

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: THE EMERGENCE OF PAN-TURKISM IN TURKEY

One of the most important problems of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century was the growth of nationalistic movements throughout the Empire. The central government used the policies of “Ottomanism,”¹ the idea of creating a common Ottoman identity among the different subjects of the Empire by giving them equal rights, and “Pan-Islamism,”² the idea aiming at creating a union among the Muslim people under the leadership of the Caliph, in order to prevent these movements and to protect the territories of the Empire. In this process, as a reaction to the alienation between Muslims and non-Muslims and the spread of separatist-nationalist movements among the subjects of the Empire, the concept of “Turkishness” gained importance among Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals. Parallel to this, in the same period, the studies of Western orientalist such as Joseph de Guignes (1721-1800), Sylvestre de Sacy (1758-1838), Arthur Lumley Davids (1811-1832), Arminius Vambery (1832-1913), and Léon

¹ For a brief summary of Ottomanism, see Selçuk Akşin Somel, “Osmanlı Reform Çağında Osmanlıcılık Düşüncesi (1839-1913)” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 1, *Cumhuriyet’e Devreden Düşünce Mirası, Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet’in Birikimi*, ed. Mehmet Ö. Alkan (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001), pp. 88-115.

² For a detailed study on Pan-Islamism, see Jacob M. Landau, *The Politics of Pan-Islam: Ideology and Organization* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); and Mümtaz’er Türküne, *Siyasi İdeoloji Olarak İslamcılığın Doğuşu* (Ankara: Lotus Yayınları, 2003).

Cahun (1841-1900)³ on the philology and history of Turks since pre-Islamic times were among the most significant sources of inspiration for Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals.⁴ As a result, some of these intellectuals, such as Ahmet Vefik Paşa (1823-1891), Süleyman Hüsni Paşa (1832-1892), Mustafa Celalettin Paşa (Constantin Borzecki, 1826-1876), Ali Suavi (1839-1878), Şemseddin Sami (1850-1904), and Necip Asım (1861-1935), paid special attention to the concept of Turkishness in their studies.⁵ In the final analysis, however, they did not have a Pan-Turkist ideal, which means either a geographical or a political unification of all Turkic peoples from the Balkans to Central Asia in a single country.

The Origins of Pan-Turkism

In the nineteenth century, there were various Turkic groups living in Russia, especially in the Crimea and the Caucasus. The most prominent of these groups were the Volga Tatars, Crimea Tatars, Kazakhs, Turkmens, Uzbeks, Kirghizs and Azeris. According to the Russian census of 1897, the total number of the Turkic people was 13,600,000 and this figure was almost eleven per cent of the total Russian population.⁶ Nationalist sentiments developed among the Turkic peoples living in Russia, beginning

³ Cahun's book, *Introduction a l'histoire de l'Asie. Turcs et Mongols des origines a 1405*, which was published in France in 1896 and translated into Turkish in 1899 by Necip Asım, became one of the main sources that effected Pan-Turkist figures not only in the Ottoman period, but also in the Republican era. For instance, Ziya Gökalp declared that it was Cahun's book that had inspired in him a Pan-Turkist ideal. Reha Oğuz Türkkan also recounted it among the books that had had an effect on himself when he was a student. For a more information about Cahun's book, see Taner Timur, "Batı ideolojisi, Irkçılık ve Ulusal Kimlik Sorunumuz" in *Osmanlı Kimliği* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1998), pp. 137-171.

⁴ Bernard Lewis, "History-writing and National Revival in Turkey" in *Middle Eastern Affairs* 4 (June-July 1953), pp. 221-222.

⁵ For detailed information on this subject, see David Kushner, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu (1876-1908)*, trans. Şevket Serdar Türet, Rekin Ertem, Fahri Erdem (İstanbul: Kervan Yayınları, 1979).

⁶ Jacob M. Landau, *Pan-Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation* (London: C. Hurst & Company, 1995), p. 7.

from the 1860s, much earlier than among those of the Ottoman Empire. The main reason for this national revival was the Russian Empire's Russification and Christianization policies.⁷ These policies triggered nationalism among the Turkic peoples living in Russia as a means of self-defense and preservation of national identity. In addition, according to Sükrü Hanioglu, there were two factors that expedited the rise of nationalism among the Turkic peoples in Russia when compared to the Turks of the Ottoman Empire. First, as minorities, there was no all-encompassing Ottoman identity pressuring the Turkic peoples in Russia, and this, for them, facilitated to adopt nationalism. Second, because the degree of westernization of Russia was greater than that of the Ottoman Empire, nationalist ideologies, which originated from the West, was able to spread more rapidly among the Turks of Russia.⁸ As a result, the concept of nationalism and a common origin for all Turkic people became increasingly evident at the end of the nineteenth century among the Turkic intellectuals living in Russia.

One of the most important among these intellectuals was the Crimean Tatar İsmail Gasprinsky (1851-1914), known as Gaspıralı İsmail in the Ottoman Empire.⁹ Among the Turkic groups in Russia, the Tatars were the greatest champions of Pan-Turkism. By the end of the nineteenth century, the Tatar bourgeoisie had reached a higher level of cultural and economic development when compared to other Turkic groups in Russia.¹⁰ Their desire for a Pan-Turkist unity was not only a cultural reaction

⁷ Landau, *ibid.*, p. 7.

⁸ Sükrü Hanioglu, "Türkçülük" in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 5 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1985), p. 1395.

⁹ For a more detailed information about İsmail Gasprinsky, see Cafer Seydahmet Kırmıner, *Gaspıralı İsmail Bey: Dilde, Fikirde, İşte Birlik* (İstanbul: Matabacılık ve Neşriyat Anonim Şirketi, 1934); Hakan Kırmımlı, *Kırım Tatarlarında Milli Kimlik ve Milli Hareketler (1905-1916)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1996), pp. 37-64.

¹⁰ For the rise of Tatar bourgeoisie, see Serge A. Zenkovsky, *Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), pp. 12-23.

against Russian's policy of Russification and Christinization, it was also considered that Pan-Turkism would facilitate a stand against the imperialist tendencies of the Russian bourgeoisie, which constituted a threat to the Tatars' economic position and advancement in the area.¹¹

Gasprinsky was the intellectual leader of the Tatars in Russia. While he did not advocate a political unification of all Turkic peoples, but he played an important role in spreading the consciousness of Turkishness among the Turkic peoples in Russia through his successful weekly journal *Tercüman* (Interpreter). In *Tercüman*, which began publication in April 1883 in Bahçesaray in Crimea, although Gasprinsky stressed the importance of Islam for the Turkic world, he, also continuously promoted the idea of the spiritual and linguistic unity of the Turkic peoples.¹² In other words, he supported a cultural Pan-Turkism that was expressed in his motto "*Dilde, fikirde, işte birlik*" (Unity in language, thought, and action) printed in *Tercüman* after the 1905 Revolution in Russia.¹³ At the beginning of the twentieth century, the circulation of *Tercüman* was, approximately, 6,000.¹⁴ It was read in the Ottoman Empire and was often quoted by Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals.¹⁵ In other words, Gasprinsky had succeeded in drawing the attention of some Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals.

In addition to İsmail Gasprinsky, the Azerbaijani author Hüseyinzade Ali (Turan) (1864-1941)¹⁶ and his fellow countryman Ahmet Ağavey (Ağaoğlu, 1869-

¹¹ Günay Göksu Özdoğan, "*Turan*"dan "*Bozkurt*"a Tek Parti Döneminde Türkçülük (1931-1946) (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001), p. 69.

¹² İlber Ortaylı, *Ottoman Studies* (İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004), pp. 203-209.

¹³ Yusuf Akçura, *Türkçülüğün Tarihi* (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 1998), pp. 66-75.

¹⁴ Landau, p. 10.

¹⁵ Kushner, p. 17.

