paused only long enough to burn villa­
ges and crops which they could not take with them28.

But Lloyd George did not want to give up. He tried
to obtain forces from Commonwealth countries, but after
having been refused by them (including Canada), he this
time attempted to obtain them from Yugoslavia, which coun­
try as well, refused to oblige.

The people of the world wanted peace and stability rather than to satisfy the ambitions and personal hatred of the British diplomat.

In the meantime, negotiations for an armistice took place at Mudanye. But the parleys seemed to fail at a certain moment, as they dragged on for eight days and as the Allied Powers diplomatically did not try to understand that the victor was not their respective states, but actually Turkey, the country which was thought dead at the end of World War I.

Thus, Mustafa Kemal's greatest triumph was still to come in the incident at Çanakkale, an incident which led to the overthrow of Lloyd George.

Following the liberation of Izmir, Mustafa Kemal sent a column of troops to the Dardanelles, where an Allied Force was still stationed, to break through Thrace and protect Istanbul from a possible new Greek attacks. The French and Italian troops withdrew, leaving the British standing alone to block the way to Europe.

As Donald E. Webster describes the situation,

The Turkish leaders had no desire to become embroiled in open warfare with the British, but Gha­zi and Ismet Pasha were obstinate in demanding an armistice basic to a treaty consistent with the National Pact. Turkish troops were advancing with arms reversed to pass through the British lines at Çanakkale, without shooting or stabbing, and had reached the English barbed wire.

The ruse de guerre bore great danger. A slight misunderstanding could have led to a new war, this time between Turkey and Great Britain.

General Harrington, the British High Commander in Istanbul, in a telegram to Mustafa Kemal, asked that the Nationalist troops be withdrawn from the no man's land between Erenkoy and Biga. Kemal answered that "I am unaware that a no man's zone was established through the talks between the Grand National Assembly and the countries concerned". Mustafa Kemal stressed that the Turkish forces were following the Greeks, and that if the British were sincere in concluding peace, they should sign the armistice.

After a further exchange of telegrams, and the intervention of Franklin Bouillon at a stage when tension was mounting, the Armistice of Mudanya was signed (October 11th, 1922), thus ending all hostilities.

---

Accordingly, the Turkish armed forces liberated Eastern Thrace and took over the civil administration of Istanbul.

The Armistice of Mundros was replaced with the new Armistice of Mudanya. Now it was time for the humiliating Treaty of Sevres to be replaced with an honorable Treaty of Lausanne, a treaty where the victorious and defeated sides exchanged seats.

Following the Greek defeat, the Allied Powers invited the Ankara as well as the Istanbul Governments to the Peace Conference which was to open at Lausanne in October, 1922.

The Turkish Nationalists came to the conclusion that something should be done in the legal field to avoid any representation by a government which existed merely in theory. On November 1st, 1922, the Grand National Assembly held one of its historic meetings, passing a law of the Abolition of the Sultanate, a law which was retroactive to March 16th, 1920, the day of the military occupation of Istanbul by the Allied Powers.

The Ottoman Empire, founded in 1299, and which for six long centuries dominated vast territories, was buried in history, a case, in which external and internal factors
played an important role. It could be roughly stated that the Ottoman Empire's downfall was mostly due to its incomparable victories.

The second Lausanne Conference re-opened on April 23rd, 1923, the third anniversary of the first opening of the Grand National Assembly. Britain and France deemed it proper to change their delegates. Sir H. Humbold replaced Lord Curzon, and M. Barrere was replaced by General Pelle. The Peace Treaty was finally signed on July 23rd, 1923. With the sole exception of the territory of Mosul, the National Pact was realized.

In its territorial clauses, the integrity of ethnic Turkey was recognized; Turkey regained Eastern Thrace up to the Maritza River. The Islands of Imbros and Tendros (Bozca ada and Imbroz) were restored to Turkey, but other Aegean islands went to Greece. Italian possessions of the Dodacanese and British possession of Cyprus was confirmed.

Although the Turkish Delegation strongly insisted that in Western Thrace, a territory where the Turkish inhabitants form a majority, a plebiscite should be held, Mr. Venizelos, receiving the backing of other countries, succeeded in avoiding a plebiscite. His argument were that Western Thrace was economically and strategically necessary for Greece and such necessities would overrule the principle of self-determination. Secondly, the Yugoslav Foreign Minister declared that his country would enter into war if the Turks would pass the Maritza River.
The boundary with Syria was accorded in line with the Franklin Bouillon Agreement of 1921. However, the Sanjak of Abyandulla had to have a special protocol.

No limitations were concluded upon the national sovereignty of Turkey. Capitulations were abolished. No limit was placed upon her military, political or economic activities. Only the Dardanelles were to be kept demilitarized within a thirty kilometre zone.

At the Conference, the Soviet Delegation, which was permitted to attend those limited sessions in which her interests were concerned, “staunchly supported Turkey on the question of the Straits, but the Entente's will prevailed to the chagrin of both delegations”\(^32\). However, these stipulations had to be changed in accordance with Turkey's national interest and her sovereignty in the coming Montreux Conference.

The large sum of the Ottoman debts were reconsidered in proportion to the size of new Turkey. According to Article 50, Greece recognized her obligations to pay for the damages caused in Anatolia by the acts of the Greek Army or Administration which were contrary to the law of war.

On the other hand, Turkey, in consideration of the financial situation of Greece resulting from the prolongation of the war and from its consequences, finally renounced all claims for reparations against the Greek Government. Turkey received only Kara-Ağaç, a small land in Thrace which was regarded as payment for war damages.

Thus, the only legal Government left on the scene as well as in reality, was the Nationalist Ankara Government. Events followed one after another.

On November 4th, 1922, Refet (Bele) took over the administration of Istanbul. The Turks once more conquered Istanbul, and once more, by this act caused the downfall of an empire, this time one of their own. Following the Nationalist victory, the Sultan left the country for Malta, (November 17th, 1922), where he spent his last years.

Mustafa Kemal did not find sufficient grounds to order the abolition of the Khalifate. He kept his idea of the abolition of this office for the opportune moment.

In the six-day speech, delivered in 1933, Mustafa Kemal reminded Turks of his speech delivered at the Grand National Assembly on the occasion of the abolition of the Sultanate:
Speaking of the history of Islam and of Turkey, based on historical facts, I showed that the Khalifate and the Sultanate could be separated from one another, and that the Grand National Assembly could possess the national sovereignty. I asserted that the execution of the Kalif Mutaasam by Hulago had put an end to the Kaliphate, and that unless Yavuz, who conquered Egypt in the year 924 (Islamic Calendar - corresponds to 1517) of the Hegira, would not have attributed importance to a fugitive who held the title of Kalif, we should not have had the title handed down to our days.\footnote{Donald Everett Webster, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 99.}

The Grand National Assembly thus elected another member of the royal Ottoman dynasty, Abdul Mejid, the Khalif, provided that he would not mingle in any sort of politics (November 18th, 1922). Three days later the Peace Conference, in which Turkey was represented by General Ismet, now Foreign Minister for the National Cabinet, opened. England was represented by a well-known Turkish enemy, Lord Curzon, while France was represented by M. Barrere.

The Conference dragged on and on, agreement seeming impossible as the Englishman held out for his point of view. Finally, he composed an imposing statement of his demands, had it put into French of unmistakable phraseology, practiced reading it until there could be no misunderstanding his pronunciation, and then presented himself at Ismet Pasha's suite. When Curzon had finished his hour of tedious reading, the Head of the Turkish Delegation merely cupped his ear and said: "Pardon me, but I am very deaf; would you mind reading that again?" In a fit of rage, Curzon stamped out of the room and away from Lausanne, forcing the adjournment of the conference (Feb. 4, 1923) without accomplishment.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 100.}
The Lausanne Treaty was approved by the Grand National Assembly (August 24th, 1923), and on October 2nd, the last remnants of the Entente Powers left Istanbul. The British and their allies folded their tents, saluted the Turkish flag and sailed away.

Thus, the War of Independence or rather the War for National Sovereignty ended and a new era started. Turkey had to set to work to rebuild the country on solid foundations.

Thus also ended the foolish Greek megalomaniac idea which made Mr. Venizelos confess at a later date that "the only mistake I made in my life was to attack Anatolia".

Undoubtedly, the Treaty of Lausanne was a signal victory for the Turkish nationalists. By signing it, the government of Mustafa Kemal obtained formal international recognition and buried forever the remnants of the Ottoman tradition. It fulfilled, in the main, the program outlined in the National Pact. Now it was the National Pact which dominated the spirit of the peace treaty, instead of the secret agreements concluded by the former victor, and present vanquished. Turkey, as the result of the efforts of Mustafa Kemal regained her independence and secured the unity of her ethnic territory.
As a matter of fact, the Turks, in the course of their history, are one of the very few people who never lived under a foreign yoke. Now Turkey threw off the shackles of foreign control in political, judicial, military, administrative and economic matters. She emerged from this ordeal with her national pride restored, enjoying a new and progressive leadership, impoverished but hopeful and confident in the future, and homogenous in population.

The Treaty of Lausanne was a difficult one to draft, but inasmuch as it was freely negotiated and not an imposed treaty, it provided a sound foundation for peace in the Near and Middle East than had its ill-fated predecessor.

The feature of free negotiation was purchased at a heavy price of bloodshed and human suffering. But the peace settlement, as it emerged in relation to Turkey, was quite different from the settlement in the Arab portions of the Ottoman Empire. In both cases, the original intention of the European Powers was to impose upon these areas an imperialistic peace which would subject them to a rather semi-colonial rule, and which would conform to the aforementioned wartime agreements. In both cases, however, there was a revolt against these schemes, but with completely different consequences. Whereas the Arabs, divided and ill
prepared, did not succeed, the Turks succeeded beyond all expectations.

As Mr. George Lenczowski\(^{35}\) puts it,

the West imposed its will under the form of the mandatory system upon the Arabs, but saw its designs frustrated by the tough resolution of the Turks. In the long run, such a turn of events was to serve the real interest of the West. A healthy and strong Turkey in two decades was to become a bulwark protecting world peace against the destructive inroads of modern totalitarian states.

With regard to the exchange of population between Turkey and Greece, resulting from the peace agreement, the author notes that

This agreement was greatly criticized during and after the conference for its inhumanitarian surgery, but it should be borne in mind that the bitterness endangered as a result of the Greek invasion of Anatolia made any other solution impracticable. The exchange affected approximately 1,500,000 Greeks and 5,000,000 Turks. To Turkey it proved to be something of a blessing, since it eliminated from her territory a minority of questionable loyalty, and vacated many professions and trades for younger Turkish intellectuals. (...) In human terms, the suffering was incalculable. Such was the sad harvest reaped from Venizelos's adventure in 1919\(^{36}\).

This statesman, at least being honest enough to confess the truth, admitted his mistake by stating that "the only mistake I made in my career was to attack Turkey".

---


\(^{36}\) Ibid., p. 109.
CHAPTER VI

KEMALISM

"Peace in the country
Peace over the world."

K. Ataturk

When the military task was over and the demands of the National Pact had been realized with the conclusion of the Treaty of Lausanne, there remained a greater task than the military one. This was to rebuild a new state, a national state on sound and radical foundations, that is to say, on quite different patterns than those on which the former Ottoman State was built. The Great Reforms were of more importance than the military activities of the War of Independence. During this war, all the Turks clung to each other and practically formed a united front to face the common external danger of imperialism. The Turks, whether revolutionary or conservative, progressive or reactionary, supported one another. However, when the war was over and the problem of deciding upon the new regime arose, that is to say, the question of whether to continue on the monarchical patterns or to establish a Republic, or whether to return
to Istanbul or to stay in Ankara forever, presented the obstacle of conflicting theories.

People who had previously clung to one another now started to differ on political grounds and in their beliefs. Some were progressives, while some were conservatives or, more dangerously, reactionaries. This was making more difficult the task of Ataturk.

Mustafa Kemal knew, beforehand, what he really intended to do. However, he, the real and only architect of the Great Turkish Reforms, knew perfectly well that reforms could not be based upon force, but that it was essential to win the people to his side. This was not difficult for him, as he was well known and loved since his military victories at Gallipoli, and especially since his perfect leadership during the War of Independence, the success of which was owing to him. Thus the people had complete faith in his ideas and beliefs. Being a perfect psychologist, he did not abuse this favorable sentiment and chose the proper time for the right revolutionary reform. More striking is the fact that Mustafa Kemal realized these reforms in less than five years. This proves that the ground was partly prepared beforehand, especially by Ziya Gokalp. Another remarkable feature was that Ataturk did not become a despot, a case
often observed in the Middle East. A military leader who had achieved so much, in so short a time, against so many odds might, in Turkey, be expected to appeal to religious feelings in order to maintain his popularity, or not to endanger his popular position. He took, however, quite the opposite direction. He did not become a despot and was not a dictator in the sense to which Europeans link the term. It is for these reasons that the Turkish people love him more and more each passing day, although more days pass since his death.

However,

one may argue that modern Turkish and Russian history offers a somewhat similar example. It is undoubtedly true that the Bolshevik experiment in Russia went a long way toward a complete transformation of the life of the Russian people. However, no detailed comparison between Turkey and new Russia is needed in order to rule out the example. One single fact will suffice for the Bolshevik achievements in Russia; they were a product of collective effort by a revolutionary movement, which lasted for decades prior to their seizing power. Great was the part played by Lenin; he was the ideologist and leader of a movement. Not so Ataturk. He was personally responsible for the origin of his reforms. He was not only the chief executive of a New Turkey but he visualized, planned and forced the creation of that New Turkey.

Thus, unlike the Russian Revolution, the Kemalist Revolution was a revolution from above and not from below.

---

KEMALISM

Ataturk had collaborators, friends who helped him during his Reformation, but the spirit, energy and guidance were his and no one else's. "There has been no parallel to Ataturk's feat in the history of mankind. No man yet succeeded so radically as did Ataturk in changing the life of a nation in all its spheres."²

Ataturk realized this great "miracle" by following a policy of nationalism, achieved through revolutionary means and not evolutionary ones.

In a speech delivered on the Tenth anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic, Ataturk declared: "Our national idea is to promote, support and prop with all kinds of means our high character, untiring efforts, innate intellect, devotion to science, love of good arts, and national unity and consciousness".

The Great Turkish Reforms, realized in such a short period, would not have been regarded important if the new Ankara regime had not cut her links with the Ottoman past, an Empire which has fulfilled its historical mission.

Turkey has cut her links with the past - to a certain extent - through the Great Reforms, and therefore they

² Ibid., p. 17-18.
have a special value. They are not ordinary reforms, as exercised in any country, but bear a great moral value. Mustafa Kemal carried through several reforms, and therefore, as no one can deny, Kemalism became the appropriate designation of the complexities of policies and processes realized in Turkey.

The first major reform was carried on in the political field in changing the state into a Republic.

When Istanbul was evacuated by the enemy troops, the possibility of returning the Capital to Istanbul arose. However, on October 13th, 1923, the Grand National Assembly, following Mustafa Kemal's advice, voted in favor of Ankara as the permanent capital for Turkey.

The main reasons for Ankara's being selected were that Ankara was the very heart of the new nationalist spirit. Ankara became the seat of the Nationalists, while Istanbul, with its mixed population, was far from representing a national unity. Strategic reasons, that is to say, being in the inner part of the land, played an important role, aside from emotional ones.

The Turkish Kemalist Reforms were exercised in political, economic, and especially sociological fields, each bearing importance of its own.
Kemalism - no one will deny - is an appropriate designation for the complexities of policies and processes in the New Turkey intimately associated with Mustafa Kemal.

Kemalism is, first of all, a program of progress. According to the definition of the program of the Republican People's Party, Kemalism is explained thusly:

The fundamental ideas that constitute the basis of the Program of the Republican People's Party are evident in the acts and realizations which have taken place from the beginning of our Revolution until today.

On the other hand, the main ideas have been formulated in the general principles of the Statutes of the Party, adopted by the Grand Congress in 1927, as well as in the Declaration published on the occasion of the elections to the Grand National Assembly in 1931.

The main lines of our intentions, not only for a few years, but for the future as well, are here put together in a compact form. All of these principles, which are the fundamentals of the Party, constitute Kemalism.

Thus, Kemalism could be defined as a political doctrine, a conception, both political and sociological, aimed at reconstructing the political framework of Turkey, and shaping the Turkish nation along new, progressive lines, strongly connected with the nation's historical heritage.

---

While that program is implied in the Constitution of the Republic and explained in detail in the Program (platform) of the Republican People's Party, its essential principles engage our attention.

It should be stated that the Kemalist principles were in application long before they were included in the Turkish Constitution of 1937. The People's Party adopted the Kemalist Principles officially during its Fourth Grand Congress in May 1935, and they were included in the Constitution only in 1937. However, as aforementioned, these principles were in application since the proclamation of the Turkish Republic.

Many authors dealing with modern Turkish nationalism overlook its real objectives, as they do not deal with the four essential principles outlined in the Program of the Republican People's Party.

The four fundamental principles - Fatherland, Nation, Constitution of the State, Public Rights - form the very essence of Kemalism. They are its main objectives and ends, while the so-called six pillars are merely the means by which those objectives could be attained.
Fatherland

According to the definition of the Party, the Fatherland is the sacred country within our present political boundaries where the Turkish nation lives with its ancient and illustrious history, and with its past glories still living in the depths of its soil. The Fatherland is a Unity which does not accept separation under any circumstances.

In this sense the country is understood in two different manners, the first dealing with the political boundaries, and the second with the supreme importance of its national integrity.

The Fatherland is not solely a material entity, but a moral conception as well.

Nation

Similar to the teachings of Gokalp, Kemalism rejected the religious and racial factors as a necessary element in creating a nation. While geographical factors could easily be rejected, economic factors could be accepted to a certain extent.

According to the teachings of Kemalism, the Nation is a political and social group of people who are united
with one another by cultural, ideologic and linguistic ties.
According to the definition of the Party, the Nation is the
political unit composed of citizens bound together with the
bounds of language, culture and ideology.

Secularism and Nationalism (not Pan-Turanism or
Pan-Turkism) should be considered the means to realize this
objective, a peaceful and humanitarian one.

Government

Like all other political doctrines, Kemalism deemed
it necessary to deal with constitutional organs of the
state as the main canal through which Kemalism may work is
the Government.

Let us first observe how Kemalism regards the con­
ception of State as compared with other contemporary polit­
cical doctrines. As understood by the jurists, "a State is
a permanently organized society, occupying a fixed territ­
ory and enjoying within the borders of that territory the
freedom of control by any other State."4 However, the con­
ditions and details do not concern this essay.

4 Charles Fenwick, International Law, New York,
Appleton, 1948, p. 104.
Besides the liberal concept which regards the State as a power which executes the legislative and the judicial powers, the Nazis and the Fascists accept the philosophy of Laband who regards the State above everything, the individual, and even the nation. The motto of Fascism, as well as Nazism is, as laid down by Giovanni Gentile:

Everything for the State,
nothing against the State,
nothing outside the State.