¹⁶ His famous poem *Turan*, which had a great influence on Ziya Gökalp, was, according to Uriel Heyd, the first poetic call to Turkish unity. Uriel Heyd, *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism, The Life and*

1939), also used the concept of the spiritual and linguistic unification of all Turkic peoples in his studies, but the most influential and active Pan-Turkist in Russia was, no doubt, a Kazan Tatar Yusuf Akçura. (1876-1935)

Yusuf Akçura was born in the town of Simbirsk (now Ulyanovsk) in the Volga region in Russia. His father died when he was two years old and, five years later, he and his mother moved to Istanbul in 1883.¹⁷ After his primary and secondary education, he entered the Military School in İstanbul in 1892, but was exiled to Tripoli in Libya by the Hamidian regime in 1897 due to his political activities. He escaped to Paris and continued his education at the *Ecole des Sciences Politiques*. Having completed his education in France, he returned to Russia in 1903 and wrote his famous article, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Three Types of Policy).¹⁸ The article was anonymously published in 1904 in the journal *Türk* (Turkish), which was published in Cairo. In his article, which is considered the manifesto of Pan-Turkism, Akçura compared Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism. For Akçura, Ottomanism, which had begun with Mahmut II and reached its peak at the time of Ali Pasha and Fuat Pasha, was not a useful idea for the ideological needs of the Ottoman Empire because it was impracticable. According to Akçura, therefore, “to try to constitute an Ottoman nation” was “a vain exhaustion.” As for Pan-Islamism, this idea had begun to be used in the reign of Abdülaziz when the

Teachings of Ziya Gökalp (London: Luzac & Company Ltd and The Harvill Press Ltd, 1950), p. 107. For more detailed information on Hüseyinzade Ali, see Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye’de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları, 1998), pp. 267-276.

¹⁷ The immigration of the Crimeans, or the Tatars, to the Ottoman Empire started shortly after Crimea was incorporated into Russia in 1783 and accelerated throughout the nineteenth century. The Ottoman-Russian war of 1877-1878 accelerated the migration to the Ottoman Empire. The Crimean immigrants mainly were settled in the line between Ankara and Eskişehir by the Ottoman government in order to increase agricultural production. According to Kemal H. Karpat, the total number of Tatar who immigrated to the Ottoman Empire between 1783 and 1922 was approximately 1,800,000. Kemal H. Karpat, *Ottoman Population (1830-1914): Demographic and Social Characteristics* (Madison, Wis.: University of Madison Press, 1985), pp. 60-77.

¹⁸ François Georgeon, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935)*, trans. Alev Er (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999), pp. 15-23.

idea of Ottomanism had started to weaken.¹⁹ For him, though Pan-Islamism would found a powerful Muslim community with a strong basis of religious unity, it was also an unattainable idea due to its tendency to increase the enmity between Ottoman citizens and the Great Powers, which had large Muslim populations.

Akçura's third and final idea was Pan-Turkism.²⁰ According to Akçura, the idea of Turkic unity was very new, and without example in history.²¹ Moreover, the implementation of this policy would cause the loss of some territories and population, in particular in non-Turkish areas. However, in the last analysis, a national unity of all Turkic groups based primarily on race was the only available idea for the Ottoman Empire's survival. In his article, by using the concept of *ırk* (race), instead of that of *kavim* (nation), which was, in general, used to differentiate ethnic elements from each other in the Ottoman Empire at the time, Akçura tried to define an ethnic totality of Turks without resort to the definitive value Islam held for it and to emphasize common cultural and ethnic heritage of the Turkic peoples. In other words, Akçura meant neither a human community that had common physiological or physical features nor Turkish blood. In addition, he did not consider race as a unique factor in order to establish a Pan-Turkist unity and, for this reason, stated tradition, language and religion as other important factors.²² While İsmail Gasprinsky emphasized the cultural and linguistic unity of Turkic groups, Akçura, in his article, went further and emphasized a political one. In this way, for the first time, Pan-Turkism was proposed as a coherent and serious alternative to Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism in the Ottoman Empire.

¹⁹ Yusuf Akçura, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1998), pp. 20-31.

²⁰ In his article, Akçura uses the concept of Turkism instead of Pan-Turkism.

²¹ Akçura, p. 23.

²² Ibid., p. 33.

In fact, in his article, what Akçura was trying to do was to persuade Ottoman intellectuals to select a new policy, Pan-Turkism. However, the Pan-Turkist ideas of Akçura were quite unfamiliar to the Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals, who dedicated themselves to saving the Ottoman Empire. As noted by Akçura, their interest were directed to the “Western Turks who were the subjects of the Ottoman State.”²³ Ottoman intellectuals, therefore, found Akçura’s thesis inappropriate and its effect remained limited in the Empire.²⁴

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Pan-Turkism was inappropriate, at least for the Hamidian regime, which adopted Pan-Islamism, and a new idea, which was brought to the Empire by the Russian Turkic émigrés in the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, its effect in the Ottoman society was limited. However, the idea of Pan-Turkism had made its debut in the political arena and it would develop in the Ottoman Empire gradually.

²³ Ibid., p. 35.

²⁴ When Akçura’s article was published in Cairo in 1904 neither Pan-Turkism nor Turkism had reached a political dimension among the Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals. In fact, the article was perceived by Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals as full of extreme ideas. For instance, the first reaction to the article came from Ali Kemal (1862-1922), who was the publisher of the journal, *Türk*. Ali Kemal, in his article, published in *Türk* on 26 May 1904 under the name of *Cevabımız* (Our answer), having described Akçura’s proposal as a “raw imagination” and a “strange project,” stated that the Ottoman Turks had not been able to defend Crimea and sarcastically asked: How could they unite the Turks of Central Asia? Besides, he stressed that the concept of Turkism was non-existent in the Ottoman Empire. For him, the salvation of the Empire depended on the improvement of individuals in the Empire and the creation of a strong society. Ali Kemal, “Cevabımız” in *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*, pp. 37-44. In addition to Ali Kemal, even Ahmet Ferit (Tek) (1877-1971), who was a close friend of Akçura, in his article, written as a reply to Ali Kemal’s writing, published in *Türk* in June 1904, did not support Akçura and described Ottomanism as the most appropriate ideology for the Empire. Ahmet Ferit, “Bir Mektup” in *Üç-Tarz-ı Siyaset*, pp. 45-55. Akçura’s article had its real effect when it was published again in Istanbul in 1911 during the Tripoli war and just before the Balkan War started. See Georgeon, p. 48.

Pan-Turkism in the Second Constitutional Period

The proclamation of the constitutional monarchy again on 23 July 1908 and the fall of the despotic Hamidian regime provided Pan-Turkism with fertile ground. Soon after the proclamation of the constitution, prominent Pan-Turkists such as Yusuf Akçura, Hüseyinzade Ali and Ahmet Ağaoğlu came to Istanbul and they were welcomed by the new regime, controlled by the Committee of Union Progress (CUP), which did not have a homogeneous structure and used an Ottomanist discourse in order to keep the minorities in the Empire together at the time.²⁵ In this process, Pan-Turkism developed within Turkism, which was generally understood by Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals to apply solely to the nationalism of the Ottoman Turks.

Turkism, as an ideological movement, had been limited only to the cultural arena due to the barriers created by the Hamidian regime that had adopted Pan-Islamism as an ideology that would save the Empire from collapse. However, the freedom brought about by the constitution created a new opportunity for those intellectuals who supported Turkism as an ideology and they began to organize by establishing some associations.²⁶ The Pan-Turkist figures mentioned above played crucial roles in these associations. The first Turkist association, the *Türk Derneği* (Turkish Association), was

²⁵ Kemal H. Karpat, “Tarihsel Süreklilik, Kimlik Değişimi ya da Yenilikçi, Müslüman, Osmanlı ve Türk Olmak” in *Osmanlı Geçmişi ve Bugünün Türkiye’si*, ed. Kemal H. Karpat (İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004), pp. 46-47.