The communist conception of the State is somewhat different. Although admitting that the State is the creation of the society who profess a class struggle (Proletariat).

Kemalism, on the other hand, does not favor any of these doctrines, as it regards the State as a servant of the nation and not an instructor, as Ziya Gokalp thought, nor as the Nazis professed, a supra national form, nor does it demands a class struggle as the Proletarians claim.

More details shall be seen in the following pages in a discussion of the six principles of the government.

The idea of the Kemalist doctrine is the following:

According to the Party Program, Turkey is a nationalist, populist, etatist, secular and revolutionary Republic.

---

The form of administration of the Turkish nation is based on the principle of the unity of power. There is only one sovereignty, it belongs to the nation without any restriction or condition.

The Grand National Assembly exercises the right of sovereignty in the name of the nation. Turkey, unlike certain other Western democracies, has only one chamber – the Assembly, and has no Senate. This is quite in line with the revolutionary character of the state. Both the legislative authority and the executive power, in Turkey, are embodied in the Grand National Assembly, the sole representative of the people.

Political Rights

According to the Party, it is one of the important principles of our Party to safeguard the individual and social rights of liberty, of equality, of inviolability and of property. These rights are within the bounds of the State's authority. The activity of the individuals and of legal persons shall not be in contradiction to the interest of the people. Laws are made in accordance with this principle.
Following this brief survey, we are able to study the six pillars of Kemalism: Republicanism, Secularism, Nationalism, Revolutionism, Populism and Etatism (Part II, Article 5, of the Program of the Republican People's Party).

Republicanism

"My humble body one day surely will become earth, but the Turkish Republic will last forever"

K. Ataturk

Before the end of 1922, Mustafa Kemal announced (December 6th, 1922) that his group in the Grand National Assembly would be transformed into a political party throughout the entire country. The People's Party (Halk Firkasi) was thus coming into the scene, a party which was the continuation of the "League of Defense of Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia", founded at the Erzerum and Sivas Congresses. Mustafa Kemal travelled throughout the country trying to explain the program of the party.

His interviews were filled with questions, and he doubtless learned much about what the elite of the masses were thinking, but the principle product of his conversations was the impression he made on those people who were accustomed to thinking of their ruler as a palace dweller whom they could never hope to see, came face to face with the head of their government, as it was impossible to be in
his presence without coming under the spell of his personality. Almost without exception those who came in contact with Ghazi feel that they can never be anything but his loyal followers.

It is rather needless to point out that Mustafa Kemal proved to be a perfect sociologist and psychologist, as he did not hint at his real intentions. His party was supported mainly because of his great personality. The ignorant mass, on the other hand, was satisfied with this program.

On April 1st, 1923, the new National Assembly took its seat. Thus came the era for radical reforms. The first changes were political ones.

Following the declaration that Ankara was made the permanent Capital of Turkey, a Cabinet crisis occurred. Rauf Bey, the Prime Minister, a man whose religious loyalties were marked in contrast with those of Gazi, was asked to resign from his post. Kazim Karabekir and Ali Fuat Pasa, though recognizing the ability of Kemal, resigned from the Assembly and returned to military posts. Following the resignation of Rauf Bey, the ensuing caucus of the People's Party was unable to agree upon the constituency of the new ministries. According to the periods law, each minister had

---

to be elected by the Assembly individually. Being the head of the Party, Mustafa Kemal, pleased with the caucus, took the initiative when he stated that all such difficulties could end if the President would elect a Prime Minister who would be subject to a vote of confidence in the Assembly. When he named the form a Republic, heated discussion took place. Mustafa Kemal gave a convincing speech on the matter.

He said:

Sovereignty and Sultanate are not given to anyone by anyone because scholarship says so, because of debate or discussion. They are taken by strength, by power, by force. By force the Ottoman dynasty seized the sovereignty of the Sultanate of the Turkish nation, they have maintained this usurpation for six hundred years. The Turkish nation has called a halt, it has rebelled, it has taken the sovereignty into its own hands. This is an accomplished fact. The question is not whether or not we are going to leave the sovereignty to the nation, the question is merely how to give expression to the accomplished reality.

Hence, the Constitutional Act was modified on October 29th, 1923, and the form of the new nationalist Turkish state was declared as being a Republic.

The President, who at the same time was the President of the National Assembly, had to be elected by the Assembly itself. He had to elect the Prime Minister, and the ministers

---

were to be elected by the Premier, ratified by the President and ask for the vote of confidence from the Prime Minister. The Constitution was changed accordingly. It took just fourteen minutes after changing the fundamental laws to do the balloting, which ended with the historic statement of Ismet Pasha declaring that "One hundred and fifty-eight Deputies have participated in the election of the President of the Republic. By 158 votes, they have unanimously elected His Excellency, the Gazi Mustafa Kemal Pasa, Deputy for Ankara, President".8

As the official Turkish history points out, "calling the new regime Republican and the Chief of the State President of the Republic merely meant the legislative dubbing, with correct titles, of the two institutions according to the new form they had already assumed".9

Turkey thus became a Republic in 1923, and this was the first principle of Kemalism which was embodied in the Constitution. The other five pillars were not included in the Constitution until 1937, though they were applied in practice.

9 Ibid.
The Turkish text books, articles and treatises do not deal with the term Republic and the adjective republican, as they rightfully claim that there is nothing much to say about this principle, as its concept is nothing different than its axiom. However, it is especially deemed necessary to state that Article I of the Turkish Constitution, which defines the Turkish State as a Republic, is the only article in which Turkish Constitution cannot be subject to further discussions, and cannot be changed whatsoever, even if the whole Assembly were to favor such an amendment. It is an organic, fundamental law. This restriction should not be regarded as an unlogical stipulation. Any person who is familiar with the Turkish Revolution and the conservatism of the ignorant hojas and masses could do nothing but praise such a restriction. Republicanism was, and is still regarded as the only way out of the collapsed Ottoman autocracy. Mustafa Kemal, himself being asked to become the new Sultan of Turkey and the Caliph as well, did not hesitate for a second to turn down such types of offers. The Political History has proved that a Republic is one of the best forms of Government and is the best form for Turkey. The Ottoman dynasty could not have been kept longer in Turkey as the ruler of the nation, since its corruptness was clear to all
the Turkish people. Moreover, a dynasty fighting against the national interests could not rule the country further.

Consequently, on March 4th, 1924, the Grand National Assembly voted for the abolition of the Caliphate and the expulsion of the entire Ottoman dynasty. The Republicans were justified in fearing that any member of the dynasty could endanger the young Republic established only a year ago. Such measures are usually taken when such constitutional changes occur, that is to say, when a country abolishes a monarchy and starts a republic. The French Republic, although on a similar occasion, was much more radical, since the king was sent to the gallows.

Secularism

"The truest guide in life is Science."

K. Ataturk

With the emergence of nationalism as the great ideal of Turkey, alterations were made in every section of Turkey's social structure; Islam as a religious system had also to be dealt with. With regard to its undeniable delicacy, secularism is one of the most important policies of Kemalism.
as it not only attacked the former personal Sultanate, but the religious hierarchy as well. Secularism in Turkey was revolutionary and national as well. As we shall try to show, the modern Turks tried to adopt Islam to their national structure instead of adopting themselves to the Islamic structure. Turkish secularism would be considered an important and vital element of the Kemalist ideology "when one considers that Islam has always prided itself on being an all-inclusive system which prescribed rules for every phase of human activity, and alteration which pretends to draw a line between realms subject to an independence of the religion's influence must be recognized as well-nigh revolutionary".¹⁰

However, it is rather needless to devote an extended survey in order to prove that secularism sometimes is a natural and logical outcome of nationalism, and that both nationalism secularism would go hand in hand in the field of politics and sociology.

As Hans Kohn wrote¹¹,

---


Nationalism taking the place of religion, is as diversified in its manifestations and inspirations in its form and even its substance as religion itself (...) Yet in all its diversities, it fulfills one great task—giving meaning to man’s life and justifying his noble and ignoble passions before himself and history, lifting him above the loneliness and futilities of his days, and endowing the order and power of government without which no society can exist, with the majesty of true authority.

Turkish secularism is especially important as it was the spine of the Kemalist revolution, and as it succeeded in a large way without any opposition—except the minor Kurdish revolt—and without any bloodshed. Nevertheless, we can firmly assert that in contrast to Europe, as a sphere of culture, the Turkish laic movement succeeded in a shorter period. As a consequence of the national and laic revolution, the New Turkish State was founded on radical and solid foundations rather than upon utopias and rosy dreams.

The Kemalist secular policy, ending with radical reforms, abolished the Ottoman religious hierarchy which brought nothing but harm to the Turkish nation. However, until the Kemalist reform, this reality was not admitted by many individuals mainly because they were strongly intoxicated by the ignorant and fanatical hodjas.

Mustafa Kemal, later called Ataturk, was successful in realizing a complete secularization of the state and religious affairs.
Although at first glance it would seem that we are leaving our subject aside, it would be rather useful to draw a brief historical sketch of secularism, so that we may be able to show that in most cases, national interests proved to be a stronger force than religion alone.

Since the very early days, there were three main distinct powers dominating the world: science, religion and politics. Science invites thought, while religion gives faith and politics, on the other hand, gives action. Thus, in the very early stages of history these three distinct phenomena were united at a single hand. It was a single man who used to think for the tribe, act as the religious chief and exercise politics. The case could be observed among the tribe's chief who was the magician, fortune teller and head of the tribe, all at the same time. In early Egypt, the Pharaohs were both the religious heads of the country and the temporal rulers as well.

Following the conquest of Egypt and the assumption of the Caliphate, similar conditions existed in the Ottoman Empire. However, when the Turks began to adapt themselves to this situation, Europe was undergoing the Reformation.

At the present stage, most of the modern nations secularized their state organism and separated the afore-
mentioned powers. All three powers were in different hands. However, speaking about exceptions, we can easily state that, although the Queen of England is the Head of the State as well as the Head of the Anglican Church, the latter is merely a title, as the real authority is in the hands of her bishops.

In order to achieve this end, that is to say, the separation of the temporal and spiritual powers, much human blood was shed. Nevertheless, it should not be asserted that blood was shed only to secularize the two functions. Blood was shed among two different branches of the very same religion. The Ottoman Turkish ruler, Sultan Selim I, fought with Shah Ismail because of such a difference, though the latter was a Turk and a Mohammedan as well. Tamerlane, a great Turkish ruler, spoke about Yildirim Beyazit, the Turkish ruler, as an unbeliever, while Queen Elizabeth I proposed an alliance to Suleyman the Magnificent against the King of Spain, as she defined him as an idolator. Following the defeat of Francois I, his mother begged aid from Suleyman the Magnificent, a Turkish and Moslem ruler, against another Christian ruler. Finally, the attitude of the Arabs during World War I is noteworthy as well. These people did not only join the Christian Powers, but fought against
their Calip as well. All these historical events show that in recent centuries politics played a greater role in the international field than the religious phenomena did. Hence it was useless, impractical and unrealistic for Modern Nationalist Turkey to insist on hanging on to this religious phenomena.

As aforementioned, the secular policy, like the other pillars of the Kemalist regime, was in action from the time of the abolition of the Caliphate, and it is for this reason that we shall try to show the secular reformations from this date. It is hoped to show the secular acts with their historical and sociological implications. It is strange enough to note that, after nationalism, it was secularism which was followed in Turkey despite the great fanatical populace.

However, it must be admitted that certain events aided Mustafa Kemal in realizing the secular attempts. The anti-Nationalist Caliphate Army, which was mainly directed against the Caliph-Sultan, gave a bad impression to a great majority of people. The fiasco of the Holy War prepared the ground for secularization among the general public, whilst Ziya Gokalp had influenced the intelligentsia. But, despite this fact, there was a great majority still believing that
the Caliphate provided an external prestige to Turkey. However, they were practically unable to grasp the reality that, by 1918, the Caliphate as a political body had proved a fiasco. The separatist tendencies of the Arabs and Moslems within the Ottoman Empire showed that Islamic Internationalism had faded away, and its place was being taken by nationalism among the Moslem peoples. Nationalism proved to be a more powerful weapon than the religious weapon.

While the first changes of Kemalism were marked in the political field, the second attack took place upon the religious hierarchy, already weakened from the removal of the Sultanate.

The Turkish secular movement could be observed in different lines of the political and social history of Kemalist Turkey. The Turkish secular movement aimed at:

1. Abolishing fanaticism which harmed the entire body of the State and the nation.

2. Liberating the country from the fanatical hodjas and ideas.

3. Liberating religion from its position as a tool of politics.

4. Leaving the people alone with their faith.

5. Making religion a matter of conscience.
KEMALISM

In order to achieve these objectives, the following means were used:

(a) Attacks upon the office of the Caliphate and other religious institutions.

(b) Attacks upon the idea of Pan-Islamism.

(c) Attacks upon the temporal rulers who used religion as a tool for politics.

(d) Attacks upon the ignorant thought which prevailed among the Islamic theologians.

(e) Demands to nationalize the Islamic Religion.

(f) The policy of secularization.

For this reason the following was done:

The removal from the Islamic jurisdiction its laws, educational system and other phases of life which western nations were observed to have removed from religious into secular domination; the destruction or removal of all leaders and breeders of bigotry and reaction, and the diversion of religious energy so far as possible into channels which would make for progress and cooperation with the governmental program.

Thus, it could be easily stated that the Kemalist ideology is not directed against the religion itself, but against the fanatical thought which prevailed during the
previous centuries. This fanatical spirit which came into existence because of the ignorance of the Mollahs, Ulema and Hodjas, endangered the national growth of the state, a situation which could no longer be permitted in a newly established State, salvaged at the cost of so much bloodshed and sacrifice.

Attacks upon the Caliphate

As has been seen following the abolition of the "personal sultanate", the "sultanate of the nation" was proclaimed, and the Ottoman dynasty was permitted, however, to keep the title of Caliph, provided that the authority of the Caliph should be restricted solely to spiritual affairs. During this era, the power of the Nationalist Ankara Government was undisputed and the Caliph had no real authority only that of organizing and assisting at religious ceremonies. The survival of the Caliphate was tolerated, for it was thought to be more advisable to kill the past in two strokes than one, as it would give the people a better chance to adjust themselves to the new circumstances, especially as the people had still faith in the Caliphate.

Under these circumstances it was going to be naturally unwise to try to kill two birds at a single stroke,
which act could have endangered the national revolution.

The fact that a non-political Kalif was seated, following the abolition of the Sultanate and the exile of Vahiddedin, is attributed less to the nascent weakness of the new regime than to the fact that the disestablishment was intended only as a non-political measure. However, internal peace required undivided loyalty. Most of the people had never learned to distinguish between 'Church and State'. Their failure to grasp the idea was another reason necessitating the abolition of the non-political Kalifate after it had been tried for sixteen months.

Following the abolition of the Sultanate and the exile of Vahiddedin, his uncle Abdul Aziz was elected by the National Parliament - with a Fetwa - as the Caliph. This was the last time the Turks ever used a Fetwa for any other matter.

The new Caliph was strictly instructed to deal only with religious affairs, and not to meddle in politics, regardless of whether against or in favor of the Nationalist Government. Besides that, he was made sign a renunciation of the Ottoman throne. But, following the Declaration of the Republic (1923), Abdul Aziz was unable to refrain from interfering in domestic politics, agitating the fanatical ulema and other hodjas. It cannot be claimed that any newly established state, especially if founded on quite different

patterns, could ever tolerate such a circumstance. The abo-
lation of this office became a necessity, a necessity for the
national survival.

While Abdul Mejid began to meddle into domestic po-
litics, the hodjas began to criticize the works of Gazi
Mustafa Kemal. In the Mosques, public places, the hodjas
and the dervishes preached, warning the people against the
government. They denounced Mustafa Kemal and his sacrili-
gious acts, his sneers at sacred things. They planned to
make Abdul Mejid the constitutional sovereign of Turkey,
with themselves as ministers in the government. Perhaps
Mejid, a quiet and honest man, did not want to carry the
affairs to the extreme, but however, whether he wanted it
or not, he found himself in the middle of anti-revolution-
ary activities. Thus, he became a danger to the success of
the national revolution.

Aga Khan and the eged and revered Emir Ali, two
prominent Indian Moslems, decided to write a letter of pro-
test on behalf of the Indian Moslems, demanding that the
dignity of the Caliph should be respected and that no harm
should be brought to this institution. In a very tactful
manner, the letter was sent first to the Press of Istanbul
and then only to the National Government of Ankara. On the
other hand, England, unable to destroy Turkey with the Greeks, tried to strike this time from the weak point - by exploiting the religious sentiments. But, with the exception of a few persons, the Grand National Assembly flew into blind passion while the deputies cursed the hodjas and mol­lahs, the voices of opposition and the Calip as well.

In the meantime, Mustafa Kemal was begged by some moderates to assume the title of Caliph. A delegation from India and Egypt repeated the request. It was no doubt a great position, behind it was tradition, prestige as well as an international position. Mustafa Kemal had all the necessary attributes, he was a victorious general, the ruler of a free Moslem nation which, since the War of Independence, attracted the sympathy of most of the Moslem people the world over. Mustafa Kemal was an outstanding figure not only in the Moslem world, but in the international field as well. Another man might have been tempted, but Mustafa Kemal did not hesitate to refuse and turned down these propositions. His goal was nationalism and it had to stay this way.

Ataturk strongly supported the abolition of the Caliphate, stating that there was no room for this institution in a national state. Moreover, he proclaimed "the deliverance of politics from religious prejudices", adding that in order
to reach this end, certain sacrifices would undoubtedly be made. At all costs, he said, the Republic must be maintained. It is threatened. The Ottoman Empire was a structure based on broken religious foundations. The new Republic must have good foundations and a well made, scientific structure. The Caliph and the remains of the Ottoman dynasty must leave the country forever. The antiquated religious courts and codes must be replaced by modern and scientific civil codes which might answer the modern and national needs of the new Republic. The religious schools must give way to the secular public schools. The Republic must be founded on radical foundations, and must therefore become secular.

On the same occasion, Prime Minister Inanu declared:

We cannot forget that this nation suffered mostly from the Caliph’s army, which fought side by side with the invaders against the National forces, to save his throne.

Thus, on this same day (March 3rd, 1924), a most important decision was taken by the Turkish Grand National Assembly to abolish the Caliphate, a decision important to the Turkish nation and equally important to the rest of the Moslem world. The Sheriat and Evkaf Institutions, that is to say, the Ministry of Pious Foundations was abolished as well. With another article of the same law, all Mosque
schools (medresse) were closed and the ecclesiastical courts based upon the Canon Law, were brought to an end as well. A year later, in regard to the reactionary Kurdish insurrection, the Nationalist Government deemed it necessary to ban all monasteries of the dervishes (September 2nd, 1925). However, it was only the Moslem convents which were closed. According to the decree banning these Convents, the following could be stated:

They first closed all religious houses (tekkes and zawiyeks) and abolished all religious orders in Turkey; prohibited individuals from living as members of orders and from wearing the costumes or bearing the titles associated therewith; closed all chapels (mesjid) attached to religious houses and all mausolea (turbe) and abolished the office of custodian of such establishments. The second decree defined the categories of persons who were to be reckoned as ulama, and their costumes, and prohibited the wearing of these costumes by unauthorized persons. The third decree laid down that all public servants who were not required to wear a special uniform were to dress in ordinary clothes in use among the civilized nations of the world — including the hat, and were to uncover the head indoors and also out of doors as a sign of salutation.