²⁶ With the proclamation of the constitution, the Hamidian regime’s pressure and censorship over the press was abolished and a relative freedom was given to the press by the new regime. Through these freedom, many political organizations, newspapers, magazines and periodicals appeared in the Empire. For instance, while the total number of newspapers and magazines that were published in Istanbul before the proclamation of constitution had been only 52, after it, in seven months, that figure reached 352. Orhan Koloğlu, *Bir Zamanlar Bab-ı Ali* (İstanbul: Türkiye Gazeteciler Cemiyeti Yayınları, 1998), p. 6.

founded in Istanbul at the end of 1908. Since the *Türk Derneği* was a scientific association, it had a heterogeneous structure. Therefore, the association included old Turkists, like Necip Asım, Veled Çelebi, Fuat Raif; Pan-Turkists, like Yusuf Akçura, Hüseyinzade Ali and Ahmet Ağaoğlu; foreign orientalists, like Martin Hartmann, Vladimir Gordlevsky; and Armenian members of parliament, like Agop Boyacıyan and Tıngır Efendi among its members.²⁷

The main purpose of the association, according to its charter, was to research past and present monuments, activities and situations of all ethnic groups (*kavimler*) regarded as Turks and to spread the fruits of this research throughout the world.²⁸ In order to achieve this aim, the association used a monthly journal, *Türk Derneği*, as its official publication, of which only seven issues were published. The main subjects of the journal were Turkish and Turkic languages, the proverbs of Kazan, the handicrafts of the Turkmens, the history of Tatar literature, and the discovery of Turkish antiquities.²⁹ In addition to the Association's headquarters in Istanbul, branches were opened in Rusçuk, Izmir, Kastamonu, and Budapest.³⁰ The association disbanded in 1911 mainly due to some of its most effective members having left Istanbul. According to Landau, though the *Türk Derneği* was not a political society, but rather a small elitist group of intellectuals, its meetings and journal had definite undertones of cultural Pan-Turkism.³¹

²⁷ Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler*, vol. 1, *İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi, 1908-1918* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998), pp. 440-441.

²⁸ Masami Arai, *Jön Türk Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliği*, trans. Tansel Demirel (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2000), p. 25.

²⁹ Landau, p. 38.

³⁰ Arai, p. 27.

³¹ Landau, p. 39.

On 31 August 1911, another association, named the *Türk Yurdu Cemiyeti* (Association for the Turkish Homeland), was founded in Istanbul by Mehmet Emin (Yurdakul), Ahmet Hikmet (Müftüoğlu), Ahmet Ağaoğlu, Hüseyinzade Ali, Akil Muhtar (Özden) and Yusuf Akçura.³² The primary aim of the Association was to build a hostel for Turkish students and to publish a journal in order to contribute to the improvement of the intellectual standard of Turks and to make them strong-willed and enterprising.³³ Because the foundation of this association happened together with that of the *Türk Ocakları* (Turkish Hearths), it was closed a short while afterwards, but its main contribution to the development of Pan-Turkism was the creation of the *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Homeland) magazine.³⁴ The first issue of the magazine, which was published every fifteen days, appeared on 30 November 1911. Its first issue had only twenty-four pages, but because it soon became so popular that,³⁵ from the second issue onward, it grew to thirty-two pages.³⁶ According to its editorial program, written by Yusuf Akçura, the language was supposed to be simple and the magazine was supposed to create an “ideal language acceptable for all Turks.” Activities targeted to make Turks more aware of themselves were also to be part of this program. According to its editorial policy and aims, in addition to the Ottoman Turks, the Turks living outside the frontiers of the Ottoman Empire were a serious target of the *Türk Yurdu*.³⁷ From this point of view, as emphasized by Koroğlu, it was obviously a Pan-Turkist magazine.³⁸

³² Tunaya, pp. 441-442.

³³ Arai, pp. 82-83.

³⁴ Erol Koroğlu, *Türk Edebiyatı ve Birinci Dünya Savaşı (1914-1918): Propagandadan Milli Kimlik İnşasına* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004), pp. 110.

³⁵ Although the *Türk Yurdu*'s circulation is unknown, its achievement was so great that the first issue was printed four times, the second three times, the third and fourth two times. Zenkovsky, pp. 108.

³⁶ Arai, p. 85.

The *Türk Ocağı* (Turkish Hearth) was the most important and the longest lasting of the associations founded in the second constitutional era. The *Türk Ocağı* was founded on 20 June 1911 by students of the military school, who asked for help from the intellectuals. It was officially founded on 25 March 1912, with Ahmet Ferit (Tek) as its chairman and Yusuf Akçura as its vice-chairman.³⁹ According to its charter, published for the first time in 1913, the object of the association was to strive for the development of the Turkish race and language through the promotion of the national education and improvement of intellectual, social and economic standards of the Turks who were the most important among the Islamic nations. In addition, in order to accomplish its objectives, the association would open clubs called Turkish Hearths, arrange lecturers, conferences and publish books and brochures.⁴⁰

The Association developed in a short time and played an important role in spreading national sentiments among Ottoman-Turkish society. In 1914, the association had sixteen hearths in various parts of the Empire, with a total membership of over three thousand. The Istanbul hearth, the largest branch in the Empire, had more than 1,800 members, including about 1,600 students at institutions of higher education. In the 1920s, membership reached approximately 30,000.⁴¹

In the summer of 1913, another association was founded under the name of the *Türk Bilgi Derneği* (Turkish Knowledge Association), which was designed by the CUP as a scientific academy that would function according to nationalist principles. In

³⁷ Firdevs Gümüsoğlu, "Türk Yurdu" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), p. 270.

³⁸ Köroğlu, p. 111.

³⁹ Yusuf Sarıınay, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Tarihi Gelişimi ve Türk Ocakları, 1912-1931* (İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 1994), pp. 126-127.

⁴⁰ Akçura, pp. 169-170.

⁴¹ Landau, p.41.

addition to figures like Dr. Nazım, Celal Sahir (Erozan), who was the president of the association, Necip Asım, Hüseyin Cahit (Yalçın) and Emrullah Efendi, prominent Pan-Turkist of the time such as Yusuf Akçura, Hüseyinzade Ali, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, Ziya Gökalp and Mehmet Emin (Yurdakul) were among the members of the association, which had branches assigned to Islamic Studies, Turkish Studies, Sociology, Philosophy, Mathematics and Turkism.⁴² However, the association, which published a scholarly journal, *Bilgi Mecmuası* (Journal of Knowledge), of which seven issues appeared in Istanbul between 1913 and 1914, did not survive long and it ceased its activities in 1914 due to some of its members having devoted their energies to other associates and the negative circumstances created by the First World War.⁴³

These associations and, especially their magazines, played a crucial role in the creation of a young audience interested in the Turkish language, history, culture and literature in the Ottoman Empire. In addition, they oriented the Ottoman-Turkish intellectual's attention towards Turks living outside of the Ottoman Empire. In this way, Pan-Turkism and Pan-Turkist ideas began to become evident among Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals. On the other hand, however, such ideas were still confined to a small section of the Ottoman population. The principal figure who spread Pan-Turkist ideas to the mass of people in the Ottoman Empire was, undoubtedly, Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924), who is considered the father of Turkish nationalism.⁴⁴

⁴² Zafer Toprak, "Türk Bilgi Derneği (1914) ve Bilgi Mecmuası" in *Osmanlı İlmî ve Meslekî Cemiyetleri: Birinci Milli Türk Bilim Tarihi Sempozyumu*, ed. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1987), pp. 247-249.

⁴³ Landau, p. 39; Sarıнай, pp. 160-161. However, according to Zafer Toprak, the members of the *Türk Bilgi Derneği* published many journals in the period between 1914 and 1918, such as *Yeni Mecmua*, *İçtimaiyat*, *Ulum-ı İctimaiye ve İktisadiye*, *İktisadiyat*, *Ulum-ı Siyasiye ve İktisadiye*, *İslam*, *Milli Tettebular*, *Harp*, *Edebiyat-ı Umumiye*, *Ticaret-ı Umumiye*, *Sanayi and Harp*. Toprak, *ibid.*, pp. 252.

⁴⁴ For more detailed information on Ziya Gökalp's biography, see Uriel Heyd, pp. 19-40. Also see, Taha Parla, *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924)* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985), pp. 10-19.

Although he wrote only a few articles related directly to Pan-Turkism, Ziya Gökalp did more to popularize the Pan-Turkist ideology in the Ottoman Empire by using the concept of *Turan* in his poems than anyone. *Turan*, was etymologically a Persian word, designating a geographical field extending from north of Persia and Afghanistan to the Aral Lake and eastwards to the borders of Chinese Turkestan.⁴⁵ This concept was redefined in the nineteenth century by the Hungarians, who were searching for a point of support against Russian's Pan-Slavism policy, as a bond among Hungarian, Finnish, Turkish and Mongolian notions.⁴⁶ In this process, "Pan-Turanism" emerged as political movement, targeting a cultural and political unity among the countries belonging to Turanic geography.⁴⁷ In this sense, though he used many times the word *Turan* in his poems, Gökalp had no intention of supporting Pan-Turanism or of emphasizing kinship with Hungarians, Finns or Mongols. In fact, he used *Turan* to denote the great Turkestan containing the whole Turkic peoples. In this framework, for Gökalp, *Turan*, the natural geography of Turkic peoples, was an ideal, which would be realized in the future. Gökalp's Turan ideal could be seen clearly in his poems. For example, in 1911 in his famous poem "*Turan*", which became a slogan among the Pan-Turkists in the Ottoman Empire, he expressed his yearning for *Turan* as follows:

Fatherland for Turks is neither Turkey nor Turkestan
Fatherland is a great and eternal country: Turan.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Günay Göksu Özdoğan, "Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Turancılık" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001), p. 388.

⁴⁶ Köroğlu, p. 128.

⁴⁷ For more information on Pan-Turanism, see Tarık Demirkan, *Macar Turancıları* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000); Nizam Önen, "Turan'a İki Farklı Yol: Macar ve Türk Turancıları" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), pp. 406-408. And also see, Nizam Önen, *İki Turan Macaristan ve Türkiye'de Turancılık* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2005), pp. 35-95.

⁴⁸ *Vatan ne Türkiye'dir Türkler'e, ne Türkistan;*
Vatan büyük ve müebbet bir ülkedir: Turan., Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, *Ziya Gökalp Külliyyatı-I, Şiirler ve Halk Masalları* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1952), p. 5.

However, three years later, in August 1914, just before the Ottoman Empire's entry into the First World War in which Russia, the greatest obstacle in front of *Turan*, fought against the Ottoman Empire, Gökaltp declared his belief and desire for ideal of *Turan* one more time in his poem, *Kızıl Destan* (Red Epic):

The land of the enemy shall be devastated
Turkey shall be enlarged and become Turan.⁴⁹

Pan-Turkism, thanks to Gökaltp's contributions, started to become a widespread ideology among the Ottoman-Turkish intelligentsia. In this process, Pan-Turkist concepts such as *Turan*, the Caucasus and the Central Asia became increasingly evident in the Ottoman intellectuals' works. For example, Halide Edip (Adıvar) (1882-1964), in 1912, published *Yeni Turan* (The New Turan), which had a clear Pan-Turkist message and advocated Pan-Turkism against Ottomanism.⁵⁰ Moiz Kohen (Tekinalp) (1883-1961), an Ottoman Jew from Salonika, was one of the most ambitious Pan-Turkists in the Empire at the time. He explained his passion for *Turan* by using a militarist discourse in his article *Yeni Cengizlik* as follows:

Turan is living, but under the Chinese paw and the Russian boot. Turan is captive and imprisoned; Turan is degraded and oppressed! Living nothing for Turan is the greatest abasement for Turanism. The most important, intimate and sacred duty, nationalistic obligation, for every Turk, who is fully aware of his duty and who knows his nation is to help Turan, and rescue it from the bloodstained claws of the Chinese dragon and Russian eagle. The Turkish people, the Turkish states are all the time obliged to this duty...

Yes, Turan must rescue, Turan should be rescued...Turan will be rescued!

-But how and with the help of what?

-How and with the help of what? It is simple: with iron and fire! Our swords' iron and ideas' fire is to conquer and seize Turan. History shows

⁴⁹ *Düşmanın ülkesi viran olacak!*
Türkiye büyüyüp Turan olacak., Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, ibid., p. 102.

⁵⁰ Landau, p. 32.

us: The unity and freedom of a nation can be only provided with the sword and the pen.⁵¹

In addition to the contributions of Gökalp, Akçura and other Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals who adopted the idea of unifying all the Turkic peoples, one of the main factors that reinforced the Pan-Turkist ideology was the Balkan War, which changed the demographic structure of the Ottoman Empire radically. At the end of the Balkan War, in 1913, the Ottoman Empire's territories in Europe had declined from 169,845 square kilometers to 28,842 square kilometers. In other words, the Ottoman Empire had lost 83 percent of its territories in Europe.⁵² Moreover, the Empire had lost approximately 4 million people, the great majority of whom were non-Muslim, from a population of about 24 million.⁵³ Indeed, the Balkan War was the last stage of a long process, starting from the Ottoman-Russian War of 1877-1878. During this process, according to Feroz Ahmad, the Ottoman Empire had lost 32.7 percent of its total territory and 20 percent of its total population.⁵⁴ After the war, the Empire had a more homogeneous population structure in which the Turks had the great majority and this

⁵¹ "Turan yaşıyor, fakat Çinli pençesi ve Rus çizmesi altında yaşıyor. Turan, esir ve mahkum, Turan hakir ve mazlum! Onu bu halde bırakmak, Turanlık için en büyük zillettir. Gözünü açmış, milletini tanımış her Türk'ün en birinci, en mübrem, en mukaddes vazifesi, vazife-yi milliyesi onun imdadına koşmak ve onu Çin ejderi ve Rus kartalının kanlı tırnaklarından kurtarmaktır. Türk şahsiyetleri, Türk devletleri hep bu vazife ile mükelleftir...

Evet, Turan kurtulmalı, Turan kurtarılmalı...Turan kurtarılacak!

-Fakat nasıl ve ne ile?

-Nasıl ve ne ile mi? Pek basit : Demir ve ateş ile ! Turan kılıçlarımızın demiri ve fikirlerimizin ateşi feth ve teshir edecektir. Tarih bize gösteriyor: Bir milletin vahdeti, istiklali, ancak kılıç ile ve kalem ile temin olunabiliyor." Jacob M. Landau, *Tekinalp Bir Türk Yurtseveri (1883-1961)* (İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 1996), pp. 170-172.

⁵² Zafer Toprak, "Cihan Harbi'nin Provası Balkan Harbi," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 104 (August 2002), p. 104.

⁵³ Feroz Ahmad, *The Young Turks: the Committee of Union and Progress in Turkish Politics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 152. The economic results of the Balkan War were also very destructive for the Empire. For example, while the rate of foreign credits to the total budget of the Empire was 23.7 percent in 1911, after the borrowing, originated from the Balkan War, it rose to 35.1 percent. Sina Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1998), p. 348.