On the same day, another law was passed by the Grand National Assembly stating that all opposition to the Republic, and sympathy to the ex-Sultan or ex-Caliph was considered treason and punishable by death. There was no alternative but to stop the voices of the fanatics and those who served foreign interests.

In regard to these decrees, Kemal Ataturk said in his Six Day Speech delivered two years after this act:

Could one regard as a civilized nation a mass of men who allowed themselves to be taken in a tow by a rabble of Sheiks, Dedes, Saids, Tcelibis, Babas, and Emirs; who entrusted their fate and their lives to chiromancers, magicians, casters of lots and amulet sellers? Ought it to be allowed to retain in the new Turkish State, in the Turkish Republic, elements and institutions like these which, for centuries, had given the nation a different appearance as if it were real?

As the major objective of the Turkish National reforms were to separate Turkey from the ancient Asiatic-Arabic sphere of culture and tradition, and to transform her into a modern, Westernized nation, the main attack was naturally directed towards such institutions which were likely to perpetuate the older and undesirable order. The abolition of the Caliphate as a non-national institution proved to be therefore a good starting point. The abolition of this artificial institution cleared the path to secularism and to nationalism. Instead of having an international institution of the Caliphate, it is much better to have a national government.

Instead of the convents "Peoples Houses" came into being where lectures and conferences were given quite

\[14\] Ibid., p. 178.
frequently. However, the article defining the State Religion as Islam existed in the Turkish Constitution.

According to that Constitution, the form of the State was defined as a republic, the State religion as Islam, the official language as Turkish, and the capital as Ankara.

The presence of the Caliph in the former capital of Istanbul seemed to encourage wild dreams of reaction in the minds of some of the pious who had been fond of their temporal persequites. As a remnant of the symbol of something which had ceased to exist, his office became the rallying point of malcontents bent on resorting to political action because their spiritual effectiveness had come equally nonexistent. Keenly aware both of the recent attempts to incite a Holy War, and of the sympathy and support for the warfare waged by Armenians and Greeks against Turkey, the Kemalists cannot be blamed for eliminating a situation which might have become a cause or a pretext for other hostilities.

With regard to the abolition of the Office of the Caliphate, a Turkish author wrote that "the abolition of the Khilafat, considering its nature and the depths to which it has sunk, has put an end to a terrible evil. (...) The Moslem world can be confidently expected to fare better without it".


Turkey, after having the bitter experience, could not link her future with the past. Celal Nuri, expressing this idea stated that "to be faithful to the past in order to be united in fate with a body of 300 million who never make progress is to rebel against the present and the future (...) it means to lose the national existence".17

However, it should be stated that the importance in abolishing the office of the Caliph should not merely be regarded as an abolition of an institution. The importance is in the moral field rather than the material one. It was for the good of Turkey as well as for the rest of the Moslem world to abolish the Caliphate, and by doing so the non-Turkish people should be grateful to Kemalist Turkey instead of criticizing her act. The Caliphate was not a useful institution and, moreover, it was not a religious necessity. It was an artificial institution, and basically against the principles of the Islamic religion, as this religion definitely states that no human being can ever enter between the conscience of the human being and God.

Thus the Caliphate, merely a delusion, diverted the attention of the Turks to other places than civilization.

17 Ibid., p. 58.
As a consequence, the Turks, as the most powerful Islamic nation, were animated by this vain point of view. The Caliphate was believed to give Turkey an external prestige. However, although an external prestige existed, it did not help Turkey in any way when she needed it most. As Ataturk declared, "Turkey cannot undertake such a heavy responsibility such an illogical mission".

For Turkey, the Caliphate does not exist; however, this does not prevent other Islamic States from adopting the Caliphate. It was needless to state that Turkey would not, and could never be subject to the authority of such a possible caliphate. Turkey at the time being is a country with a population of twenty-four million, while the rest of the Moslem world total population is over three hundred million, and thus, forming such a great majority, they could do anything they wished to restore this institution.

However, it should be strictly stated again and again, Turkey, by abolishing the Caliphate, the Ministry of Pious Foundations, and the Evkaf did not betray Islam. Turkey was not the first country to make a departure from the Islamic principles. The Caliphate, though a delusion, 

established after the death of the Prophet, had an elective nature, while in less than twenty years it adopted a hereditary nature. When Hulagu, the descendant of Cengiz - both Turkish rulers - conquered Bagdad, the Arab Caliph took refuge in Egypt where the hereditary nature continued.

Ataturk declared:<sup>19</sup>

Gentlemen, I must frankly and categorically declare that those who busy themselves any more with the chimera of the Caliphate, and thereby lead the Moslem world astray, are nothing but enemies of the world of Islam, and especially of Turkey. Hopes to set up such an imposture can only be the affairs of the ignoramuses and dummies.

As has already been stated, in 1920, shortly after the Nationalist Government was established in Ankara, the old Sheik-ul-Islamate and the Ministry of Pious Foundations were combined in Ankara under a single Commisary. On November 18th, 1922, a Caliph with solely spiritual powers was elected by the Grand National Assembly to supplant the old office of the Sultan-Caliph, an office which combined temporal and spiritual powers. But on March 3rd, 1924, the Caliphate was abolished and this Ministry of Pious Foundations was abolished as well. Worth noting is the fact that, although the Minister of Pious Foundations had seat in the

---

Nationalist Government, he had no seat in the Cabinet as his predecessors used to have. It is therefore the law of 1924 which brought to an end an already half dead body. Replacing this office, a "Presidency of Religious Affairs" was established.

Article 1: Whereas the laying down and execution of the Law in cases concerning civil transactions in the Republic of Turkey falls within the province of the Great National Assembly of Turkey and of the Government which it has constituted, there is now (hereby) established in the capital of the Republic an office, designated "Presidency of Religious Affairs" (Diyanet Ichleri), for the dispatch of all cases and concerns of the Exalted Islamic Faith which relate to dogma and ritual, and for the administration of the religious foundations.

Article 2: The Commissariat of the Sherief and Evkaf (Pious Foundations) is abolished.

Article 3: The President of Religious Affairs is appointed by the President of the Republic on the recommendation of the Prime Minister.

As has already been mentioned, the Mosque Schools (medresse) were closed, as those who graduated from them were but harmful elements for the Turkish national society.
Those who graduated from these schools were not theologians in its sense, but rather narrow minded fanatical reactionaries. Those who opposed any sort of innovations in the course of the Ottoman history, those who offered foremost resistance to the Harekat Ordusu (previously mentioned), those who gave the anti-nationalist Fetwas condemning the Kemalist Movement, and finally those who fought against the Nationalist armies, graduated from these schools. Graduates from these schools were reactionary, fanatical, ignorant and unaware of all worldly affairs and scientific progress. Young people were taught arabic and the Islamic law, and nothing else. When Ziya Gokalp urged the absolute necessity of reforming these institutions, and advised the following of Christian patterns, he had considerable right. In the West the Christian clergy is educated not only in the theological fields, but in the fields of positive science as well. However, the case was not the same in the Ottoman Empire, a case whose price was too high.

Following the abolition of the convents, the time came to revise the Civil Law, or rather the Family Law, which was the only remnant of the Islamic Law.

Following the abolition of the Mosque Schools, a modern system of education was applied in Turkey. Public
education was divorced from church influences, and a constitutional provision concerning free and compulsory tuition on the primary level was put into effect.

Much importance was given to this field; a matter which shall be dealt with in further pages.

As another consequence of the above mentioned act, that is to say, as a consequence of the abolition of the Sheriat, the problem of adopting or writing a new Civil Law came into existence. Thus the Family Law, the only remnant of the Islamic Law was replaced by the Swiss Civil Code, another factor which shall attract our concern in the following pages.

The Turks, unlike the other Moslems, began to amend the God-made laws of their state as early as the sixteenth century, when Suleyman the Magnificent proclaimed the laws recalled with his name. Thus the Islamic jurisdiction within the State gradually yielded to man-made jurisdiction. But despite this, the Sheik-ul-Islam sat in the cabinet sanctioning any radical change the government planned to bring.

In 1916 the Young Turks regulated the Family Law and brought it considerably on modern lines, but the Government of the Sultan which succeeded the Young Turks following the defeat in the World War, abolished the revised Family Law and again brought the Sheriat into practice.
forward. The Young Turks brought a limited separation of spiritual and temporal affairs, but still the spiritual power was more powerful than the latter. Ziya Gokalp desired to remove the Sheik-ul-Islam from the Cabinet. Perhaps he desired the abolition of this office, as he did for the Ministry of Pious Foundations, but was unable to express this point of view, as it was too radical for the time.

In regard to the office of the Caliph and his international authority over the Moslem world, a policy of Pan-Islamism was subject to severe criticism in the Kemalist State. Gazi Mustafa Kemal Ataturk discussed the Pan-Islamic policy in his well-known Six Day Speech, and in view of its importance and historic value we would like to mention it:

Let us say gentlemen, that there is a Caliphate extending over the Moslem world. This responsibility is held by a personage whose title is "Caliph of the Moslems". I ask what is, according to those who speak of the duties and powers of the Caliphate, the duty of this Caliph of the Moslems? It is not to deliver the Moslem world? There exists, in the domain over which the jurisdiction of the Caliph extends, a State of Turkey, Persia, and Afghanistan, there is the Moslem mass of seventy million Indians, Egypt, Morocco, etc. If we admit the duties of the Caliph, as they are defined in the recognized treatises, we are obligated to save all those countries. And to save them it is necessary to have energy, power, money and men. Who can say that, for this purpose, the Turkish State and the population of Turkey are under the orders of the Caliphate? Who can say, "Go, gentlemen, inflict a defeat on the entire world and save the Moslem world." I ask the nation: Does it consent to that? Can this poor nation assume such a great
responsibility? (...) Gentlemen, it is this point of view which has moved our nation for centuries. But what has come out of it? She has left millions of men in the places where she had gone. Finally, she has been driven out. And to-day she has fallen in this situation. Do you know the number of children of Anatolia exterminated in the deserts of Yemen? Can you count the number of men whom we have lost to be able to preserve Syria, and Iraq, to keep our hold in Egypt and Africa and to carry conquest to the gates of Vienna? And what all this has finally resulted in? (...) Suppose, for an instant, that Turkey should take seriously the duty in question, that we should aim at and have good success in freeing the Moslems, uniting them on one point and governing them. Very good! But what if, after we had, for example, freed Egypt, the Egyptians should say: We thank you very much. But we are not willing to be governed by you. Egypt is for the Egyptians. We shall allow no one to interfere with our independence, and our national sovereignty. We shall remain independent.

Gentlemen, you see that it is proposed to destroy this poor nation for a whim, for an illusion, in a word for nothing (...) Enough of these misfortunes into which our nation has been drawn by obstinacy in not seeing real situations and following those who are mistaken! We cannot, knowing the cause, permit the same drama to be played on 21.

History is one of the best teachers and guides in the field of politics. It could be said that Turkey learned her lesson, a lesson the price of which was too high. Though it is usually said that history is always a repetition, the Turks sincerely hope that history should not record a similar event as the Pan-Islamic dream initiated by Turkey. Pan-Islam-

---

21 Ibid., p. 59-60.
KEMALISM

ism was a rosy dream and a historic unreality. Certain Western scholars claim that Mustafa Kemal declared that "Islam is dead". However, it should be stated that these authors fail to stress a difference. The Gazi Mustafa Kemal Ataturk did not declare that Islam was dead, he merely declared that "Pan-Islamism is dead". Under the light of our previous survey, and under the guidance of Ataturk's saying, we do not deem it necessary to argue further about this aspect.

Hence, following the abolition of the Caliphate and the Ministry of Pious Foundations, an imperium in imperio, the Modern Turkish Nationalist State regarded it a national duty to separate the State and Religious activities as they should be done.

As Allen had stated, "no less than the religious leaders of the Turks are blamed their rulers, who misused their powers and kept the people in ignorance and poverty instead of helping to enlighten them".

But it cannot be denied that the greatest share of blame was put upon the shoulders of the Islamic theologians,


who rather used religion as a tool and interpreted it according to their own understanding. It is needless to state that the biggest handicap was the illiteracy of the common people.

Attitude toward the Moslem Clergy

In the process of secularization, someone had to be criticized in the eyes of the public in order to achieve the end. Without blaming any institution or idea, another idea could not be set forth, as the people would wonder about the origin of the new idea. However, the case was the same in the Kemalist Laic Movement, but nevertheless the Kemalists were doing the right thing, and expressing the truth when they blamed the Islamic theologians for Turkey's backward situation. The greatest share was given to the Ulema, Mollah and Hodjas who practically and virtually exploited the innocent and naive human brains into fanatical ones.

Celal Nuri claimed that "the fault was not with religion, but with the rulers who have made it an instrument of their despotism through their servants, the clergy"\textsuperscript{24}.

\textit{Ibid.}, p. 33.
Celal Nuri furthermore argued:

In the first epoch of the Islamic history, both in Bagdad and Spain, there was a great tolerance of free decision, but afterwards, our scholasticism prevented thinking with reason. Since then we have slept, and it is only in these last years that we began to awaken.

A non-Turk, Sirdar Ikbal Ali Shah, had this to say of the matter:

Eben the slightest divergence from the established church was considered the highest crime, and the faithful wandered in and out of the four-water, tight compartments of schools of theology completely dazed by the priest-made dogma that would neither reconcile with the early teachings of Islam, nor ring true to the advancing humanity of the present age. The clergy made every effort to circumscribe the view of every Moslem, and placed the right of interpretation beyond the reach of even the intelligent seeker after the truth.

However, much blame and indignation may have been lost upon the selfishness, despotism, extravagance, inefficiency and corruption of the rulers and the Moslem clergy; there was plenty of criticism to be leveled at the governmental system which permitted dominance of religious laws (sheriat) and the quality of the religion which permitted itself to become degenerate.

---

25 Ibid., p. 29.

26 Ibid.
The abolition of the Caliphate as a non-Turkish institution was the first major step taken in the field of secularization. The abolition of the "fez" was another important step in this direction. The fact should not be regarded solely as a material change. The fez, a red Venetian Greek cap adopted from the Greeks, later during the Ottoman era, became the fiercest rallying cry of the ulema, when certain westerners tried to replace it with another kind of hat. The ulema, unaware of its real origin, began to yield that the religion is going away. The fez was abolished especially for this reason.

Ataturk, in his Six Day Speech (1929), recalled this reform and stated:

"Gentlemen, it was important to remove the fez, which sat on our heads like a symbol of ignorance, of fanaticism, of hatred against progress and civilization, and its place was taken by the customary hat, headdress of the entire civilized world, and to show thereby, among other things, that no difference in manner of thought existed between the Turkish nation and the great family civilization.

With the abolition of the fez, a severe blow to religious fanaticism, the veils were banned as well. The veil, unknown to the Turks until the Islamic era, was not welcomed by the real Turkish women. The Turkish women in the distant

\[27\] Ibid., p. 87.
villages of the country never wear this veil and the outer garment.

The abolition of the fez had an important significance in the eyes of the Europeans as well, for from now on they slowly began to consider the Turk a civilized person and not a "clown" under this essentially Greek cap.

In order to have a clear picture of the essence of Turkish Laicism, it would be useful to lay emphasis on the definition of this term, as given in the People's Party Program, and especially upon the text books in the schools. The latter is characteristic, as it will clearly show how the coming young generation is educated and how secularism is taught to them.

Part II, Section D, of the People's Party Program states:

The Party considers it a principle to have the laws, regulations and methods in the administration of the State prepared and applied in conformity with the needs of the world, and on the basis of the fundamentals and methods provided for modern civilization by Science and Technique. As the conception of religion is a matter of conscience, the Party considers it to be one of the chief factors of the success of our nation in contemporary progress, to separate ideas of religion from politics, and from the affairs of the world and of the State28.

In every new regime, it becomes an essential task to devote much effort to educate the new generation in a new manner. Secular teachings were therefore incorporated into school books. It would be interesting to note certain passages from the text books used at the primary level of the Turkish schools.

Mitah Sadullah in the *Yurt Bilgisi*\(^{29}\) - text book of Civics used in the schools stated that:

The Padishas were ruling in Turkey for many years. These men would think only of their amusement, and would consider the nation a group of slaves. In Europe, there had been founded well organized states according to new principles. On the other hand, when a movement toward modern ideas started in Turkey, the conservatives, the fanatical people would step in and say: This modernization is unreligious, and it is sinful. With such trifling talk they would prevent modernization. And already all the laws of the Government of the Padishah were based on the principles of religion. So it was impossible to separate worldly and religious problems. As you know, religion teaches man more about heavenly things, although it teaches at the same time truth and goodness. One must not confound heavenly things with the problems of the world. As if it were not enough to crush the people under the title of Padishah, the old Padishahs took the title of Caliph also, in order to give themselves importance in the public eyes. These men used to live in palaces with all kind of amusements and pleasures, and they were supposed to be the representatives of the Prophet. They never thought that religion is a concept of the conscience, and that nobody has the right to interfere with people's religious problems. The reason why men have organized states is not to deal with heavenly problems, but it is only to assure the living of a confortable and joyous life in the world.

Professor Abdulbaki discussed the same matter in a similar manner in a school text as well:

You understand, don't you, that religious work is one thing, while secular work is another thing. But before, those who handled religious work tried to handle the secular affairs of the world also. The Sultans took the title of Caliph, the replacer of the Prophet, and began to rule as they wished. And the Hodjas used to say all right to whatever the Sultans said, and they were also in the habit of saying to the nation: There is the power of seven prophets in one Sultan. Such foolish things they said. In short, the affairs of the world and the affairs of religion were not separate. About even the smallest thing, the hodjas were asked "Is it in harmony with religion or not?", and only after the consultation, was it done. For instance, as we have studied in history, printing was invented in Europe. They printed their books in the printing houses and since everybody was able to buy books, ignorance diminished. On the other hand, in our country printing was introduced very late because permission had to be asked of the hodjas, for they had to be satisfied, and on account of that we suffered very much. (...) Once the Sultan agreed with the head of Hodja and the other hodjas, the most impossible things were done. Heads flew off and hearths were extinguished.

The Turkish Secular Movement, in light of the social and political history of the country, eliminated the Mollahs and hodjas from the political field of the Turkish life.

It is needless to say more in order to stress that the Mollahs and hodjas were against every sort of innovation.

---

Turkey suffered at the hands of these hodjas, and now it was time to try the other way, the secular way which proved to be quite successful in other countries.

The two ways could not be harmonized in a period of revolution. Either the Mollahs or the national interests should be pleased.

In one of his interviews, Mustafa Kemal accurately stated:

If we are to say 'Let's please the hodjas, let's please the Moslem world, let's please everybody', it will be easy to make them all happy, but it is we who will not have attained our purpose. Men inclined to compromise cannot accomplish a revolution, and besides, in the present stage of misery and disorder, it is impossible to satisfy anyone whatever. When the country becomes flourishing, when the nation becomes prosperous, everybody will be happy.

It is quite obvious that in a rule of nationalism as well as in others, all the sides could not be pleased, and in such a kind of rule secularism would become a natural and logical outcome of nationalism. Moreover, it is virtually needless to think of satisfying or pleasing the rest of the Moslem world who brought nothing but misfortune to the Turks. In all matters, the Turks have to think for

themselves and not for the Arabs, Indians or Albanians, a group which hardly makes any progress, and a group which exploited the moralities and the material power of the Ottoman Turks. Turkey has no need and no obligation whatsoever to think, in the first place, of the interest of others even if they should be the Turks living outside the present political boundaries.

As has been mentioned in our previous pages, the Turk's own religion, when they emerged from what they called Turan, had been a simple, natural religion, glorifying the sky which blankets the entire world. Blue is still the favorite color of the Turks, and the sky seems their favorite part of nature.32

Thus with the secularization of the temporal and spiritual authorities, attempts to reform the religion, and to simplify it, were made. What was needed to nationalize the religion, to harmonize it according to the modern needs as well as with the national spirit. Although this attempt was not carried as far as it should have been, still the achievements were of major significance.

The most important realization was in the translation of the Koran into Turkish, a matter which shall be dealt with in future pages.

In contrast to the general thought which prevails in the mind of the Westerner and the fanatic and ignorant Moslem as well, Islam is not in contrast with progress, and it does not in any manner oppose any innovation. Elisha Allen said:

Many writers of Christendom who hold a narrow view of Islam would agree with Andre Servier when he writes: "The Moslem, bound by his religion, cannot accept Western progress. The two civilizations are too different, too much opposed ever to admit mutual interpretation." While some justification might have been found for such a statement by an observation of remote Moslem countries where primitive conditions keep alive the traditional and Koranic practices, Turkey would certainly furnish contradictory evidence, for that country, long re‐doubtable as a pillar of Moslem strength, is to‐day in the process of taking over many features from the West and adapting them to her peculiar needs. Servier might insist that Turkey, in so doing is no longer part of the Islamic civilization, yet Turkey has not, up to the present time, renounced Islam in favor of the alternative Christendom, and gives little evidence of an inclination to do so. Whether the process will later become mutual, with Turkey furnishing features to the West in return, remains to be seen. The historic contribution of Islamic Spain to Christian Europe of five hundred years ago indicates that Western Christendom has not ipso facto a monopoly of perfection.

The fault in Turkey's backwardness was not with Islam, but with those who made it an instrument of their despotism.

Thus, the secularization of religion became an urgent necessity. It is true that demands to reform the religion according to the needs of the modern age were expressed long before the Kemalists. The liberal Turkish Journal Turk, which appeared in Cairo, urged the people to send their children to Europe where they might learn something useful, instead of building Koran schools. In this paper, "the reactionary character of the existing religions, and particularly of the priests, was vehemently censured".34

As early as 1904, a Russian Tatar, Mohammed Fatih, wrote in this paper the following article with interesting points of view:

In my humble opinion, the precepts of the Koran can easily be brought to conform with culture and civilization. But unhappily, there are no Ulemas living in our day, capable of inspiring Islam and reconciling it with civilization. The Ulemas of to-day occupy themselves with outward forms alone; they do not understand the philosophic spirit of Islam and cannot therefore apply their religion advantageously in practice. Our ignorant clergy expound Islam according to their own ideas, and instead of benefiting, they injure us. You Europeans (...) have spread light in your midst. Your faith is in your own hands, your conscience is free and your minds are enlightened, whilst our

religion is still dominated by Mollahs. Until we follow your example and escape by our own efforts from the grip of the Mollahs, abandoning empty formalities, our decadence is inevitable.\textsuperscript{35}

It is rather true that Islam lacks well educated and broad minded theologians, such as exist in the Christian world. The need for well educated theologians was expressed by Ziya Gokalp who advocated the methods used in Christendom in educating their clergy. The educated Moslem theologian should not only be a master in Islam, but in other religions, as well as in positive science. Such a situation, that is to say, well educated and broad minded priests exist in the West, a situation highly desirable for the Islamic theologians. The hodjas were those people who, in their teens, began to study Arabic and Koran and nothing else, neither other religions nor any science. As a consequence, being ignorant of other religions, they became fanatics and, unaware of the scientific developments, they were anti-progressives. Thus, it is absolutely necessary that the Islamic theologians follow the Christian patterns in order to be more able to serve the Islamic people. The West, not only in the scientific field, but in this field as well, could be a commendable example.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., p. 115.
With regard to the fatalist tendencies, Ali Vahit appealed to the simple minded peasants in the following manner:

O Moslem community, I am going to speak to you about disease and its cure, which is in the power of our God who has created the world. Before speaking to you, I would like to ask you this: It may happen that a dog attacks you, and if it tries to bite you, what will you do? Won't you swing your stick or throw a stone at the dog to drive it away? Won't you try to find means to protect yourself? Of course you will. (...) O you Moslems, I have asked you this in connection with the smallpox vaccination. I use the attack made by the dog to personify smallpox because they resemble each other. Why shouldn't we carry a stick and weapon for smallpox disease? (...) When an animal attacks, you don't say I have confidence in God so I don't need to use my stick. When it comes to disease, why do you try to be confident in God? 36

Ali Vahit, who gives a simple but rather interesting lecture on this aspect, tries in further lines to prove that caution is essential instead of the fatalistic trend. Here we may easily recall a passage previously mentioned in regard to the fatalist mood of Suleyman the Magnificent, in the plague cases.

In present day Turkey, the old concept of fatalism is buried in the pages of history; it gave way to energy and work in the concept of Kemalism.

Alisha Allen, a western scholar and an authority in Turkish affairs, gives us, in her book, quite interesting and useful information: "A Turkish educator with whom I was discussing these matters (secularism), described Turkey's treatment of Islam within her borders as similar to a father's discipline of his own child: a spanking does not imply hatred."\(^{37}\)

Observing this, it can be stated that Gibb was right when saying that "the growth of nationalism has paralleled the decline of religion as a political force."\(^{38}\) Secularism was thus not only in full harmony with the new Turkish nationalism, but even one of its essential, fundamental elements and factors.

The Turks have no desire to refrain from religious beliefs, but try to purify them from the elements which joined it later.

As we have already observed in our previous surveys, the early Turks did not give religion a power in the state.

\(^{37}\) Ibid., p. 173.

affairs, and as a consequence it would not be hard to de­fine the patriarchal Turks as secular Turks.

The Turks' own religion, when they emerged from what they call Turan, had been a simple, nature religion, glorifying the sky which blankets the entire world. Blue is still a favorite color of the Turks, and the sky seems their favorite part of the nature. The Sky Turks (Gok Turkler), came from high country near sky, and had created an empire which extended from the Caspian Sea to the Sea of Japan. What the conquering Turks first learned of Christianity, as they moved westward across Asia Minor and into Europe, makes a strange story seldom told in detachment of the rest of Christian history, yet it came to them as a unique experience detached from any other knowledge of Christianity. Crossing the mountains of Transcaucasia into the Ararat region in successive migrations during the sixth to twelfth centuries A.D., they early met the Armenian Gregorian Christians. Nothing to-day indicates whether they paid enough attention to that faith to learn anything of it. They did soon learn that the Christians they met were not only Christians. And they soon judged that Christian sects must be kept separated from each other for the sake of peace. When they reached Nicea (Iznik), they must have learned that the Christians assembled there long before (325 A.D.) to decide if their God was one God or a Trinity, and that somehow or other, human debate at the meeting had settled this question in favor of the Trinity, an idea abhorrent to the Turks. (...) Subsequently, they probably heard of other mass meetings of Christian leaders to settle more disputes about the nature of Jesus, held at Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon (Kadikoy), in the land which the Turks were then conquering. When they reached Constantinople, they found themselves at the scene of the worst Christian schism of all, Byzantium vs Rome. Who was the head of the Christian Church, the Byzantine patriarch or the Roman Pope? Neither the Byzantine nor the Roman Christians at that juncture demonstrated an exemplary of peace and good will toward each other.  

---

It was following these events that the Turanian Turks entered under the influence of the newly emerging religion of Islam.

As a consequence, an official step was taken four years after the abolition of the Caliphate:

On April 10th, the Constitution of the Republic was modified to remove all references which might seem to give the religion of Islam a favored place in the Constitution of the Republic.

Article 2, the clause which referred to the state religion as Islam, was eliminated.

Articles 16 and 38 provided that, in taking oaths of office, deputies and the President should be sworn in on their word of honor instead of on the Koran. The deputies from now on started to swear in the following manner:

"I swear on my honor (instead of I swear before God) that I will have no other aim but the happiness and safety of the father and the absolutely unrestricted sovereignty of the nation, and that I will never forsake Republican principles."40.

In the foreign press this law, as a whole, was severely criticized, especially among the non-Turkish Moslems. Turkey was accused of having betrayed Islam.

However, this criticism was not only superficial, but untrue and inaccurate as well. If religion, in the best sense, is in any danger of losing its hold on the Turkish people, it is not due to the absence of governmental interference but to governmental interference itself. Moreover, if the Turkish people were to turn to atheism, merely with a change in the Organic Law, this would imply that religion has no hold in Turkey whether a law should exist or not. The religious faith is a strong phenomenon, and could not be abolished that simply. However, this was a necessary step in the process of laicism.

No religion is persecuted in Turkey, and is profoundly respected in so far as it remains a matter of individual consciences and does not interfere in state politics.

According to the traditional Islamic practice, political allegiance was, so to speak inseparable from a religious one. In Kemalist Turkey, the principles of Islam are not regarded as utterly incompatible with the requirements of the modern way of life and the national needs of the country.
According to the Turkish Constitution, "all religious services not in contravention to public order and morals and the laws are authorized".

The religious writers of the Kemalist period were dealing with religious matters - mostly in the school textbooks - from a slightly different angle than purely religious one.

Among the original principles of Islam, the following points are concluded and promoted:

(a) good character and high morals, which include justice, honesty, sobriety and generous helpfulness;

(b) self-reliance;

(c) thrift in money and time;

(d) emphasis on the practical as opposed to the theoretical point of view;

(e) progressive adaptation to new conditions;

(f) good health;

(g) patriotism, instead of Ottomanism or Pan-Islamism;

(h) tolerance, the character of which is in the inner nature of the Turks, and

(i) encouragement of intelligence and science, instead of fatalism.
As can be observed, the Turks tried to combine the modern needs of the present age with the principles of Islam, and consequently they simplified the religion, brought it back to its original form, and thus avoided any further possible complications.

Ziya Gokalp said: "My religion is neither hope nor fear. I worship God because I love Him; I do my duties without smelling any fumes from heaven or hell. The Arabs obey God as a God of rage, and the Turks follow him as a God of love."\(^4^1\)

The new attitude towards science, religious tolerance and patriotism, was dealt with in the writings of Yusuf Ziga and Professor Abdulhaki as follows:

Though fanaticism is rejected completely in Islam, we see, unfortunately, that fanaticism has entered into our religion. It is fanaticism to call others misbelievers, to become enemies of reform and progress, to hate without cause, and to attach oneself blindly to old habits. The religion of Islam is free from these bad morals \(^4^2\); Moslems do not hesitate to accept new movements.

Secondly\(^4^3\),

---


\(^4^3\) Ibid.
If we respect what other people believe, they also will respect what we believe. We have no right to interfere with the beliefs of others. We respect every thought and belief which does not harm our fatherland and nation. It is certain that God has said that a person will not be held responsible for the conduct of another. For example, a person does not worship; if the person does not neglect his duty, naturally we cannot interfere with his not worshipping. Also those who do not worship must not interfere with those who do worship. Faith arises in the mind. Everyone is free in his thought. Every thought is sacred as long as it does not harm the welfare of our nation.

Professor Abdul Baki, speaking about the religious and patriotic sentiments, wrote:

To believe in Allah, the Prophet, and the religion of Islam is religious faith. We have also a national faith. We are Turks. Turks are civilized. Our country will always go forward, and will always conquer our enemies. When the name "Turk" is spoken, my chest swells with pride, my head goes up. I love people who are useful to my nation and to my country, those who do harm my beloved country, I do not love at all. (...) There cannot be a religion without a fatherland. If we had not struggled in the War of Independence, if we had not saved our fatherland, today neither government, nor country would remain.

In the field of nationalizing the religion, the matter of translating the Koran into Turkish could be emphasised. Most of the former fanaticism came into being as the Koran was written only in Arabic, and few persons really understood the essence of this Book.

---

44 Ibid., p. 222.
Ziya Gokalp argued in an interesting manner in advocating the translation of the Koran into Turkish:

A land in which the call to prayer resounds from the mosque in the Turkish tongue,
Where the peasant understands the meaning of his prayers,
A land where the schoolboy reads the Koran in his mother tongue,
O Son of the Turk, 'that is thy Fatherland'.

It is rather needless to argue about the importance and usefulness of the translation of the religious books in national languages. The fact that Islam originated in the Arabic lands would not imply that the Arabs have a monopoly in this subject. Moreover, Islam, being an international religion and belonging to a large group of mankind, cannot have a single pertinent language.

The men who sponsored the secular movement were not irreligious at all. Certain Western scholars claim that Ataturk was indifferent to religion. It was not quite so.

Ataturk, though a religious man, was obliged to act in such an indifferent manner because he had to be an example to his citizens, acting in a manner similar to the Turkish rulers in the Patriarchal Turkish Society. Hence, as Mr. Webster notes 45,

---

Ataturk and his colleagues have not instituted anti-religious measures or sentiments as have the dictatorships of Russia and Germany. While they have not displayed anti-religious attitudes, it is probably correct to say that they have no love for hidebound ecclesiastics and ecclesiasticism. They would like to eliminate every trace of conservative influence of this type of religious leadership and life, so anxious are they for an unhampered intellectual development to flourish; but they do nothing directly against religion, for that would be unconstitutional and contrary to the fundamental secularism. The State in its conduct and the party in its propaganda are strictly laic.

In this regard, it can be said that Ataturk acted in accordance with Islam, as in this religion ecclesiasticism does not exist. By avoiding such a class in Turkey, he served Islamic society of Turkey.

In this respect Turkey gave a perfect example to many western democracies who still have a State religion. In such states, high offices such as the presidency could only be occupied by those persons who belong to a certain religion, whereas in Turkey, such a case does not exist. Any person, no matter of which religion or sect, is eligible for any office without any exception. Hence, the abolition of the clause defining a state religion was necessary, reasonable, and a democratic act, and was in harmony with the nature of the Turkish nationalist State.

Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's. The Turks at
last rendered to Caesar the things that were Caesar's, but Caesar in Turkey still keeps the things which are God's. "Unless the Presidency of Religious Affairs is made free, unless it ceases to be controlled by the office of the Prime Minister, it will be always a governmental instrument. In this respect, the Muslim Community is less privileged and less free than the Christian Patriarchates".46

Although in agreement with the last clause, we are unable to agree with Halide Edip who advocates that the Presidency of the Religious Affairs should be liberated from government control. The populace in Turkey did not yet reach that stage where religion and its practices could be out of State control.

Ataturk's revolution in the secular field was a great success despite the reactionary elements who previously hampered the policies of reformation or westernization. The Republican Government did not abuse this control and shows no tendency to do so. Therefore it is thought more advisable to leave the Presidency of Religious Affairs in Turkey under Government control.

KEMALISM

With regard to the large freedom enjoyed by the non-Moslem citizens, we could note that the Christian Churches enjoy a large measure of freedom. The only restriction imposed equally upon all religions is the law forbidding the use of the clerical garb outside the religious ceremonies. With the exception of the head of each religion, no one can wear continuously the clerical garb (Law of November 27th, 1934). This law was passed to eliminate the publicity attendant upon the public display of the religious garb, likely to be reminiscent of the old days, and partly as a phase of the larger program to eliminate social and class distinction within the Turkish Republic.

The law had to be applied to all religions, as the Turkish Laws do not give special privileges to any special class or community.

Thus, religious beliefs and practices became a matter of the individual conscience of any citizen, without any interference of the State. There was separation of state and religion, abolition of a privileged official religion, but not of religions as such.

Istanbul is the seat of the Ecumenical Patriarchate who is the head of the Orthodox Church in Turkey. The Gregorian Church is ruled by a Patriarch in Istanbul who is
subordinate to the Katholikos of Etchmiadzin. The Uniat Armenian Church is ruled by the Patriarch of Cilicia. The Chaldaenas have one bishop at Mardin. The Syrian Uniats have a See of Mardin and Amida, but it is united with their Patriarchate of Antioch, whose incumbent resides in Damascus. The Greek Uniats have as their Ordinary in Istanbul, the Titular Bishop of Grantianopolis. The Latins have an Apostolic Delegate in Istanbul and an Archbishop in Izmir, but their Patriarch of Istanbul is titular and non-resident. There is a Grand Rabbi in Istanbul for the Jews 47.

According to the census results of 1945 (October 21st) 48, there were 18,497,801 Moslems, 103,839 Orthodox, 76,965 Jews, 60,260 Gregorians, 10,782 Roman Catholics and Armenians, 5,213 Protestants, 12,582 adherents of other religions and 561 without religion, 221 undeclared 49.

However, so much could be stated that Turkey's present population is over 24,300,000 and consequently the proportions could be increased proportionally.


48 Results of the 1956 census are not yet officially declared.

As elsewhere, such a fundamental reform met with general acceptance in the country; only in South Eastern Anatolia, where a number of Kurds live, certain revolts, which had to be dealt with in a rather radical manner, broke in 1925, 1929 and 1930. Apart from the strongly religious fanaticism of these Kurds, foreign agitation played an important role. Certain countries, unable to digest the Turkish national victory, aimed at weakening the State from its internal affairs. As a whole, this is a weak point which, being buried in the pages of history, should not be given much attention from a purely psychological point of view.

Nationalism

"How fortunate to say I am a Turk."

K. Ataturk

The Turkey of today, as the product of Kemal Ataturk's revolution, is something far different from the Ottoman Empire of yesterday, not only in size and structure, but mainly in character and national spirit as well.

Neither the way of life, nor the way of thinking, neither the country, nor the nation are similar. A country
founded on the ashes of a Sultanate, came into being, thanks to the spirit of nationalism.

Necmeddin Sadak seems to be right when writing that the Turkish national feelings showed themselves in the course of the War of Independence, and therefore they were not based only on philosophy or certain theories, but they were created from the common history, common desire for a unity and from the desire of independence as well as from the desire of having a unity in language and culture, and also from a common aim.