⁵⁴ Feroz Ahmad, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Sonu" in *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Sonu ve Büyük Güçler*, ed. Marian Kent, trans. Ahmet Fethi (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999), pp. 28.

created fertile ground for the Pan-Turkists, who advocated an Empire mainly based on Turkic peoples, in order to disseminate their ideology. In addition, the defeat at the hands of the Balkan nations, which were the former subjects of the Empire, in the war and the loss of Rumeli, which had been the heart of the Empire for ages and were the birthplaces of many Unionists, as stressed by Tarık Zafer Tunaya,⁵⁵ constituted a serious shock for the Ottoman-Turkish intelligentsia. This shock, which was, in general, expressed by the Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals by using some concepts such as revenge, not forgetting and national vengefulness, and its reflections over the Ottoman-Turkish society were described by a source as follows:

The Turks have not forgotten this pain. They all remember the epics tied to the loss of Rumeli. They have awoken a national sprit and a national vengefulness by telling these epics to the students at school, to the children at home and to the soldiers in the barracks. They have indoctrinated the sprit that would, one day, settle the insult and cruelty made the Turkishness an account. On the maps, Rumeli has been shown painted black. All of the army has been provoked to revenge its honour that had been stained. The soldiers are drilled every day singing ‘Oh in 1328 Turkish honour was stained. Oh, oh, oh, oh, revenge!’ The soldier who returned to his village was tilling his field singing this song.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Tunaya defines the Balkan War as an ideological war and emphasizes its influence on the Ottoman-Turkish society in the following words: “The Balkan War is not a simple war, since it had profound effects over the Ottoman army and Turkish society. A vast literature, searching the answer of the question ‘Why were we defeated?’ came into existence because of this reason. Hundreds of scientific or emotional articles, pamphlets, books and studies were produced in order to reply this question and many writers, local and foreign, civilian and military, appeared. This is a research and disclosure literature.” *“Balkan Harbi basit bir savaş değildir. Osmanlı ordusu ve Türk toplumu üzerinde çok derin izler bıraktığı için değildir. ‘Niçin Mağlup Olduk?’ sorusunu araştıran geniş bir literatür de bu nedenle oluşmuştur. Bilimsel ve duygusal yüzlerce makale, broşür, kitap ve inceleme bu amaçla üretilmiş, yerli yabancı, sibil asker, bir o kadar da yazar ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu bir araştırma ve ifşaat edebiyatıdır.”* Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *Türkiye’de Siyasal Partiler*, vol. 3, *İttihat ve Terakki, Bir Çağın, Bir Kuşağın, Bir Partinin Tarihi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998), p. 583.

⁵⁶ “Türkler bu acıyı unutmadılar. Rumelinin kaybediliş menkıbelerini canlandırdılar. Mekteplerde talebeye, evlerde çocuklara, kırsalalarda askerlere bu menkıbeleri anlatarak milli bir ruh, milli bir hınç uyandırdılar. Türklüğe yapılan hakaretin ve zulmün, birgün hesabını görmek ruhunu aşıladılar. Haritalarda Rumeli siyaha boyanarak gösterildi. Bütün ordu lekelenen namusunun intikamını almaya tahrik edildi. Asker her gün, ‘1328’de Türk namusu lekелendi ah. Ah, ah, ah, ah, intikam!’ şarkısıyla talime gidiyordu. Köyüne dönen asker, bu şarkıyı söyleyerek ekin ekiyordu.” Cemil Bilsel, *Lozan*, vol. 1 (İstanbul: Sosyal Yayınları, 1998), p. 126.

In harmony with that description, Halide Edip's article, "*Feleketlerden Sonra Milletler*" (Nations after disasters), which was published in *Türk Yurdu* in May 1913, reflected best the dominant discourse of the time. In her article, which actually was a speech she had made at an assembly of women at the *Darülfunun* (The University of Istanbul), having declared that "Bulgaria should be destroyed" to her listeners, asked all women, who would bring up the future generations, to inculcate this idea in the minds of their children.⁵⁷ These kinds of words were continuously reiterated by the Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals in various platforms during the period after the Balkan Wars. For example, Halil Menteşe, a prominent member of the CUP, the ruling party at the time, felt the necessity of reminding the Parliament of the defeat in the Balkan War one more time in his speech on 19 May 1914, when he was elected president.

From this sublime pulpit, I recommend my nation not to forget! I recommend that it does not forget beloved Salonika, the cradle of the torch of liberty and the Constitutional monarchy, green Manastır, Kosovo, Yanina and the whole beautiful Rumeli. I ask our teachers, writers, poets and all intellectuals to use their lectures, writings, poems and all their moral influence to keep alive continuously, in front of our present and future generations, that there are brothers to be saved and pieces of the motherland to be liberated, which remain outside the frontier. This is the only way to protect our future from repeating the mistakes that have prepared our calamities and defeats.⁵⁸

Numerous writings related to Pan-Turkist ideas, which were published by Yusuf Akçura, Moiz Cohen and others in journals such as *Türk Yurdu*, Gökalp's poems, novels like *Yeni Turan*, revolts by various non-Turkish communities against the central

⁵⁷ Halide Edip, "Felaketlerden Sonra Milletler" in *Türk Yurdu* 40 (16 May 1329/29 May 1913), translit. ed., vol. 2, pp. 287-291., cited in Köroğlu, pp. 121-122.

⁵⁸ "Bu yüce kürsüden milletime tavsiye ederim: Unutmamasını! Hürriyet ve Meşrutiyet meşalesi nurunun beşiği olan sevgili Selanik'i, yeşil Manastır'ı, Kosova'yı, İskodra'yı, Yanya'yı, bütün güzel Rumeliyi unutmamasını tavsiye ederim. Muallimlerimizden, muharrirlerimizden, şairlerimizden, bütün fikir adamlarımızdan hududun öte tarafında kurtarılacak kardeşler, tahlis edilecek vatan parçaları bulunduğu bugünkü ve yarınki nesiller önünde, dersleriyle, yazılarıyla, şiirleriyle, bütün manevi nüfuzlarıyla daima canlandırmalarını rica ederim. Ancak bu suretle felaketlerimizi, yenilgilerimizi hazırlayan hataların tekrarından geleceğimizi koruyabiliriz." Tunaya, *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler*, vol. 3, p. 563.

government such as the Imam Yahya revolt in Yemen in 1911 and the Albanian revolt in 1912, together with the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan Wars, played a crucial role in the increasing acceptance of Pan-Turkism among the Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals. In this atmosphere, the number of the personages who supported the idea that the survival of the state was possible only with a Pan-Turkist nationalism increased remarkably in the Empire.

Meanwhile, in accordance with this ambiance, some of the figures who had sympathy for the idea of *Turan*, such as Enver Bey, later Pasha, had increased their power within the CUP.⁵⁹ According to Zafer Toprak, most of the Unionists, at the time, supported the idea that “a modern state can only be built on an ethnic group that shares common emotions.”⁶⁰ Accordingly, Pan-Turkism, which proposed unification based primarily on race among all Turkic peoples, was an appropriate ideology for the targets of the CUP to some extent. Besides, since it could compensate the loss of the European territories of the Empire by opening the doors of Central Asia, the idea of a Turanic Empire, stretching from Anatolia to the Caucasus and Central Asia was another factor that made the Pan-Turkist ideology attractive for the CUP.

Before the outbreak of the First World War, many Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals had accepted Pan-Turkism as a serious ideology that could save the Empire. Moreover, Pan-Turkism had many supporters within the ranks of the state apparatus controlled by the CUP, the army, in particular among the young officers, and university students. When the First World War broke out in Europe in August 1914, the atmosphere in the

⁵⁹ Another effect of the Balkan War on the CUP was that it abandoned the policy of Ottomanism. For instance, after the war, the Greek Ottoman citizens, who had economically strong position and were mainly inhabited in Istanbul, Tharace and the Aegean region, began to be perceived as collaborators with Greece. As a result of this perception, the CUP started to force them to immigrate to Greece. According to Halil Menteşe, the total number of the Greeks, who had immigrated to Greece from the Ottoman Empire between 1913 and 1914, was approximately 200,000. Halil Menteşe, *Osmanlı Mebusan Meclisi Reisi Halil Menteşe'nin Anıları* (İstanbul: Hürriyet Vakfı Yayınları, 1986), pp. 165-166.

⁶⁰ Zafer Toprak, *Türkiye'de Milli İktisat (1908-1918)* (Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 1982), p. 32.