The concept of nationality in Turkey is not based upon blood relations or anthropological researches. Kemalism in this respect accepted the theory of Ziya Gokalp. Accordingly, "the nation is neither race, nor tribe, not the whole of the people who live in the same country, nor all the Muslims together. The nation consists of the complex of individuals who have a common language, a common national loyalty, a common morality and esthetic feeling, that is to say, of those who derive their culture from these sources."

Unlike the Ottoman Empire, the modern Turkish State is not a multinational state but a national one. The land within its boundaries, as defined in the National Pact and

50 Necmeddin Sadak, Sosyoloji, Ankara, Milli Egitim Masimevi, 1947, p. 49.

reaffirmed by the Treaty of Lausanne, is purely Turkish one, and does not include any region which is originally non-Turkish. The new spirit which enlightens the people is nationalism.

Modern Turkish nationalism is therefore based on realities rather than upon dreams or utopias. First of all, there is a real Turkish soil, secondly, a Turkish people, and thirdly, a Turkish national consciousness, a Turkish spirit. It is not based upon foundations which do not belong to the Turks. For the Turks, for Kemalist Turkey, the only reality is the supreme national interests within the community of nations. In a recent declaration, a Turkish Youth Society declared that for the Turkish Youth there are only two books which are honored. The first one is the Koran (in the spiritual life), and the second is the Book of Kemal Ataturk, which includes his Six Day Speech.

As has been observed on our previous pages, the Young Turks, under the necessities of the political circumstances followed certain tendencies based upon religion and race. The religious bond of the Caliphate had more or less held the Moslem subjects together even in spite of the fact that the Young Turks' emphasis on Turanist bonds had tended to alienate the Arabs. In the interval between World War I
and the foundation of the Republic, the rivalry between these two points of view became dangerously tense while Turkism, a rather moderate form of racialism, came into being. Finally, following the defeat after World War I and the signature of the Treaty of Sevres, Nationalism, in its real sense, emerged with all its might and power. "Turkey for the Turks" became the watchword.

The question might be asked of why the Turkish national movement failed to show itself in an active way before 1920? The correct answer seems to be as follows:

The Arabs fought for their national independence during World War I, and it is absolutely true that this would not have happened had the Entente Powers not instigated them. It could be argued that these people, both intellectually and socially not more prepared for such a movement than were the Turks. The Ottoman Government, dominating a multinational population, could naturally not follow, if not an anti-national, a non-national policy. The situation changed radically, basically and abruptly with the dramatic consequences of World War I, foreign occupation, and the Treaty of Secres, an insult to the Turkish national pride, and a threat to the Turkish national independence, and at last but not least, the Greek attack against the purely Turkish homeland.
Ataturk had explained the aim of Turkish nationalism in the following manner:\(^52\):

In order that our nation shall be able to enjoy a strong, happy, stable existence, it is essential for the state to pursue a wholly national policy based upon an adequate to the structure of our society. When I say national policy, the meaning and sense which I intend is this: to strive within our national boundaries for the true happiness and prosperity of our nation and country (...) by reliance above all upon our own strength (...) and to look forward to civilized, human dealing and reciprocal friendship from the civilized world.

Attaturk continued by saying that

The rule of our country is nationalism, the care of nationality. This rule constitutes for every people a truth and an obligation; This truth, which history confirms much each day, is vaster and fuller of meaning for Turkey. Indeed, the events which we have gone through up till now, the bitter experiences which we have known, the special situation of our country, command us to hold to this rule more firmly than any other nation. In spite of the efforts for solidarity and peace which are being established in the political world, the only truth which has value in all countries is nationalism (...) The first condition for occupying a choice position among the civilized countries is to have a national conscience. Better than any other nation, are we able to appreciate the force of national ideal, of the national conscience, which have led Turkey, in the fight for independence, to liberty and to safety\(^53\).

Ataturk, who stated that "How fortunate to say I am a Turk", placed the term "Turk" in its right place. This


\(^53\) Ibid., p. 54.
ethnical group, within her own country, was no longer regarded as inferior, but Turkish nationality gave pride to the Turkish citizens, a case similar in contrast with the Ottoman society.

Before closing this chapter, it would be appropriate to quote two notable articles by two celebrated French scholars.

Pierre Loti, in his Fantome de l'Orient, wrote:

The Turk is the noblest of the nobles. This high nobility is not artificial or showy - it is the gift of nature. The only people that can create simplicity out of magnificence, eloquence from silence, a sensitive vitality from a graceful calmness (...) are the Turks (...) One should be blind to history not to understand the Turks. The dignified silence of the Turks against the mounting unjustified attacks and mean slanders can only be explained by their pity for the blind (...) How beautifully this attitude answers the undignified calumnies54.

According to the great English statesman, William Pitt, "these Turks have only one love, justice and truth, they did no injustice and yet they were victimized"55.


Another western author, Claude Farrer, in *La Turquie Ressuscitee* wrote: "I have never failed and never feared to express, especially in her dark hours, my esteem and my admiration for the Turkish people and my protest against all injustices and perfidies piled upon her. The Turkish people add the rarest virtues of all, gratitude, to their other rare virtues, such as courage, loyalty, soft heartedness and nobility of character".  

When Ataturk stated "How fortunate to say I am a Turk", he did not imply that the Turks are a master race such as the Pan-Germanist authors claimed the German race to be. He meant that the Turks should be proud of being Turks and that they should equally be proud of their ancestors. Thanks to the efforts of Ataturk, the term "Turk" was saved from being something "undesirable".

We have already noted how the term "Turk" was regarded in the Ottoman Empire. Ataturk, therefore, tried and was successful in awakening the national feeling of the "real Turks". The mentality of the Imperialist Turks died with the national movement. The patriarchal spirit was found mainly in the peasants who had no close contact either with.

---

the Arabs or with the West. The Turkish peasants represented the real spirit of Turkish nationalism, and therefore Atatürk gave such importance to the study of the way of life of these people in order to observe the patriarchal spirit of the early Turks. Knowing this, Atatürk stated "the peasants are the masters in the nation".

In order to avoid a repetition, we do not deem it necessary to devote an extended survey to the Kemalist views on Pan-Islamism, as they are studied sufficiently in our paragraph on secularism.

It would suffice to say that Kemalist Turkey, in view of its national ideals, abruptly and categorically rejected a policy based upon religious foundations.

We deem it necessary, however, to deal to a certain extent with the Kemalist point of view of "racialism".

Unlike Germany, Turkey does not follow a policy of chauvinism and does not predict that the Turks are a master race, a race sent by God to inspire the world with culture and civilization. Pride in the ancient and recent history is professed. The patriarchal Turkish race is considered the most civilized people for their era. But this concept never led to chauvinism, a degenerate form of nationalism.

Kemalism severely condemns "racialism", that is to say, Turanism.
In light of a small-scale Turanist movement, which began in the University circles in May, 1944, the Government took severe measures. "This took the form of arresting a number of Pan-Turanian leaders and issuing dramatic official declarations about the alleged discovery of a plot against the Government, hatched by the 'Grey Wolf Society'\textsuperscript{57}. However, it would be rather too much to state that the Grey Wolf Society organized a plot against the government. It would suffice to state that they were extremists. Nevertheless, they were accused of being traitors to the national cause. On May 18th, Martial Law was imposed, and "Radio Ankara (official radio) in feigned indignation, called the group of so-called plotters a 'pro-German one',\textsuperscript{58} based on racialism and Fascist principles."\textsuperscript{59} The Pan-Turanist leaders, mostly teachers and university students, were court martialed.

\textsuperscript{57} George Lenczowski, \textit{The Middle East in World Affairs}, New York, Cornell University Press, 1952, p. 146. The flag of the patriarchal Turks was the head of a grey wolf on a background of the blue sky.

\textsuperscript{58} In those days, Nazi Germany, hoping to provoke the Turks in favor of Turanism and consequently push them into the war openly, voiced such sentiments.

President Inonu, in his annual speech of May 19th\textsuperscript{60}, declared that "We are nationalists but we are the enemy of racialism in our country. (...) You may be sure that we shall defend our country with all our might against these new agitations as well".

The noted Turkish writer, Huseyin Cahit Yalcin, wrote:

The youth of the Republic, you are in the position to ask of yourselves, what is the real meaning and value of Turanism for today? In order to unite all the Turkish tribes, are we supposed to go to the borders of China? Are we supposed to go to those places with fights and struggles, to those places where the people could hardly go even as tourists? A small practical and serious research would prove how superficial the idea of Turanism is\textsuperscript{61}.

Another writer, Etem Izzet Benice, goes even so far as to regard the Turanists as traitors to the national cause.

The Turanists are not from us, had they been from us, they would have loved only this soil and only worked for the progress of this country. Had they been from us, they would not have been the defenders of National Socialism or the historic racialist idea of Turanism, either (...) Had they been from

\textsuperscript{60} Anniversary of Ataturk's landing at Samsun, May 19th, 1919.

\textsuperscript{61} Turk Inkilap Enstitusu Yayini, \textit{Ircilik Turancilik}, Ankara, Maarif Matbaasi, 1944, p. 139.
us they would not have tried to penetrate the poisonous ideas of Turanism and consequently open ideological gaps among the people (...) They are acting against the principles of Kemalism, the interest of this country (...) They serve the leftist or rightist ideologies.

Turanism, in its theoretical understanding, is surely something attractive. However, it is rather needless to mention that this attraction is only the external look of the matter, while the internal look, the internal reality, is quite different. Kemalist Turkey, which has cut most of her links with the Ottoman past, a country which sincerely desires to follow a peaceful policy, cannot support a racialist policy. Under the influence of the years, the Central Asian Turks are not thinking in the same manner as the present modern nationalist Turk does. A Turanist policy would mean a return to the east and abandonment of the policy of westernization. The two tendencies, that is to say, Turanism and Westernization, are hardly compatible. Thus, Turkey cannot afford this either. Moreover, despite the fact that a great majority of Turks in Central Asia still speak their mother tongue, under the despotic regime of Sovietism the new generation is becoming lost. "The Russians impose

62 Ibid., p. 139.
different alphabets and dialects on various Turkish regions, in order that they should not understand each other. Moreover, Turkish people are forced to migrate from one region to others where the Russians are in a majority. According to recent reports, young Turkish men are forced to marry Russian girls, and Tartars from Crimea are sent to Siberia. Under all these circumstances, there is no hope to find a useful Turkish element in these regions after a short while.

Turanist activities would mean the destruction of nationalist Turkey. These Turks are hardly Kemalists. As Ziya Gokalp mentioned, a person would rather live with those people with whom he has an intellectual understanding than with those with whom he has a blood relation. The blood relation between the Anatolian and Central Asian Turks exists but, not an intellectual one. Unfortunately, it cannot be denied that the young generations are indoctrinated with communist principles. Therefore these people would form a danger to the national unity of Turkey. The case was explicit when Turkey, in 1952, accepted two hundred thousand people of Turkish descent from Bulgaria.

KEMALISM

In short, Kemalism has no desire whatsoever to look to the East. As Halide Edip had stated, "We come from the East, we go to the West".

Ataturk, in one of his speeches, delivered at Erbiset, stated:

The policy which will be followed by the New Turkey (...) will absolutely be proportioned to the capacities and needs of the country. Neither Islamic Union nor Turanism can form a doctrine, a logical policy for us. Henceforth the governmental policy of the New Turkey is to consist in living independently, relying on her own sovereignty within her national boundaries.

Ataturk, the great leader of the Turks, to whom the Turks are eternally grateful, knew perfectly well the real needs of the Turkish nation. He never gave any credit to racialism, and neither does the present group of Turkish leaders. Kemalist Turkey does not spread fear and terror to her neighbors, as have the Fascist and Nazi governments, but instead, advocates the vital importance of good neighborhood and sincere, friendly relations. Nationalist Turkey for her part, does everything in order to reach such an objective.

On the contrary, Turkey became an example to most of her neighbors or countries elsewhere. While trying to imitate the works of Kemal Ataturk, the Arabs and Afghans
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made a "mess" of it. This is not our concern; it has simply been mentioned to note that Kemal Ataturk became a good example, an ideal example, while Hitler and Mussolini became persons hated even by the real patriots of their respective countries. If Ataturk was a dictator, he was a dictator long before the Nazi and Fascist adventurers. Neither Hitler nor Mussolini were guides for him. The only guide Ataturk had was his extraordinary wisdom, love of the country and sober ideas.

It appears from the preceding study that no well informed person could pretend that Turkish nationalism, like most of the recent nationalist doctrines, is ever aggressive. Only within the boundaries of Turkey it is quite anxious to strengthen the national solidarity of the people living in this territory.

On the other hand, Turkish nationalism, that is to say, Kemalism, the supreme ideology of the Turkish nation, is absolutely humanitarian and peaceful.

There is a certain analogy between the Czech nationalism as has been outlined by Masaryk, and Turkish nationalism as outlined by Kemal Ataturk. However, although Kemalism is a perfect example of humanitarian nationalism as was the case among the former Czechs, it is more realistic
and positive. Humanitarian nationalism cannot be reached by beggings. A country must be first of all, strong enough to resist any external aggression. For this end, one of the most essential necessities is to have a strong national unity. Turkey has a strong national unity, and it is remarked that in case of external danger, all the Turks, regardless of their domestic points of view, cling together. The Turkish army stands for peace and it is backed with a strong national spirit. The supreme idea is "Peace in the country, peace over the world". If this phrase is not pacifist, what else is it? The Kemalist ideology has no aggressive desire whatsoever.

Although there are a great number of Turkish groups living all around the present political boundaries of Turkey, and a greater racial boundary exists, Turkey by condemning the racialist doctrines, does not intend to annex these territories. While Kemalist Turkey is so peaceful towards the rest of the world, she has the right to expect the very same thing from others. Turkey has no desire whatsoever to give an inch of territory to any country, and is ready to fight against aggression.

Even in 1945, when she stood alone and had no political or material support from a Western country, Turkey
did not hesitate to reject the Russian demands for a so-called 'joint defense of the Dardanelles', and the annexation of the three Turkish provinces, Kars, Ardahan, and Artvin. It seems that Russia forgot that the Dardanelles were to be defended against no one else but herself.

It is hoped that other nationalisms, at least in the future, should take Kemalism as a model instead of demanding lands which no longer belong to them. "Turkish nationalism is not that kind of nationalism which becomes a misfortune to other nations". On the contrary, it became a sample to be copied.

Turkish nationalism is one of the few nationalisms which develops love instead of hatred. Unlike the Pan-Germanists, Turkey does not condemn any individual or national group because they are not from themselves.

Turkish nationalism, as opposed to Shintoism, Fascism and Nazism, is a constructive nationalism, humanitarian and peaceful.

---

65 Remzi Oguz Arik, Ideal ve Ideolojy, Istanbul, Kulturmus Basimevi, 1947, p. 44.
While nationalism is the supreme ideal of Turkey, patriotism covers an important aspect of Kemalism. Though nationalism and patriotism are closely related to each other, nationalism appeals to members of an ethnic unity regardless of their country of residence, whilst patriotism appeals to all residents of a country regardless of their ethnic background.

As has been seen, Namik Kemal was the first Turkish patriot, though his patriotism was mainly an Ottoman patriotism.

Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, to whom the entire Turkish nation is obliged for his efforts, promoted the patriotic feelings as well as the national ones. Ataturk, who trusted the future of the Turkish Republic to the Turkish youth, addressed them in his Six Day Speech in the following manner, giving us a supreme example of patriotism:

O Turkish Youth, your first duty is to guard and defend forever the national independence, the Turkish Republic. That is the sole basis of your existence and your future. The basis contains your most costly treasure. In the future too, there will be, both at home and abroad, ill will which will want to snatch away this treasure from you. If you are forced to defend your independence and the Republic, then, in order to perform your duty, you will
have to watch out for the possibilities and conditions of the situation in which you may find yourself. It might be that these conditions and possibilities were absolutely unfavorable. It is possible that the enemies, who sought to destroy your independence and your Republic, represented the most victorious power that the earth had ever seen; that through intrigue or force of arms every fort and every arsenal in the fatherland was seized; that all your armies were dispersed and the land actually completely occupied.

Assume, in order to put before your eyes a still gloomier possibility, that those who possess the governmental authority in the land have fallen into error, that they are fools or traitors; yea, that these ruling people have let their personal interests fall in with the political aims of the enemies. It might come about that the nation had fallen into complete want and extreme privation; that she found herself in a state of collapse and complete exhaustion.

Even under such circumstances and conditions like these, O Turkish child of the future centuries, it is your duty to save your independence, the Turkish Republic. The strength you need for this end surges in the noble blood which flows in your veins.

Right into the twentieth century, "the separate religious communities in Turkey were also political units, and their religious leaders, especially the Greek and Armenians Patriarchs, were likewise princes in the political sense. The word "Turk" was often taken to indicate simply "Mohammedan" and often it was used in a contemptuous sense. The Empire was known as the Ottoman Empire and when the new

---

Kemalist Republic banned the word "Ottoman", and wished to name the country the word "Turkiye" was adopted officially, which from now on rang with an entirely different tone. The country was named by the people who were the masters. People were no longer ashamed of their nationality, but the word "Turk" meant a name of pride and honor. The people no longer felt the Mohammedan Faith as a bond with other Mohammedan people, but began to recall Turkey's past and, derived from it the proud consciousness of a warlike sovereign race.

The Turkish national and patriotic pride is very sensitive against Russia and Communism. Long before the Western nations were able to understand the real intentions and the anti-humanitarian character of Russia, the Turks had an experience with these people, and realized what they actually are. Turkey was in close contact with Russia from 1683, and had at least twelve major wars with this country. Russia is, therefore, regarded as the enemy not only because of her present Communist ideology, but because of historical reasons as well. The Turkish people reject everything what comes from Russia, no matter what it might be.
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As a conclusion, the following principles could be derived from the above mentioned concept of Turkish nationalism:

1. The Turk should know "the exceptional spiritual powers which were inherited by him from the Turanist fathers"68.

2. In all aspects of life, respect should be paid to all ancestors and national heroes.

3. Every Turk should work for the supreme national ideal of rapid westernization.

4. Every Kemalist Turk should beware of the dangers of foreign interference in the ethnical, social and cultural life.

5. The Turk should be aware of the dangers of extreme "modernism" as a danger to the national unity.

6. The Turk should not become lulled with the ancient victories, and consequently not believe that all the matters in the future can be solved that easily.

7. The Turk should beware of individualism. However, we would like to state that individualism in an extreme form is a deadly danger to any society. However, under the present

international circumstances, a measure of individualism is introduced into the lives of the people. In Turkey, individualism did not take strong root, however, as since the introduction of liberalism as an economic policy, a measure of individualism has been introduced as well. In regard to the tendency of condemning individualism, we may observe the influence of Ziya Gokalp who professed a theory of "absolute devotion of the individual to the State". But this devotion was not at the expense of the individual as was the case in the Nazi terrors. In Kemalist Turkey, the people have complete freedom in all the respects.

As long as individualism exists in a moderate form, it would prove useful, and its extreme form is dangerous for the supreme national ideal.

8. Importance should be given to the national ideals and the national unity.

9. In order to keep the national unity, all kinds of sacrifices should be made. In this respect, the first thing to be done is to reject categorically all other doctrines which are in contrast to Kemalism, beginning with Communism.

10. To follow the high human ideals and to try to surpass the western civilization.
Rusen Esref (Unaydin), in his tribute to the soldiers and flag of the Nationalists, powerfully expressed the devoted and heroic spirit which guided the nationalists in the War of Independence, in his article entitled Bayragimiz (Our Flag), written in January 1921.

The flag which had received its color from the hearts of our ancestors nearly became black in our days. It seemed about to fall like a black mourning cloth after having run from victory to victory and gracing the kavuk (headress of the Janizaries) like a red rose. But in a crowd of Turkish soldiers, its old significance returned, and it seemed to be gay and no longer sorrowing. The day after Inonu (battle of) it seemed to me more fresh and glorious than at the day of the battle of Mohac. It was perhaps more courageous when it flew in the winds of conquest while fighting in Europe. But then it was less substantial. It flies now with more life in the gale of independence rising from the rebellion of a band of oppressed souls. The moment which it passed at Mohac was the end of the road leading to conquest. But at Inonu it marked the beginning of a new road, when the world all was ended (…) O flag - The God of Lionlike gazis and the sacred trust of our brave sehits (martyrs) (…) you are not created of artificial imaginations. You have sprung directly from our hearts. You are the color of the life stream which is the most sacred thing in the human body, and on you there appear traces of heaven (the white star and crescent on the red field). That is why you will not fade nor wither. You will live free and as red above the heads of our ancestors. Never shall you see the last generation of Turks.

Among the well-known nationalist poets, Mehmet Emin Yurdakul and Mehmet Akif could be noted who, with their
famous poems To the Martyrs of Gallipoli and National Anthem became immortal in the minds of the Turks. Due to its relation to our subject, it would be appropriate to quote a section of the Turkish National Anthem, written by Mehmet Akif.

Fear not, for never will it fade this crimson flag,
dawn arrayed, floating so proudly,
While yet there burns one heart, fire bright, in all the land 't will float still undismayed,
Star of my country forever it will shine,
Mine it is, my country's flag, and mine alone.

Frown not, O Crescent benign, My life I give you may shine,
Smile on my nation, heroic nation, What is this passion fierce,
What is this wrath of thine? Blood of our hearts we will spill for naught but this,
Freedom for the just, our nation's right divine.

As religion was made a matter of individual conscience,
in Kemalism, the former religious loyalty was replaced by the loyalty to the nation. We have observed that loyalty to the ruler and to the tribe was an essential character of the early Turks. Now, the Turkish people themselves have a national character which makes it possible for the great qualities of leadership displayed by Ataturk to develop and mature. The people are older than any political regime. They have a deep grained sense of honor, loyalty and decency. They are proud and tough. They are a vigorous race, and have shown great fortitude in adversity. (...) They have great powers to endure suffering and make sacrifices for the cause they believe in.

Revolutionism

"Turk, you should surpass the contemporary civilizations."

K. Ataturk

Revolutionism is one of the most essential principles of Kemalism, as it shows the means to reach the national objective.

The national objective of the Turkish reforms, in the general sense, was to separate the Turkish spirit from the Arabic one, to purge the Turco-Arabic Synthetic spirit, to separate Turkey from the Arabic sphere of influence.

As Ataturk said, its aim was to "raise the nation to the position to which she is entitled to aspire in the civilized world and to establish the Turkish Republic forever on firm foundations." 71

Turkey, under the guidance of nationalism, intends to westernize herself in civilization. Westernization does not imply the abandonment of all national customs. The westernization should not harm the national institutions,

and therefore Turkey desires to westernize herself in civilization, but also to maintain her national heritage.

Hamdullah Suphi (Tanriover), the orator, declared as early as 1921:

As regards the philosophical outlook of our movement, our eyes are turned westward. We shall transplant Western institutions to Asiatic soil. No more Pan-Islamism, but nationalism, Asia's new watchword. First, and foremost, we aspire to our inviolable and complete national individuality. We wish to be a modern nation with our minds open to admit current ideas, and yet to remain ourselves. We do not wish to be regarded as an Asiatic people, anxious to remain isolated behind moral barriers. Our education and culture is a direct channel of communication with all civilized countries.

In 1923, in the Program of the Republican People's Party, it has been stated that although our party wants to keep pace with all other modern nations in the path of progress and development and in the cultivation of international relations and intercourse, it is at the same time determined to preserve the individual character of Turkish society and its essentially independent personality; whatever happens, we can't go back. We must go on; we have no choice. The nation must understand this clearly. Civilization is a blazing fire that burns and obliterates those who will not acknowledge her.

---
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In one of his speeches, Ataturk defined Turkey's progressive intentions in the following manner.

Resistance to the flood tide of civilization is vain; she is pitiless towards those who ignore or disobey her. Civilization pierces the hills, soars in the skies, seas and stars. Nations which try to function with medi­eval minds, with primitive superstitions, in the presence of her might and sublime majesty, are doomed to annihi­lation or at best, to servitude or ignominy.

And again:

We have got to be men, from every point of view. We have suffered, and the reason has been that we did not understand the way the world was going. Our thoughts, our mentality, are going to be civilized. We are not going to pay any attention to what this one or that one says; we're going to be civilized and proud of it. Look at the state of the rest of the Turks and Moslems! What catastrophes and disasters have come upon them because their minds could not adjust themselves to all encompassing and sublime dict­ates of civilization! This is why we, too, remained back­ward for so long and why we finally plunged into the last morass. If, in the last few years we have been able to save ourselves, it has been because of the changing of our men­
tality. We can never stop again. We're going on. The Westernization meant in Kemalism is quite clear. Turkey wants to close the gap of civilization which exists between herself and the Western world. Since 1923, the gap has been closed to a great extent, but there is still much to be done. Moreover, remembering the superiority of the ancient Turkish civilization, Kemalism desires to see that Turkey should outstrip the Western world in this field.

Ataturk, in his speech delivered at the tenth anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic, stated:

"Turk, you should surpass the contemporary Western civilization."

Thus, the objective is not only to reach the level of the Western civilization, but to outstrip it as well.

In modern times the forms taken all over the world by national reactions to cultural contact can be reduced to rather uniform pattern. At one extreme stands the negative pattern by the resistance of the Chinese imperial government, to the Westernization of China. This resistance took the form of a complete refusal to allow any intercourse between China and the rest of the world. It was almost a totalitarian isolationism, a rejection of the concept of the family of nations, and the cooperation of equal states. This complete isolationism led to a number of conflicts in which the Chinese Empire was the loser (...). At the other extreme stands the Turkish Republic under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal. Contemporary Turkey eagerly sought and encouraged intercourse with the west. The result was not only a complete Europeanization of all external forms of life, but an acceptance of the basic
attitudes underlying the achievements of the west. The ideological base of the Turkish government - though not necessarily all its concrete measures and manifestations - implies a full acquiescence in the parliamentary methods and the individual rights of the 19th Century, which is Europe's legacy from the Glorious Revolution and from 1789. (...) During the 19th Century, Westernization and Orientalism fought a protected duel in Turkey, in the last 20 years, Westernization has definitely gained the upper hand, to the exclusion of isolationist and romantic elements 74.

A noted Swedish observer and political writer wrote, with regard to the Turkish Reformation, the following article 75:

In this remarkable development there is only one country comparable, and that is Japan during the last three decades of the 19th century. The differences are also very important. At first sight, Japan did not go so far in her occidental reform as Turkey has now done. Japan adopted only occidental technique. Mentality and reforms in the social life have preserved an indifference. This indifference, after 1900 or 1910, tends rather to grow than to diminish. But Turkey's point of departure was quite different, and besides, she found herself much nearer the common civilization in the Occident. In that which concerns mentality, the Turks are not so far from the common European type as one might imagine, much nearer than the Russians for example.

An Italian author, P. Gentzione, wrote about the Kemalist Revolution:


The French Revolution was limited to the domain of political institutions; the Russian Revolution has brought about disorder in social relations, but only the Turkish Revolution has concerned itself all at one time with political institutions, social relations, religion, the family economic life, the customs and even the moral bases of the society. One transformation invites another. One reform conditions the following one. For all lay hold on the life of the people.

If the Turkish reforms were to be studied, there would be hardly a person who would not agree with Gentzio- ne. Moreover, the author expresses a reality when he states that one reform follows the other.

Legal Reforms

The objective of the reformations in this respect could be found in the words of the then Minister of Justice who declared that

We desire to draft our laws in accordance with the methods and principles of civilized Western peoples. Mediaeval principles must give way to secular laws. We are creating a modern, civilized nation and we desire to meet contemporary needs. We have the will to live, and nobody can prevent us.

---
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Thus, another important step was taken after the abolition of the Ministry of Pious Foundations and the She­riat. It became necessary to adopt a new code. However, it was rather difficult to write a Turkish code for the time being, as it had to be written article by article, word by word.

In an era of Revolutionary reforms, such amendments would not prove useful, as too many thoughts and inter­ferences could have harmed the supreme objective. There were the Western laws, which have been used for a long time and were subject to experience.

The Minister of Justice, Mahmut Esat, did not mind blaming the Islamic laws for keeping Turkey in a backward state. He stated^:

States whose laws are based on religion become incapable, after a short lapse of time, of satisfying the exigencies of the country and the nation. For religion expresses unchanging precepts. Life goes ahead, needs change rapidly. Religious laws, in the presence of life which constantly progresses, are no more than words void of sense and forms without value. Changelessness is a dogmatic religious necessity. Also, the need for re­ligions to be nothing more than a simple affair of conscience has become one of the principles of modern civilization and one of the characteristic differences between the old civilization and the new. Laws which derive their inspiration from

---

religion fetter the societies in which they are applied to the primitive epochs in which they arose, and they constitute invincible factors which prevent progress. It is indubitable that our laws, which came out of changeless precepts of religion, and which ensured a permanent place to divine elements, have been the most powerful and the most effective factor which, in modern times, has enslaved the destinies of the Turkish nation to the mentalities and institutions of the Middle Ages. (...) The purpose of laws is not to maintain old customs and beliefs which have their source in religion, but rather to assure the economic and social unity of the nation.

Thus, the Kemalist Government did not hesitate to adopt certain western codes, en bloc, because, in an era of revolutionary reforms, any government cannot tolerate slow reforms, as would have been the case if the new codes were to be written article by article or rather, word by word, by the Turkish lawyers. Moreover, the more important part was that had Turkey not adopted the western laws en bloc, and consequently had the Turkish lawyers written them, the new codes positively were to include fanatical elements.

As the era's Minister of Justice, Mahmut Esat declared in an interview:

We are badly in want of a good scientific code. Why waste our time to produce something new when quite good codes are found ready made? Moreover, what is the use of a Code without good commentaries to guide in the application of it? Are we in a position to write such commentaries for a new Code? We dispose neither of the necessary time
nor of the necessary precedents in practice. The only thing to do is to take a good, ready made Code to which good commentaries exist, and translate them wholesale. The Swiss Code is a good code; I am going to have it adopted, and I shall ask the Assembly to proceed to vote en bloc, as Napoleon had his Code voted. If it had to be discussed article by article, we should never get through.  

Consequently, the Swiss Civil Code, the Italian Criminal Code and the Commerce Law from Germany were adopted with extremely slight modifications (1925).

With regard to the replacement of the Islamic Laws by Western ones, by an Islamic country, P. Gentzione wrote:

The adoption of a European civil code by a Moslem nation, accustomed for centuries to obey only a religious law considered as revealed, is one of the most important dates and events in the history of the world. For the first time a people of Mohammedan religion applies with respect to personal and family law, legislation completely free from theocratic dispositions and able to rule indiscriminately all the inhabitants of the country, whatever their race or their religion. (...) Turkey no longer admits any difference between men according to their faith or their belief. And in doing this, in accepting that legally in her midst there are no longer any but citizens equal in rights and in duties, Turkey, first among the Moslem countries, admits a rationalistic conception of the universe and humanity.

Another reform was the introduction of the Latin Alphabet and the Latin numbers which replaced the Arabic ones.
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This act was important in the field of secularization as well, as it became a blow to the fanatics who considered Arabic a holy script. The Arabic letters had no relation to the Turkish language. Mustafa Kemal himself toured the country and taught the new Latin alphabet, which became another means to enlightenment.

Closely related with script came the purification of Turkish from all alien elements. Turkey, under the leadership of Kemal Ataturk, took the matter seriously and not as a fashion, as has been done previously.

The Turkish Language Society was established in 1932, which society began to study the early Turkish languages. The Language Society began its work mainly through the People's Houses, by urging the people to eliminate from their speeches all Arabic and Persian words for which they could find a Turkish equivalent, and thus directing them toward a search of ancient Turkish words. The deepest atavist tendency in Kemalism could be encouraged in this respect.

Although Ataturk was advised to complete the linguistic reform in an evolutionary manner rather than a revolutionary one, he rejected it basically. Had it been an evolution, the Turkish language at the present stage
would have been nothing but the Ottoman language. Though the purification did not succeed in a manner as sought before, the Turkish language rid itself of the Arabic terms on a large scale. The great part was done by revolutionary means, the rest is expected by the evolution.

The Sun-Language theory was first mentioned in the semi-official paper Ulus (November 2nd, 1935), and defined as an outstanding thesis developed by the Turkish Language Society. The theory was considered in harmony with the history of the patriarchal Turkish society. According to the theory of the Sun Language, Gunes Dil theorized:

Primitive man uttered his first speech sounds in response to the awe inspired by the sun. The first was the exclamation, followed by the closely related syllables having to do with fire, light, heat and so forth. The attempts which have been made to tie this explanation, which is so attractive in its psycho-deductive aspects, to recognized roots in the Indo-European and Semitic languages, have failed. There was a missing link between the natural sounds and the words in those tongues for the objects and phenomena mentioned. Research into the primitive Turkish supplies the missing link by its discovery of syllables which are both Turkish and related to the idea involved.

Thus, on the same lines parallel to the language theory of primordial mankind, a second theory was set forth by the National Historical Society which asserted that "all

---
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human achievement is basically Turkish — since all humans began as Turks — and that there is an unbroken thread of purposeful development from the earliest known Turks straight to modern Ankara, a thread, moreover, in which is to be found the central meaning of world history”.

These theories were propounded on official levels and included in the textbooks. However, despite these efforts, they were not as deeply rooted as has been expected. But they were very useful and successful, as they gave another prop to pride in the heritage of the Turks.

By shortcircuiting pride in the Ottoman past, and by claiming the Hitites as Turks, the Kemalists were successful in portraying Anatolia as a purely Turkish soil, and thus they legalized the historical part of self-determination, as it has been proved that Anatolia had always been Turkish. The Hitites are considered "by their migrations and conquests to have spread civilization over the earth, all civilization is deeply indebted to the Turks".


83 Hans Kohn, Revolutions and Dictatorships, p. 267.
"By expanding Pan-Turkism to include humanity entire, they most skillfully drew those of its fangs which, had the idea been left specific, would certainly have aroused other Turk ruling states, and in particular Soviet Russia." \(^{84}\)

Despite the strong tendencies to return to the old Turkish language, certain words and phrases which are used internationally have been adopted and encouraged by the language reformers.

Scientific terminology was adopted mainly from the French language, by adapting the respective terms to the requirements of Turkish language, such as phonetics, spelling (e.g. sosyology, etc.).

In 1925, the International Calendar, which replaced the Islamic one, was adopted. In 1931, the metric system of weights and measurements was introduced as well.

In 1935, all the Turks were obliged by law to take a surname. Mustafa Kemal was given the name of Ataturk - Father of the Turks - by the Grand National Assembly.

It would be rather impossible for anyone acquainted only with present day Kemalist Turkey to imagine the condition of subjugation in which women were forced to live only

\(^{84}\) Lewis V. Thomas and Richard N. Frye, Op. cit., p. 84.
thirty years ago, before the advent of the Republic. Before 1923, any woman who tried to assume the personal, social, political and economic equality that is guaranteed to her by the Republican Constitution, would have been stigmatized as "sinful".

As we have already devoted a study of considerable length to the pre-Ottoman Turkish society with emphasis on the social position of the Turkish women, there is no need for dealing with the historical realities once more.

It would suffice to say that like the early patriarchal Turkish women, the Republican women have complete equality with men. They are free to the extent the men are. In 1926, the new Civil Law adopted from Switzerland was enacted, a law which gave back the Turkish women the rights which were held by their mothers. According to the present law, divorce became a matter of the law courts, and the right to demand a divorce was given to the women and not solely to the men. In matters of inheritance, the women received equality with the men. In short, it could be stated that, according to the laws of the Republic, no man holds a special privilege over a woman. A few years later, the Turkish women were granted the right to vote and to be elected as well to any office, including the Grand National
Assembly. Only a year after this law was passed, seventeen women were elected to the Grand National Assembly (399 men, 17 women).

It would suffice to give only two examples to show the depth of this reform. At present, neither in Switzerland nor in France, the countries which are considered the cradles of democracy, the women still do not possess the right to vote or to be elected. Moreover, the Greek women voted for the first time only in the recent (April 1956) elections, in a country which had an ancient culture and civilization.

At present, Turkish girls and women are working side by side with men in all walks of life, whether cultural, economic, political or military. In short, the Turkish women, unlike their Ottoman mothers, do not stay at home but work for the national progress of the country. Thus the Republican women gained the right to which they were entitled.

Much importance is given to the education of the people in this national revolutionary spirit. The Houses of Peoples (Halk Evlerleri), which served as a Turkish Academy, were opened in 1932. It became in every town a center of education. Its task comprises both Europeanization
and nationalization. The influence of these Houses is surely apt to be much greater than the legislative measures.

Young children are educated in the same spirit. Historical courses and Civic courses are the main subjects which deal with these aspects.

The aforementioned remarkable reforms are only one part of the reforms. However, no one can pretend that any of these reforms or the others, which carry less importance in comparison to the mentioned ones, could be realized by evolutionary means. The revolutionary reforms proved that radical changes could be achieved by such means, although this was denied by Ziya Gokalp.

The greatest desire of the Turkish society, which is based on national, secular and democratic principles, and which adapted itself the social and economic fields to the general conditions of the Western Civilization, is to work for the benefit of mankind while enjoying all the privileges of civilized life within the family of nations.

In order to reach this goal, it has been absolutely necessary to establish an effective educational system. As Atatürk had stated, "the truest guide in life is science". The new national society had to be educated in accordance with this reality. Thus, new schools on the aforementioned
principles were opened, primary and secondary schools as well as the high schools and universities, were opened and made free.

There was no time to wait to achieve radical results by evolutionary means, as had been demanded by Ziya Gokalp; it is even quite doubtful to expect radical results in evolutionary means. Man must use his energy and his will to force every material integrant of life through modern molds into modern practice. Likewise, every non-material culture trait must be Turkified. Such an objective needs energy and revolutionary means.

Had evolution been accepted as the means to reach the aforementioned objective, not even half of the present work could have been realized.