Empire was described by Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, who was a student at the Teachers College (*Dar-ül muallimin*) at the time, as follows:

We the young gathered around the maps that hung on the walls of the classes of the school. We were trying to draw the borders of the new Turkish motherland on these maps. Ottoman Africa, Yemen, the Indies, Bosnia-Herzegovina were not seen by our eyes anymore. We used to put one hand on the Balkan passes and the Danube-Maritza basins. Then, with the other, by aligning the Crimea, the Caucasus, Bashkordistan, Turkistan, we cover the Altay Mountains, Chinese Turkistan, Changari and the Golden Mountain:

-All these places are ours! We used to say.

We were going to save all these places. In fact, our borders in Rumeli ended at a distance of only two kilometers from our school door at the Edirne city station, but our eye did not see this. Our eye was on the other end of the world, the Caucasus, Turkistan and the Chinese borders. We were going to go there. We were going to run the villages, to the courtyards, to the tents of nomads. With a scepter in our hand, sandal on our foot, we were going to carry the bags of books that were on our back to Anatolia, Azerbaijan, Turkistan...The near past was a gloomy dream no more. The truth was only in the future. The First World War broke out in Europe within this atmosphere.⁶¹

⁶¹ “Biz gençler, şimdi de muallim mektebinin dershanelerinin duvarlarına asılı olan haritaların başına toplanıyorduk. Bu haritaların üstünde yeni Türk vatanının sınırlarını çizmeye çalışıyorduk. Osmanlı Afrikası, Yemenler, Hintler, Bosna-Hersekler artık gözümüze görünmüyordu. Bir elimizi Balkan geçitlerinin, Tuna-Meriç havzalarının üzerine koyardık. Sonra diğer elimizi Kırım’ı, Kafkasya’yı, Başkirdistan’ı, Türkistan’ı sıralayarak Altaylara, Çin Türkistanı’na, Çangari’ye, Altın dağa uzatırdık: -Buraları hep bizim! derdik. Buralarını hep biz kurtaracaktık. Rumeli’de sınırlarımız, gerçi bizim mektebin kapısından iki kilometre ileride, Edirne’nin şehir istasyonunda bitiyordu. Ama bu bizim gözümüze görünmüyordu. Bizim gözümüz dünyanın öbür ucunda, Kafkasya’larda, Türkistan’larda, Çin sınırlarındaydı. Oralara gidecektik. Köylere, avullara, obalara koşacaktık. Elde asa ayakta çarık, sırtta kitap çantalarını Anadolu’ya, Azerbaycan’a, Türkistan’a taşıyacaktık...Yakın mazi artık kasvetli bir rüyaydı. Hakikat, yalnız istikbaldeydi. Avrupa’da Birinci Dünya Harbi işte bu hava içinde patladı.”, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *Suyu Arayan Adam* (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2004), pp. 59-60. At the time, in addition to Pan-Turkist personages and publications, another factor that directed the young like Aydemir to the Pan-Turkist ideology was, to some extent, the paramilitary youth organizations such as *Türk Gücü Cemiyeti* (Turkish Strength Association), *Osmanlı Güç Dernekleri* (Ottoman Strength Associations) and *Genç Dernekleri* (Youth Associations), which were founded in 1913 and afterwards under the control of the CUP and basically followed the example of various European scouts’ associations that had proven to help the the army during the wars. The CUP also aimed to indoctrinate a militarist discourse to the youth by benefiting from these organizations. Zafer Toprak, “II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde Paramiliter Gençlik Örgütleri” in *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2. (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1985), pp. 531-536. However, these associations had also Pan-Turkist tendencies. For instance, Kuzucuoğlu Tahsin, who was the *Türk Gücü* delegate responsible for Istanbul, in an erticle, published in *Türk Yurdu* in May 1914, expressed Pan-Turkist tendencies of the association clearly. Kuzucuoğlu, who started his article with the words “the new and vigilant Turkish world which yearns the Great Turan has erected the four pillars of sultanate palace which will cary the golden crown of Turan and carried on by defining these pillars the Turkish Knowledge Association, Turkish Homeland, Turkish Hearth and The Turkish Strength Association,” described the association as “the raider (*akıncı*) of Turan”. According to him, the real aim of the association in organizing these paramilitary activities was to reach the great and sacred *Turan*. Kuzucuoğlu Tahsin, “Güççülük” *Türk Yurdu* 66 (15 May 1330 / 28 May 1914), transit. ed., vol. 3, pp. 308-309., cited in Köroğlu, *ibid.*, pp. 141-142. fn. 49.

At the time, this irrational romanticism was not seen only among the Pan-Turkists or young university students such as Şevket Süreyya, but also among the high ranks of the CUP. For example, when the Ottoman Empire proclaimed mobilization, according to Kazım Karabekir, Bahaeddin Şakir, one of the leading members of the central committee of the CUP, and his friends, who were on their way towards the east, hung signboards and marks saying “The road to Turan passes through here” at the eastern edge of all towns and cities through which they passed.⁶² Consequently, in 1914, the position of Pan-Turkism, as an ideology, among the Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals and political elites changed radically when compared with the year 1904, when Yusuf Akçura had published *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* in Cairo, and Ali Kemal had described it as a “strange project” and “raw imagination.”

The First World War and Pan-Turkism

Although the Ottoman Empire did not have the essential military, economic and infrastructural conditions in order to fight in a serious war, just three months after the outbreak of the First World War in Europe, it joined the war on the side of Germany, which supported the Pan-Turkist movement in order to keep Russia, which possessed the Caucasus and Central Asia, under pressure due to its Eastern policy, in November 1914. As noted by Tunaya,⁶³ the principal factor that motivated the CUP in order to enter into the war was to compensate the losses in the Balkan War. On the other hand,

⁶² Kazım Karabekir, *Birinci Cihan Harbine Nasıl Girdik*, vol. 2, (İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 1994), pp. 187-188.

⁶³ Tunaya emphasizes that the Ottoman Empire entered into the Great War under the effect of the complex, created by the defeat in the Balkan War. Tunaya, *Türkiye’de Siyasal Partiler*, vol. 3, p. 592,

since a victory that could be won in the war against Russia would totally open the doors of Turan, there was great enthusiasm among the Pan-Turkists figures in the Empire.

This romantic enthusiasm could be seen clearly in the works of the Pan-Turkists. For instance, Moiz Kohen, at the beginning of the war, published a book under the title *Türkler Bu Muharebede Ne Kazanabilirler?* (What can the Turks win in this battle?)⁶⁴ Kohen, having spelt out the development of Pan-Turkist ideology in the Ottoman Empire, stated that Turkish irredentism was a political and social necessity and that unity with the other Turks in the world would establish a strong nation. Otherwise, according to Kohen, the Ottoman Turks, who were not the real masters of their own country, could face with the danger of disintegration due to the contrivance of foreign factors.⁶⁵ He concluded by declaring the possible gain of the Ottoman Empire in the war by making a reference to Pan-Turkism:

If the Russian despotism is broken down by the brave German, Austrian and Turkish armies, as we hope, between thirty and forty million Turks, will reach their independence. With the ten million Ottoman Turks, there will be a nation consisting of fifty million and this nation, which will always have the power and energy to advance, will establish a great civilization comparable to that of the German's. Even it will be more excellent than the French and British civilizations, which have degenerated in some aspects. The Turkish nations' all desires have united with this target.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ The book gained fame in Europe as the supposed statement of Ottoman war aims. It, a year later, was translated into German under the name "Turkismus and Pan-Turkismus." In 1916, it was also translated into English by the British Admiralty Intelligence Department under the title "The Turkish and Pan-Turkish Ideal. Landau, *Tekinalp*, p. 27.

⁶⁵ Landau, *Tekinalp*, pp. 221-225.