After having observed the whole historical background, the words and the deeds, it is quite easy to conclude that the policy of Westernization realized through revolutionary means was completely successful in Turkey. Thus, as far as the former U.S. Ambassador to Turkey, Mr. George McGee was concerned, "in one sense, the Turks have caught up with the West, in the other, the West had caught up with Turkey"85.

---

The adoption of new laws of western extraction, purging the language from Arabic and Persian elements, introduction of Latin script, inculcating to the people new western ideas, the whole process of westernization, turning the back to the Asiatic Continent and historical tradition with the sole exception of the ancient Turkish tradition, all of them were essentially revolutionary steps and means which would be unthinkable if the Turkish leadership of that period had clung to a normal, evolutionary way of historical development and process. And all of them were decisive in the process of the rational transformation, internal and external, of the nation and State, along the new lines in forming the decaying fabric of the Ottoman Empire into a modern national State, democratic and republican. That is why revolutionism was adopted among the six principles, fundamental and unchangeable, of the new regime and its Constitution.

Populism

"Sovereignty belongs unconditionally to the nation." K. Ataturk

Populism, is, no doubt, the equivalent of democracy. However, this democracy was not an imported one, as it already existed in the early patriarchal Turkish people. We
have seen that there were several democratic elements in these early Turkish societies. Modern Turkish democracy was founded on solid foundations, as it derived its origins from its ancestors.

Once again, the leaders were elected by the people. All class differences were abolished. No one was considered superior to another because he had a special profession. The title 'Pasha' was abolished and replaced with Bay (Mr.).

Populism, since its introduction into the Turkish life, gives to the Turkish citizens, regardless of their racial origin or religious beliefs, equal social, economic, political and judicial rights and provides a democratic way of life in all spheres of activity.

Unlike certain other ideologies, Turkish populism does not profess any hostility toward any certain class, nor does it demand a class struggle as professed by the Communists. The emphasis is on a classless society in which no privileges or handicaps attitudinally inhere in family membership, occupation, economic status or place of residence. This is a point on which the influence of Islam did not have degrading effect on old Turkish customs and traditions.
Etatism

"Turk, be proud, diligent and confident."

K. Ataturk

It must be admitted that the economic aspect of things in Turkey was not as brilliant as the social aspect during the first years of the Nationalist regime. An efficient and enterprising leadership could do away overnight with many social obstacles to progress, but the same could hardly be done in the economic field.

At the end of the War of Independence, the Kemalist Government had to rebuild a country completely ruined, and exposed to destruction by the enemy forces.

Moreover, the Turkish immigrants from Macedonia who poured to Anatolia in droves, as a result of the exchange of population needed time to become productive.

Under all these circumstances, a policy of "liberalism" was impossible. The only way out was Etatism. However, the Government itself was in deep need of money.

There is no difference between the universal understanding of Etatism and the Kemalist understanding of etatism.

Statism, or in other words etatism in Turkey became
in essence, a collection of temporary expedients eventually canonized for lack of better, and that is now under heavy fire. Etatism's roots came, in part, from the deeply felt reaction to the old capitulations system with its concomitants of foreign debt, foreign dependence, and foreign interference. Turkish nationalism had and has, in this respect, an understandably xenophobic streak. There was also the feeling that, without industry, Turkey was not modern. Considerations of the national defense then played an increasingly large role as etatism evolved.\(^86\)

The policy of etatism naturally required certain sacrifices on the part of the people, but, however, this should be done willingly in order to reach the supreme national objective.

In the inter-war period, a four-year plan for agriculture, a five-year plan for industry, a three-year plan for mining, and a ten-year plan for the development of roads were formulated and carried out. To the extent that it served the national interest and did not endanger national independence and security, foreign experts from various countries were given duties. It became a policy that one country should not be given a special privilege, and that experts from different countries should work at the same.

---

The reason was that no special privilege or capitulation should be claimed by any country. Experts from America, England, Germany, Italy, Austria and Hungary came to Turkey.

The Turks no longer regarded the use of the domestic productions as something dishonorable, but instead honorable. In 1929 the university students demonstrated in favor of the use of home production, that is to say, national production.

A vast propaganda in favor of national products took place. Here we should pay tribute to Ziya Gokalp, the first man in Turkey who advocated a policy of national economy.

Except in a few minor industries, the financial situation of modern Turkey obliges the Government to follow the policy of etatism. It cannot be claimed that etatism alone is best economic policy, and neither could it be claimed that liberalism alone is the best.

87 One of the most important functions in the economic life was given to the number of Government controlled banks. The Central Bank issued notes and supervised all financial policies. The Sumer Bank financed new state owned industries, the Eti Bank promoted mining, the Is Bank, established by Celal Bayar, dealt with business transactions and the Agricultural Bank assisted farm productions.
Today, the efforts of the Democratic Party, which supports private enterprise, proved to be extremely useful. However, there are many things which could not be done with private enterprise. This case is especially important in Turkey, which is financially poorer than many western countries. Turkey, a country which gives half of her national income to the Army, is naturally deficient in finances. In time, it is hoped that when national prosperity increases, etatism shall give way to liberalism.

Here we would like to dwell on a matter which, no doubt, concerns us.

Was Ataturk, the man who accomplished all these above mentioned reforms, the man who built a new state out of the old one, a dictator or not? If he was a dictator, to what extent was he such a ruler?

Donald E. Webster, after asking himself such a question, states that, after the study of the Turkish Revolution and its methods, "there is no need for defense." 88

Another western author, Professor Hans Kohn, wrote that Ataturk was a dictator but 89:

---
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his dictatorship was fundamentally different from Fascist dictatorships. It came into being about the same time as Mussolini's, both men were produced by Mediterraneoan culture and both worked for a fast modernization of their countries, to supplant the traditional tempo of life of backward agrarian countries by the rhythm of modern industry. In both cases, we find a vigorous concentration of the national energy in the form of intensified nationalism which, conscious though it is of a great past, is full of dissatisfaction with the history of more recent times, when the countries in question from many points of view, were mere picturesque museum pieces. But the dictatorship established by Mustafa Kemal is based upon liberal principles, upon the ideas of progress of the nineteenth century.

As the very same writer wrote, the dictatorship of Ataturk tried to "educate a people to a democratic liberalism".

Another western author insisted that "Turkey is the land a dictator turned into democracy".90.

It was Ataturk who initiated the foundation of an opposition party which came into existence under the name of "Liberal Party". The opposition was critical solely of the economic problems, as it differed on the concept of etatism and defended the policy of liberalism. Though fully loyal to the republican and secular principles, the opposition proved more harmful than useful when the Kurds took the advantage of it.

The party had to be abolished and its leader, Fethi Okyar, resigned from its presidency.

There would be hardly any dictator who would initiate the establishment of an opposition party. Anyone who knows the life and deeds of Ataturk, would easily conclude a true belief in his democratic rule.

Ataturk himself answered the question of whether he was a dictator or not, in the following words: "If the dictators are called those who impose their ideas by force, pressure and menace, I am not a dictator. If the people in my surroundings admit the accuracy of my ideas, accept them and follow me of their own free will, then I am a dictator".

Any new regime cannot naturally be established without a strong hand. Ataturk, therefore, had to act in a strict manner. However, this manner was always liberal and never at the expense of the individual. No one suffered under the rule of Ataturk, and no one feared for his life. Mustafa Kemal always "remained human, even with all the shortcomings of human beings".

Ataturk never erected himself into a semi-divine superman, as the Nazi and Fascist leaders had done. Although

---

91 Hans Kohn, Revolutions and Dictatorships, p. 256.
he had excellent opportunities to become a caliph or a dictator, in the western sense of the term, he always preferred to be one of the people.

It is rather interesting to note that Ataturk, on a certain occasion, disliking the tributes directed to him, and replaced them by stating "Ataturk is one of us".

The Turkish society was not ready for a two-party system when Ataturk initiated the formation of the Liberal Party. However, that society later became ready for such an atmosphere, and such a system would no longer endanger the success of the reforms. Turkey, at the surprise of the westerners, adapted herself to the new trend easily and quickly, a case which could hardly be found elsewhere. The reason for this quick democratic development is that the new life was not in contrast with the Turkish spirit, but, on the contrary, indicative of it.

Thus, the Democratic Party was established on the very same foundations, the principles of Kemalism, differing only in the economic system, which was not an essential principle of Kemalism.

Unlike republicanism, nationalism, secularism, populism, and revolutionism, etatism could not be and was not an eternal principle of Kemalism. It was a principle
established for a certain period. However, it is still essential in most of the economic affairs, as most of the enterprises in Turkey could not be carried through by the individuals.

Democracy continued to work after Ataturk's death. The time finally came to have a powerful opposition party. Ismet Inonu, the successor to Ataturk, gave path to the establishment of an opposition party. In 1945, four members of the Republican People's Party resigned and formed the Democratic Party. Cevat Bayar, Adnan Menderes, Fuat Koprulu and Refik Koraltan led the party into the 1946 elections, where they gained fifty-four out of 462 deputies.

Marching in the footsteps of Ataturk, the Democratic Party achieved victory in the 1950 elections. Though a strong man, Inonu made democracy work so well that finally he was voted out of office himself.

By following a more liberal economic policy, the country achieved more prosperity. As Premier Adnan Menderes wrote, "The national economy of Turkey, after being handicapped for years by a restrictive, if cautious policy, has, during the last three years, finally found the means of rising successfully toward new heights, thanks to a policy of economic development and expansion. When we came to
power, we made it clear that we had renounced the principle of recovery by means of a controlled economy, administered from the top, with one center for formulating plans and projects. Our idea was to lay the groundwork for the development of the country by building of roads and dams, by the regulation of credit for production to safeguard its security, by following a policy of reasonable prices in order to bring into action the initiative and intelligence of the whole body of citizens whose extraordinary qualities are so well known to us. It is thus that, by rejecting the narrow restrictive and outright interventionist policy, followed until 1950, we strive to stimulate the fields of labor and production, private enterprise was supported by all the means at our disposal, and there was created a constructive and dynamic economic system capable of the people and assuring them stability"92.

After having been admitted into the League of Nations, Turkey began to play an important role in the Organization. "In 1935, she cooperated loyally in sanctions

92: Adnan Menderes, "Turkey's Economy Sees New Upsurge in the Past Three Years", in Aspects of Turkey, New York, Turkish Information Office, p. 5.
against Italy". In view of the rapidly growing external danger, the Turkish Government felt compelled to demand the revision of the provisions of the Lausanne Treaty, regarding the clauses of the Straits.

In proposing the amendment of the Lausanne Treaty, Turkey claimed that the "political and military situation in 1936 was quite different from that of 1923". Turkey argued that the League of Nations was unable to carry on its duty in this respect, and that an agreement among the nations concerned would be more effective. Turkey thus setting forth the clause of *rebus sic stantibus*, urged a separate treaty.

The Western Powers finally came to an understanding, however, in the Montreaux Convention of July 20th, 1936. The jurisdiction over the Straits was restored to the Turkish Government, the passage of warships was to be left to the discretion of the Turkish Government if Turkey considered herself under an external threat of war. A separate protocol authorized Turkey to remilitarize the Straits.

---


The problem of the Sanjak of Alexandretta proved to be rather complicated, as a third state - Syria - was involved in the conflict. The Franklin Bouillon Agreement was in practice for a number of years. However, the Turks living in the region always hoped to join their motherland. When Syria was granted independence (1936) by the French, the matter arose. Turkey brought the problem to the League of Nations. The Council, with the consent of Turkey and France, drew up in 1937 a special statute calling for demilitarization, autonomy and special guarantees for the Turkish population which was forming the majority in the Sanjak.

However, despite these measures, unrest did not end. The conflict included the denunciation by Turkey of the Turco-Syrian Friendship Treaty, signed in 1926.

On June 3rd, 1938, the Sanjak was declared a Turco-Franco Condominium. On July 5th, a limited amount of Turkish troops entered the Sanjak in accordance with the principles of the Condominium. The Turks secured a majority in the local elections, which led to the union with Turkey, the last Turkish territorial claim.

Thus the last thorny problem was settled. Two fundamental Turkish aims, national sovereignty and unifi-
cation of the national territory, were satisfied. Turkey had no further claims.

Unfortunately, Ataturk, the Great Leader of Turkey, who has done so much for Turkey, the man who virtually created a new state all by himself, was unable to see this happy result as he died a few months before the union. The death of Ataturk, (November 10th, 1938) was not only a loss to Turkey, but to the whole world as well. Ataturk, who transformed a sick man to an energetic, sober and useful one, proved his geniality by keeping Kemalism within realistic bounds.

Turkey became a democratic and dynamic country, a constructive factor in world politics, due to Mustafa Kemal Ataturk's efforts.
CONCLUSION

"Ataturk, it is the national duty and the debt of honour of each Turkish patriot to love and glorify you."

Celal Bayar

As a political doctrine, Kemalism professed a philosophy of nationalism. It demanded a right of self-determination for Turkey within her national boundaries. It rejected the idea of imperialism and argued that the expansion of the Ottoman Empire had brought more misfortunes than advantages to the Turkish nation. It condemned Pan-Islamism as a nefarious movement which not only retarded the modern secular development of Turkey, but also entangled her in adventures and responsibilities that were of no concern to the Turkish people. It also abandoned the concept of Pan-Turanism which, in practical terms, meant denying support to irredentist tendencies to the twenty million Turkish speaking Muslims in the Soviet Union. In fact, the nationalism of Turkey has the distinction of being realistic, sober minded, restrained, constructive, and non-adventurous.

During the decade of 1919-1928, Turkey underwent
experiments which were equivalent - mutatis mutandis - to western Renaissance, Humanism, Reformation, Scientific Revolution, Industrial Revolution, and French Revolution all rolled into one. The mere thought of doing all that in ten years instead of taking three hundred years to do it, is enough to make any Westerner's mind dizzy.

It would have been impossible, indeed, for the Turks to get by during those hectic years, under a democratic parliamentary regime. This course would have led to a loss of all that had been gained by the War of Independence, and by the expulsion of the Sultan. And here are the enormous historical merits of Kemal Ataturk. The benevolent, educating, guiding dictatorship of Ataturk was the only form of government possible at that moment, during the period of building up a new nation and country. Without Ataturk, his friends and disciples, new Turkey as she is today, could never have been created, could never have remained free and independent, could never become a lasting stronghold of freedom and democracy, an outpost of Western ideology in the very midst of a turbulent Middle East and the turmoil of divided world.

Two possibilities are offered in an era of fundamental, revolutionary reconstruction; a choice between
absolute authority or complete freedom. For several centuries, political scientists have tried to solve the matter, but unfortunately they are still unable to find a definite solution. If, with an aim to bring order and absolute authority to the society, the individuals were to be turned into "tamed monkeys", there would be no trace of democracy, there would be no individual freedom, and all the statesmen, whether they wish or not, would virtually become dictators. In such societies human happiness is impossible. However, if the second choice is preferred, that is to say, if policy of extreme democracy is selected, we must expect all kinds of opposition which would mean a less successful reformation. In an era of reforms, in an era of Constitutional changes, such unnecessary criticism would be destructive rather than constructive.

It would be completely false to pretend that Turkey, under the Kemalist regime, is following an anti-religious policy or that she is hostile to any faith. The Turks are religious people in their individual life, but believe that the religious phenomenon has no relation to the field of politics. Religion, or rather faith, is something holy and should be kept within the bounds to which it originally belongs. In modern nationalist Turkey,
through the policy of secularization, a separation of political and religious aspects have been realized. Emphasis must be given upon the point that this separation is not at the expense of any aspect, that is to say, the separation is not at the expense of religion or the state.

The former Turkish Minister of Education, Hasan Ali Yucel, once wrote:

Roughly we may compare the surroundings of a human being to a garden. We cannot expect much from a garden which is left to its natural state of growth. If a garden were left alone it would be anything but a garden. In order to achieve good results, the soil should be trenched, harmful plants should be removed. After all, this process, the pretty and useful seeds could be planted. However, the task would not yet be over. As a matter of fact, it would never be over, as these new seeds and plants need continuous care. Moreover, the ugly and harmful plants which might grow at any time should be cleared. Let us compare the Turkish Revolution to that garden. The War of Independence and the following few years could be easily considered a period of "trenching". Certain institutions which stopped the progress of the nation had to be thrown away. It cannot be claimed that those institutions could have existed side
by side with the newly emerged national ones. A co-existence would have been impossible if the success of the national ideals were desired. A co-existence in this aspect, between the two antagonist institutions, was surely a handicap to the national ideals.

However, the amazing fact is that the factors which made the Kemalist Reformation an outstanding Revolution among its counterparts is that it cleared the soil of destructive and harmful elements, for once and forever.

Moreover, the success of the Kemalist Revolution of Ataturk, though trenching and clearing the soil so deeply, did not cost the lives of any human beings, as was the case in certain other European equivalents. It was undoubtedly a bloodless revolution, a fact which should be acknowledged. The Turkish Nationalist movement is the sole revolution in history which ended with unquestionable success, with no bloodshed. Turkish nationalism was from its very beginning a humanitarian nationalism, neither aggressive nor universalist.

Hence, neither the period of trenching nor the Period of Reformation could have been realized by any other method than a powerful hand. No one could claim that the Sultanate, the Caliphate, or the Islamic Laws could
have been abolished by a popular vote or that the Hat Law, the emancipation of women, or the alphabet reform could have been accomplished by purely parliamentary methods. At any rate, there was no despotism, no terror. Ataturk was the only strong leader desirous of guiding his nation towards a brighter future by inducing it to accept a revolutionary transformation at a moment when no time was left for a slow, organic evolution.

Nationalism, in general, is close to the heart of the cultural heritage handed down from generation to generation to the modern societies. So it was in Turkey as well. Although obscured by alien elements, the real Turkish culture never completely faded away, and was revived by modern nationalism. Turkish nationalism is based on principles, the roots of which are to be found in the nation's remore historical past. The soil had been prepared since the Tanzimat by the Young Turks movement and particularly by the writings of Ziya Gokalp. Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism, Pan-Turanism, Pan-Turkism showed the danger-points, elements and factors alien to the Turkish national heritage. All of them combined showed as light-houses to Ataturk and his friends when they led the ship of the nation towards a better future, with the masses of the people faithfully
following them. Here lies the main reason why the Kemalist reforms met with such a success, while similar attempts in certain other countries, like Iran and Afghanistan, proved a failure as a result of lack of understanding on the part of their respective nations and of links with the past. Moreover, while trying to imitate Ataturk, those leaders were unable to grasp the fundamental idea that the Kemalist reforms should be regarded as an indivisible whole, that separate, individual reforms could not achieve the objective. Here lies the greatness of Ataturk; he had a vision of the whole, the wisdom of not renouncing any one of the reforms planned, and the patience of not putting too rapidly the reforms into practice, of choosing the right moment for everyone of them, as soon as the ground was prepared.