⁶⁶ "Eğer Rus despotizmi umduğumuz gibi cesur Alman, Avusturya ve Türk ordularınca yıkılırsa, otuz ve kırk milyon arası Türk bağımsızlığına kavuşacaktır. On milyon Osmanlı Türküyle birlikte elli milyonluk bir ulus oluşacak ve her zaman daha çok yükselecek bir güç ve enerjiye sahip olacak bu ulus, Almanya'ninkıyla karşılaştırılabilecek büyük bir uygarlık kuracaktır. Hatta bazı bakımlardan yozlaşmış, Fransız ve İngiliz uluslarından daha üstün olacaktır. Türk ulusunun tüm istekleri bu hedefte birleşmiştir.", Landau, *Tekinalp*, p. 235.

In addition to Moiz Kohen, Ömer Seyfettin (1884-1920), a writer famous for his nationalist stories at the time, published a pamphlet, titled *Yarınki Turan Devleti* (Tomorrow's Turan State). In this pamphlet, Ömer Seyfettin, set out clearly his Pan-Turkist expectations from the war as follows:

First of all, we will take our religion and language brothers, the Turks, who have been under Russians' cruelty for years, within our political border. In the first attack, we will seize the Caucasus from the Russians and, gradually, start to march towards Turkistan, which is our motherland.⁶⁷

As for Ziya Gökalp, he published poems with strong Pan-Turkist messages during the war years. For example, in his poem *Millet* (Nation), published in January 1915, there were obvious references to *Turan*:

In all countries the Turk will establish a state;
But these will unite in the end...
They will worship the same religion in the same language,
There will be a nation with a single culture!..
O son of Turks, there is no I, you, he, nothing any more!..
There are no nations, clans, only the great Turan..
There cannot be polytheism in politics, nor Hans and Beys..
There is only one country and a single sovereign in the Turkish soul.⁶⁸

Gökalp, showed his Pan-Turkist desire in his famous poem *Lisan* (Language), which was published in May 1916 once again as follows:

Turan has one country,
And only one language.
Whoever says there is another language,
Has another goal.

⁶⁷ "...evvela Rusların zulmü altında yıllardan beri din ve dil kardeşlerimiz olan Türkleri kurtararak siyasi hududumuzun içine alacağız. Ruslardan ilk hamlede Kafkasya'yı zaptedip yavaş yavaş anavatinımız olan Türkistan'a yürümeğe başlayacağız.", Ömer Seyfettin, "Yarınki Turan Devleti" in *Türklük Üzerine Yazılar* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1993), p. 75.

⁶⁸ Her ülkede Türk bir devlet yapacak;
Fakat bunlar birleşecek nihayet...
Hep bir dine aynı dile tapacak,
Olacak tek harsa malik bir millet!
Ey Türkoğlu, artık ne ben, ne sen, ne o , bir şey yok!..
Uluslar yok, uruklar yok, ancak büyük Turan var..
Siyasette şirk olamaz, ayrıca Han ve Bey yok..
Türk ruhunda yalnız bir il, yalnız bir tek ilhan var..., Tansel, ibid., p. 114.

Turkishness has one conscience,
One religion, one motherland;
But they would all separate
If its language is not one.⁶⁹

However, at the end of 1917, the Ottoman Empire had not reached any of its goals in the war. For instance, the Ottoman forces had failed on the Eastern front against the Russians and they had been devastatingly defeated at Sarıkamış in January 1915. The army had also failed in the Canal mission against the British. Furthermore, in March 1917, the British forces had taken Baghdad and moved upstream. In addition, some parts of Anatolia, such as Erzurum, Trabzon and Van, were under the occupation of Russian armies. In this negative ambience, the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia revived the expectations of the Pan-Turkists in the Empire again.

After the Bolshevik Revolution of November 1917, the Russian government asked for an armistice and, following the peace negotiations, the Treaty of Breast-Litovsk was signed between Russia and the central powers in March 1918. According to the treaty, Russia agreed to evacuate Eastern Anatolia, which was under occupation, and areas such as Kars and Batum, which it had seized in 1878. After the treaty, despite the dangerous situation on the Mesopotamian and Palestinian fronts, Enver Pasha transferred the divisions, which had returned from Galicia, to the Caucasus. In September 1918, the Ottoman army, led by Nuri Pasha (Killigil), stepbrother of Enver Pasha, occupied Russian Azerbaijani, taking advantage of the power vacuum in Russia

⁶⁹ *Turan'ın bir ili var,
Ve yalnız bir dili var.
Başka dil var diyenin,
Başka bir emeli var.
Türklüğün vicdanı bir,
Dini bir vatani bir;
Fakat hepsi ayrılır
Olmazsa lisanı bir.*, Tansel, ibid., p. 120.

among the Turkic peoples.⁷³ In this way, the author sent her readers a message that reminded them of *Turan* one more time. In the same period, Ziya Gökalp, in an article published in *Yeni Mecmua* (The New Journal)⁷⁴ in 1918 under the title *Turan Nedir?* (What is Turan) emphasized the necessity of Pan-Turkism for the Ottoman Empire. In the article, having stated that Ottomanism (*Osmanlılık*) and Turanism were interdependent and that the great Turkic nation would emerge by diffusing Ottoman culture, which had acquired a national Turkic identity, he ended his article with this remark:

The Ottoman Turks have to be sincerely Turkist in order to indoctrinate their own culture to all Turks. If Ottomanism is not Turkified, it is not possible for all Turks to identify themselves with the Ottomans. Those who oppose Turkism and Turanism must consider that they are destroying, first of all, Ottomanism!⁷⁵

However, this situation did not last long. Indeed, when the Ottoman army entered Azerbaijani, the war was already about to be lost. In August 1918, the German army in France had started to retreat and, on 20 September 1918, the British army on the Palestinian front had made a decisive attack that forced the Ottoman army to retreat to the north. In addition, in October 1918, the surrender of Bulgaria, which had

⁷³ According to Köroğlu, the main character of the book, Demir, was created by Müfide Ferit by taking a famous Pan-Turkist, Yusuf Akçura, as a role model. Köroğlu, pp. 245-246.

⁷⁴ *Yeni Mecmua* was published by Ziya Gökalp as a weekly journal between July 1917 and October 1918 with the financial support of the CUP. According to Yahya Kemal (Beyatlı) (1884-1958), who was one of the writers of the journal, Ziya Gökalp had wanted *Yeni Mecmua* to be independent from the CUP, but since he did not have enough money, he had to accept the financial support of the CUP. Yahya Kemal Beyatlı, *Siyasi ve Edebi Portreler* (İstanbul: Fetih Cemiyeti Yayınları, 1986), pp. 17-18.

⁷⁵ “Bütün Türklere kendi harsını verebilmek için, Osmanlı Türklüğü samimi bir surette Türkçü olmakla mükelleftir. Çünkü Osmanlılık Türkleşmezse, bütün Türklerin Osmanlılığı doğru gelmesi mümkün değildir. Türkçülüğün ve Turancılığın aleyhinde bulunanlar, herşeyden evvel Osmanlılığı baltalamakta olduklarını artık düşünmelidirler!” Ziya Gökalp, “Turan Nedir?”, *Yeni Mecmua* 31, pp. 82a-84a, cited in Arai, pp. 145-146.

established a crucial link between Germany, Austria and the Ottoman Empire by joining the central powers in 1916, to the Entente powers had cut the link between the Ottoman Empire and its allies. In this framework, the CUP had no chance but ask for an armistice. The Armistice of Mudros, which was signed in October 1918, sealed the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the First World War.⁷⁶

Pan-Turkism in the National Struggle

After the Great War, in contrast to Pan-Turkists' great *Turan*, stretching from Anatolia to Cenral Asia, all that remained of the Ottoman Empire was Eastern Thrace and Anatolia, it was faced with partition at the hands of the Entente powers. In addition, the occupation of the Empire, including the capital Istanbul, created a serious shock among the Ottoman-Turkish intellegentsia. In this atmosphere, although many Ottoman Turks who had dedicated themselves to the ideal of *Turan* were still in Caucasia,⁷⁷ as a result of this collapse, the enthusiasm felt among the Pan-Turkists at the beginning of the war had remarkably decreased. For example, Ömer Seyfettin, who had written about conquering nearly all of Central Asia just after the entry of the Ottoman Empire into the Great War, in an article in *Kırım Mecmuası* (The Crimean Journal) published on 30 April 1918, modified his Pan-Turkist discourse, now saying "Turan is not a state, it is a cultural and national motherland"⁷⁸

⁷⁶ Zürcher, pp. 122-126.