On the other hand, if Kemalism looked back upon the past grandeur of the nation, it did not look upon it in the same manner as the Fascists looked to the grandeur of Rome. Aware of the dangers inherent in trying to reconstitute what has forever gone, Ataturk was sober and realistic; without dreaming about an empire, he wanted to see the nation free, sound, peaceful and happy. He was wise enough to limit his objectives to constructive work, to stop where Mussolini and Hitler proved unable to do: 30. Here was the vision and wisdom of a great statesman.
Kemalism, a revolution from above and not from below, remained sober and radical. It is an ideology fully accepted by the Turks of their own free will. Unlike in Germany or the Soviet regime, there is no secret police force who backs the regime. This is the best proof that Kemalism is not based upon fear, that is to say, that it is not imposed upon the people.

"Turkey stands out conspicuously among the nations of the Middle East as having undergone a tremendous change toward modernization and westernization in a radical, yet peaceful manner. In the Near and Middle East, she is unique in her social revolution as is Japan in the Far East. To Turkey's credit, it can be mentioned that while she decisively rejected the tendency of imperialism, she remained nationalist and united in her desire for peace and national independence. The moral fibre of the Turks rendered them immune to the inroads of foreign ideologies, and their martial virility warned potential aggressors that an attack on Turkey would be a costly affair and a dangerous adventure."

According to Arnold Toynbee, "when a civilization is menaced by another civilization it would either withdraw itself into its own shell - Zelotism - or adopt the material and moral weapons of the menacing civilization - herodianis". The North Africans and the Arabs proved to exercise the first choice, while the Turks, under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, realized the second alternative. The first, no doubt, leads to nowhere. The second way, if adopted in full scale, leads to the loss of the national identity and national unity.

Being aware of this immediate danger, Mustafa Kemal adopted in full scale only the material values of the western civilization. Moral and cultural values were adopted from the West only in so far as they were not in open contradiction to the early Turkish spirit, the Turkish character, and the essentials of Islam.

It would be untrue and completely false to pretend that the modern Turkish nationalist reformation is a jump from Arabo-Iranian imitation to Western imitation. The modern Turkish nationalist reformation does not copy any

---

civilization in a blind manner. It adopts the western civiliza-

CONCLUSION

One of the main reasons for the success of the reforms lay here.

Modern Turkish nationalism therefore marches in two parallel

ways which complement each other. That is why Turkish nationalism was and still is a creative, constructive one. Even in

its early stages, it has been strongly defensive, aimed at

the maintenance of national unity, independence and of the

national heritage.

One of the important factors of Turkish nationalism is that it is based on rational concepts, and disregards

and condemns the usual hatred towards other nations as pro-

fessed by several other contemporary nationalist doctrines.

This is an especially important factor, for which the Turk-

ish people, as a whole, should receive credit, as the old

feelings of enmity of World War I, and the War of Independen-
towards certain nations, are buried in the pages of his-
tory, a case which could be rarely found. In this respect it

is worthy to note that the reason that Kemalism did not

attract as much attention from Europeans as Nazism and Fasc-

ism, lay in the nature of its peacefulness and soberness.

Being a peace-loving ideology, Kemalism has no desire what-
soever to waste its powers in the deserts of Central Asia
by uniting people on biological or religious grounds. Moral values surely prove more useful than ethical ones.

Turkish nationalism is not a chauvinistic ideology, such as Nazism is. Turkey does not claim to be a master race.

Turkish nationalism, unlike Fascism, Nazism and Communism, has no eyes whatsoever on the property of others. Turkey did no demand "Lebensraum", and she condemned with all her might the aggressive policies.

By proclaiming the motto of "Peace in the country, Peace over the World", Ataturk clearly defined the peaceful aims of his doctrine. Though a soldier, Ataturk was a peace lover, and so is Kemalism peace loving. This remarkable statesman said "Those who effect conquests by the sword, finish by being beaten by those who use the plow, and by ceding their place to them".

Turkish nationalism, which has never developed a mystic tendency, is liberal in its domestic and external policies. By defending the freedom of its citizens and giving them all the human rights, it is liberal in its domestic affairs. Moreover, by desiring the very same thing of all other people in the world, Turkish nationalism is liberal in its external policy as well.

The foreign policy of Kemalist Turkey would quite explicitly show that, by resisting the Communist expansion,
Turkey does her utmost in order to safeguard the freedom of the community of the free nations of which she is a member.

If all people were to be united according to their racial descent, Turkey would be one who would end the matter with great gains. However, considering the fate of the Pan-Turanian movement, as well as her duties to the Turks living in the present political boundaries, Kemalism did not hesitate to condemn forever the dangerous policy of racialism. The Turkish government has more vital duties than to look to the east.

Ataturk's successor, former President Inonu too, emphasized the peace-loving nature of Turkish nationalism in the critical years of World War II. Accordingly, "the fruits and blessings of peace are more numerous and valuable than the most brilliant victories".

Kemalism was a framework within which the future policy of new Turkey - both internal and external - could develop along the lines set up by a farsighted statesman-leader. These lines proved all-embracing and objectively correct, as was seen from the further developments, up to the present time.

Turkey completed another peaceful revolution when the Democratic Party achieved a landslide victory in the 1950 elections. This victory was sealed once more, when in
1954, under the conditions of completely free elections, the Democratic Party received a greater vote of confidence from the people (514 out of 541 seats). In time, certain other political parties, such as Republican National Party, Party of Liberty, Peasant Party, etc., came into existence, the program of all being Kemalism. The Democratic Party, following in the footsteps of Kemal Ataturk, brought new appeal to the people by placing great emphasis on the economic progress of the nation. The Democrats advocate the principle of liberalism in certain aspects. The de-nationalization of the Turkish oil fields brought happy endings to the national interests. Etatism served very usefully in the first three decades of the Republic. However, etatism could not have been a permanent economic policy for Turkey. At the present stage we are able to mark that liberalism, in certain fields, proves more useful, than a purely etatist policy. However, this should not imply that Kemalist Doctrines are abandoned. Etatism alone is the only principle which had been proclaimed for a certain period, while the other pillars meant to serve permanently.

So much with regard to the internal policy of the new Turkey. While examining her foreign policy, we reach quite similar conclusions.
The unexpected setting up in Turkey of a regime, peace loving, self confident, self reliant and energetic capable of seeing facts very clearly and acting according to them promptly and efficiently, unquestionably constitutes a great gain for international tranquility. (...) The new Turkey, with her stable and uniform domestic situation, and her sincere hatred of intrigue and adventure abroad, surely constitutes a new solid factor in a region geographically, strategically, and politically very important, when once feeble without goal, she had been rightly looked upon as the greatest possible danger to peace.

Turkish foreign policy proved to be faithful to national and democratic principles. "During the whole of the second World War, Turkey's foreign policy was characterized by wisdom and caution. She experienced all kinds of foreign pressures and inducements, but never gave in or compromised with the basic objective of her policy - to keep out of conflict and to preserve her independence and territorial integrity". Now, the free world should be at least grateful to Turkey for not taking part in the combat, and thus keeping a strong, healthy army as a bulwark of peace against the Communist danger.

3 Ahmet Emin Yalman, Turkey in the World War, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1930, p. 293.

Turkish opposition to the Russian advances is nothing new. By standing firm against any Russian advance, Nationalist Turkey is doing the very same thing which the Ottoman Turks did for centuries. Turkey, since 1683, by fighting thirteen major wars with Russia, continuously checked and retarded the Russian advances. Thus, the Ottoman Turks, with the Poles, are one of the only two countries which served the world by stopping the Russian expansion. Consequently, the Turkish opposition to the Soviet Union and to Communism is not irrational or new. It has a long historical background, based on facts, and feelings as well. The whole Turkish people know perfectly well the Russian designs. Soviet Russia, the enemy of humanity and human happiness, is the historical enemy of Turkey. There can be no other nation in the world which could be more anti-Russian and anti-Communist.

Turkey renounced taking an active part in World War II; but mindful of the past and suspicious of Russia's war claims, she joined the United Nations, and was among the first powers who actively participated in an effort to stop Communist aggression in Korea; she joined NATO and soon became a stronghold of the western defense camp in the Near East; she was the founder of the Balkan and Baghdad Pacts, and believing that no country should be allowed to leave her entire security at the mercy of any one country, no matter
how great a friend and ally the latter may be, Turkey took a strong and realistic position, side by side with the United Kingdom, in the recent Cyprus conflict. Turkey is undoubtedly the only Near or Middle Eastern country on which the western world could rely, whether in peace or in war. All that is the direct and immediate consequence of the sober and realistic policy established and visualized by Kemal Ataturk: liberal nationalism aimed at preserving national independence, friendly relations with all peace and freedom loving nations, loyal respect of international obligations undertaken with regard to other nations.

In the present crisis, certainly one of the most serious which humanity had ever to face, Turkey remains a stronghold of the Western civilization, of all the cultural and moral values which are now at stake.

To sum up, the Kemalist reformation was not a "triumph of an alien civilization which has been swallowing the moribund society whole", as Professor Toynbee states, but a triumph of the Turkish national heritage, incorporating into its fabric new cultural and social tissues.

Such is the true significance of modern Turkish nationalism. Taking roots in the past, slowly moulding itself through the vicissitudes of the ages, it came to full
growth in the climax of the War of Independence and the Kemalist revolution. It is the best safeguard of new Turkey. By promoting the highest spiritual values of both civilizations - her own and the western - she serves the whole of the free world.
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APPENDIX 1

THE TEXT OF

Mustafa Kemal's Telegram

To the Italian Representative at Antalya,
To be forwarded to:
The Diplomatic Representative of England, France and Italy,
The Diplomatic Representative of the United States in Istanbul,
The Foreign Ministers of Neutral Countries,
The Legislative Chambers of England, France and Italy.

As the official buildings in Istanbul, including the Chamber of Deputies, which represents the symbol of our national independence, have been formally and forcibly occupied by the troops of the Entente Powers, and they have proceeded to arrest a great number of Turkish patriots who have been acting in accordance with the aims of the national movement. This last blow, which has just been directed against the sovereignty and freedom of the Ottoman nation, strikes—still more than at the Ottomans who are resolved to defend their lives and their independence at all costs—at the principles that have been regarded by humanity and civilization of the twentieth century as sacred, such as the sense of freedom, of nationality, and of country, at the principles also of modern society and human conscience which has created them.

As for ourselves, we are imbued with the sacred character of the struggle we have entered upon for the defense of our rights and independence, and we are convinced that there is no power on earth that can deprive a nation of its right of existence.

We are not content to leave it to official Europe and America, but to the Europe and America of science, culture and civilization, to judge rightly the character of this step, which constitutes a conspiracy such as history has never recorded down to the present day and which is incompatible with the honor and self respect of the peoples who have joined it. It is actually based downright dishonesty. By an Armistice based on Wilson's principles, the
nation has been deprived of all means of defense. Once more, and for the last time, we draw your attention to the great responsibility, in the eyes of history which the event will involve. Next to God, the lawfulness of our cause and its sacred character are our surest strongholds in these painful hours of difficulty.

March 16th, 1920.

Mustafa Kemal

In the name of the Representative Committee of the Union for the Defense of the Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia.
APPENDIX 2

THE TEXT OF

Mustafa Kemal's Telegram

Although still convinced of the solidarity of the entire Muslim and civilized world, which is inspired by feelings of humanity, our nation will not be able for the time being to maintain connection with the friendly or hostile world outside. The humane attitude which we shall adopt toward the Christian population dwelling in our country will be all the more appreciated at the present time, and the possibility that the Christian population will not enjoy any apparent or real protection from any of the foreign Governments will be conclusive evidence of the civilizing factors existing in the character of our race. I request you to proceed in strict accordance with the law and enforce it with vigor if any persons should act contrary to the interests of our country and disturb order and quiet in the country. Administer the law impartially, without distinction of race or creed. And I beg you to treat all those who do their duty as citizens in a conciliatory spirit and show due solicitude for them, pay honor and obedience to the local authorities. Finally I request you to communicate the above urgently to all persons concerned and bring it before the people in such a manner as appears most expedient to you.

Telegram - Urgent


Mustafa Kemal

In the name of the Representative Committee of the Union for the Defense of the Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia.
APPENDIX 3

THE TEXT OF

The Treaty of Moscow

(1) Each of the contracting parties agrees not to recognize any international convention which the other will not recognize, specifically, the U.S.S.R. will not recognize the Treaty of Sevres.

(2) The Government of the U.S.S.R. recognizes as Turkey the territory which the National Pact declares to be Turkey. The boundary set by the Gumru Treaty, with slight modifications shall be the north east frontier of the country. (This stipulation was added as in the meantime, Georgia, Azerycan and Armenia were joined to the U.S.S.R.)

(3) The Government of the U.S.S.R. undertakes to affect the adherence of the Caucasian Republics to such treaty articles as concerned to them.

(4) The two new states agree to abrogate the and deem null and void the treaties concluded between the Ottoman Empire and Czarist Russia, because they do not confirm the interests of the two parties.

(5) The U.S.S.R. accepts the abrogation of the Capitulations.

(6) Each of the two contracting parties agrees to forbid the formation and sojourn within its territories of organizations and groups operating to the detriment of the other.

(7) The two parties agree on the necessity of concluding conventions for the regulation of economic and financial and such problems, to strengthen the bonds and relations existing between Turkey and the Soviet Russia.
APPENDIX 4

THE TEXT OF

The Turkish Constitution

Art. 1 The Turkish State is a Republic.

Art. 2 The Turkish State is republican, nationalist, populist, etatist, secular and reformist. Its official language is Turkish and its capital is the city of Ankara.

Art. 3 Sovereignty belongs unconditionally to the nation.

Art. 4 The Grand National Assembly of Turkey is the sole representative of the nation, on whose behalf it exercises the rights of sovereignty.

Art. 5 Legislative authority and executive powers are concentrated and manifested in the Grand National Assembly.

Art. 6 The Grand National Assembly exercises direct legislative authority.

Art. 7 The Grand National Assembly exercises its executive authority through the person of the President of the Republic elected by it, and a Council of Ministers chosen by the President. The Assembly may at any time control the activities of the Government (Council of Ministers) and dismiss it.

Art. 8 Judicial authority is exercised by independent tribunals in the name of the nation in accordance with the laws and regulations in force.

Art. 10 Every Turk, man or woman, who has completed his twenty-second year, has the right to vote in the election of Turkish deputies.
Art. 11 Every Turk, man or woman, who has completed his thirtieth year, may be elected deputy.

Art. 30 The Grand National Assembly organizes and directs its policy through its President.

Art. 31 The President of the Turkish Republic shall be elected for one Assembly term by the Grand National Assembly in a plenary session from among its members. The outgoing President shall remain in office until the election of the new President of the Republic. A President is eligible for re-election.

Art. 32 The President of the Republic is the chief of the State. In this capacity he may, during special ceremonies, preside over the Assembly and whenever he should deem it necessary may also preside over the Council of Ministers. The President of the Republic may not participate in the debates and discussions of the Assembly nor cast his vote as long as he occupies the position of President.

Art. 35 The President of the Republic shall promulgate the laws voted by the Grand National Assembly within a period of ten days. With the exception of the Organic and Budget Laws the President may return to the Assembly for reconsideration - likewise within ten days and accompanied by an explanation of reasons - such laws whose promulgation he does not approve. Should such a law be voted by the Assembly for a second time, the President is obliged to proceed to its promulgation.

Art. 37 The President of the Republic shall appoint the diplomatic representatives of the Turkish Republic to foreign states, and shall receive like representatives of other powers.

Art. 38 The President of the Republic shall, immediately after his election, take the following oath before the Grand National Assembly: "As the President of the Republic I swear upon my word of honor that I shall always respect and defend the laws of the Republic and the principles of national sovereignty, faithfully strive with all my
strength for the welfare of the Turkish nation, ward off with vigor any threat or danger to the Turkish State, project and magnify the honor and glory of Turkey and devote myself to the duty which I am assuming."

Art. 39 All decrees promulgated by the President of the Republic shall be signed by the Prime Minister and the competent Minister.

Art. 40 The Supreme Command of the Army is vested in the Grand National Assembly and is represented by the President of the Republic. In time of peace the command of all armed forces is entrusted by special law to the Chief of the General Staff, and in time of war is given to the person appointed by the President of the Republic upon the proposal of the Council of Ministers.

Art. 44 The Prime Minister is designated by the President of the Republic from among the members of the Assembly. The other Ministers are chosen by the Prime Minister from the members of the Assembly and presented collectively to the Assembly following the approval of the President of the Republic. In the event that the Grand National Assembly is not in session, the presentation (of the Council of Ministers) is postponed until the meeting of the Assembly. The Government must submit its program and policy to the Assembly within one week at the latest and request a vote of confidence.

Art. 45 The Ministers form, under the presidency of the Prime Minister, the Council of Ministers (Executive Council).

Art. 46 The Council of Ministers is collectively responsible for the general policy of the Government. Each Minister shall be individually responsible for the affairs falling within his jurisdiction and for the acts and functions of his subordinates as well as for his general policy.

Art. 54 The magistrates of courts are independent in the trial of all cases and in the rendering of their
verdicts; they are free from all kinds of interference and are dependent only upon the law. The decisions of courts may not be modified in any manner whatsoever by the Grand National Assembly or by the Council of Ministers nor be postponed or their application be obstructed.

Art. 68 Every Turk is born free, and free he lives. Liberty consists of any action which is not detrimental to others. The limits of an individual's liberty, which is his natural right, extend only to the point where they infringe on the liberties enjoyed by his fellow citizens. The said limits are defined solely by law.

Art. 69 All Turks are equal before the law and are expected conscientiously to abide by it. Every type of group, class, family, and individual special privilege is abolished and prohibited.

Art. 70 Personal immunity, freedom of conscience, of thought of speech and press, the right to travel, to make contacts, to work, to own and dispose of property, to meet and associate and to incorporate, form part of the rights and liberties of Turkish citizens.

Art. 71 The life, property, honor, and residence of each individual are inviolable.

Art. 72 No individual shall be seized or arrested under any circumstance or in any manner other than provided by law.

Art. 73 Torture, bodily mistreatment, confiscation and forced labor are prohibited.

Art. 75 No one may be censured for the philosophical creed, religion or doctrine to which he may adhere. All religious services not in contravention to public order and morals and the laws are authorized.

Art. 76 No one's domicile may be entered or his person searched except in the manner and under the conditions stipulated by law.

Art. 77 The press shall enjoy freedom within the framework of the law and shall not be subject to any censorship or control prior to publication.
Art. 78 Travel is subject to no restriction whatsoever except in cases of general mobilization, martial law, or legislative restrictions of a hygienic nature necessitated by epidemics.

Art. 88 The people of Turkey, regardless of religion and race, are Turks as regards citizenship. Any person born of a Turkish father, in Turkey or elsewhere, as well as any person born of an alien father domiciled in Turkey and who, residing in Turkey, formally assumes Turkish citizenship upon attaining his majority, as well as any person granted Turkish citizenship by law, is a Turk. Turkish citizenship may be lost under circumstances defined by law.

Art. 103 No provision of the Organic Law shall be disregarded nor its application suspended for any reason or under any pretext whatsoever. No Law may contain provisions contrary to the Organic Law.