⁷⁷ For example, in addition to the soldiers in the Ottoman army in Azerbaijani, many Ottoman-Turks like Sevkett Süreyya Aydemir went to Azerbaijan due to the cooperation treaty, signed on 4 June 1918 between the Ottoman Empire and the Azerbaijani government, which had declared its independence on 28 May 1918. In the treaty, the Azeris requested not only military aid but also teachers for their public education system, from the Ottoman Empire and many people went to Azarbaijan. Köroğlu, pp. 233-234.

⁷⁸ Ömer Seyfettin, "Büyük Türklüğü Parçalayan Kimlerdir?" *Kırım Mecmuası*, no. 1, 30 April 1918, in *Türklük Üzerine Yazılar*, pp. 107-112.

As for Yusuf Akcura, the pioneer of Pan-Turkism in the Ottoman Empire, he also revised his ideas related to Pan-Turkism in 1919. In a conference he gave at the Istanbul Turkish Hearth on 16 September 1919, he made a distinction between “democratic Turkism” and “imperialist Turkism” and rejected the latter, since it had irredentist tendencies.⁷⁹ In 1921, along with Mehmet Emin, he joined the Kemalist movement in Ankara, which worked to rescue the country from the occupation under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal, and was elected to parliament.

Another Pan-Turkist Ahmet Ağaoğlu, who became the Director of the Press Bureau in Ankara in 1921 and was elected to parliament after joining the Kemalist movement, in a interview with a French journalist in 1923, advocated Turkish nationalism against Pan-Turkist irredentism as follows:

Ankara is nationalist, renouncing the pretensions of the old Ottoman Empire; it wishes to establish a modest Turkish national home, restricted to the ethnographic Turkish frontiers...for that it needs peace.⁸⁰

These words, no doubt, were the result of real politics and Ağaoğlu was not the first person in the country to be keenly aware of the critical situation the country faced. For example, in the *Misak-ı Milli* (National Pact), which was accepted in the last Ottoman Assembly of Deputies on 28 January 1920 as a principal document that would determine the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire, the emphasis on the Turks had been limited to only the Turks living in Anatolia, instead of all Turks. On the other hand, Mustafa Kemal himself also rejected Pan-Turkism clearly within the framework of real politics. For instance, approximately two months after the declaration of the *Misak-ı Milli*, on 4 March 1920, in a telegram titled “*Basının Dikkate Alacağı Hususlar*” (The points to be paid attention to by the press), sent to the *Heyet-i Merkeziye* (Central

⁷⁹ Gerogeon, p. 129. For a summary of the conference see, Georgeon, pp. 173-174.

⁸⁰ Berthe Geoges Gulis, *La nouvelle Turquie*, 1924, pp. 230-231, cited in Landau, *Pan-Turkism*, p. 76.

Committee) by Mustafa Kemal, he recommended that the press “avoid *Turanist*⁸¹ and Pan-Islamist propaganda in their publications” and “declare that movements in Asia are movements aiming at achievement of the cause of independence by Muslim nations within their frontiers and nations.”⁸² The main reason for Mustafa Kemal’s anti-Pan-Turkist discourse was the relationship between the Kemalist movement and the Bolsheviks. Indeed, although both of these political movements were well aware of the ideological differences between them, their reciprocal needs and interests forced them to collaborate against the common enemy, Western imperialism, which supported the anti-Bolshevik groups in Russia and sought to divide Turkey into various influence zones.

Apart from the sympathy the Bolsheviks gained in the Kemalist circles by disclosing the secret wartime agreements of the Entente and repudiating extreme Russian claims on Turkey, crucial military material aid in order to fight against the occupying forces, mainly the Greeks, and diplomatic support were the principal factors that made the Bolsheviks important for the Kemalists.⁸³ On the other hand, the significance of the Straits to the Soviets made the Kemalist movement particularly attractive for the Bolsheviks. On the basis of this framework, after various rounds of official and secret negotiations, on 16 March 1921, the Treaty of Moscow was signed between the Soviets and the Turkish Grand National Assembly. Through this treaty, the

⁸¹ Italics are mine.

⁸² “*Alemi İslam hakkında neşriyatta Turanizm ve Panislamizm propagandasından tevakki ederek Asyadaki hareketlerin Müslüman milletler tarafından kendi hudutları ve milliyetleri dahilinde naili istiklal olmak davasından ibaret bulunduğunu ilan etmek. (Madde 4)*”, *Atatürk’ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, IV* (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1991), p. 251.

⁸³ For more detailed information on the Bolsheviks’ aid to the Kemalist movement in the National Struggle subject, see Stefanos Yerasimos, *Türk- Sovyet İlişkileri: Ekim Devriminden Milli Mücadeleye* (İstanbul: Gözlem Yayınları, 1979); and Bülent Gökay, *Bolşevizm ile Emperyalizm Arasında Türkiye (1918-1923)* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1997), pp. 116-141.

Soviets became the first state, which gave the Turkish Grand National Assembly diplomatic recognition.⁸⁴ In addition, the two regimes not only came to an agreement on the boundaries, but each also accepted to suppress political movements against the regime and the politics of the other. The eighth article of the Treaty of Moscow was evidence of this approach:

The contracting parts undertake to never accept in their respective territories the formation and settling of organizations or associations claiming to be the government of the other country or of a part of territory and organizations whose goal is to wage warfare against the other state. Russian and Turkey mutually undertake the same obligation with respect to the Soviet Republics of the Caucasus.⁸⁵

This article meant that the Kemalist movement would not support any Pan-Turkist activity within Turkey or the Soviet Union. On the other hand, in return to this, the Soviets would not support Bolshevism in Turkey. In this framework, the Kemalist movement not only used an anti Pan-Turkist discourse, but also tried to direct the personages who had gone to Russia to support the Turkic peoples against the Bolsheviks, to assist the Bolsheviks in order to create a territorial border between Turkey and the Soviets, which was crucial for transferring the Bolsheviks' military aid to Anatolia.⁸⁶ When 1923 came, the National Struggle, thanks to mainly Mustafa

⁸⁴ *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar*, ed. Baskın Oran (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001), pp. 173-174.

⁸⁵ “Bağıtlı taraflar, toprakları üzerinde karşı taraf ülkesinin ya da ona bağlı topraklardan birinin hükümeti rolünü üstlenmek savında bulunan örgüt ve grupların kurulmasını ya da yerleşmesini ve öteki ülkeye karşı savaşım amacıyla olan grupların yerleşmesini hiçbir zaman kabul etmemeyi yükümlenir. Türkiye ve Rusya, Kafkasya Sovyet Cumhuriyetleri için de karşılıklı olmak koşulu ile özdeş yükümlülükler üstlenirler.” *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası*, p. 174

⁸⁶ For example, in 1920, Kazım Karabekir, in a telegram he sent to Halil Pasha, who was in Azerbaijani at the time, recommended that Halil, Enver and Nuri Pasha support the Bolsheviks in creating a border between Turkey and the Soviets. Halil Kut, pp. 323-324. However, Enver Pasha pursued a very different policy. He went to Russia in the fall of 1920 and joined the Congress of the Peoples of the East, organized by the Bolsheviks in Baku as a delegate of North Africa. After the congress, he tried to get support of the Bolsheviks, but he could not and, in order to realize his Turanist dream, he joined the Basmachi movement, which fought against the Bolsheviks in order to create a united Turkestan. In Bukhara, he declared himself “Commander of the Great Revolutionary Turan armies.” However, he

Kemal's intelligent and congruous manoeuvres, had reached its main target, national independence and, in the same year, Mustafa Kemal, in a speech he gave at Eskişehir, declared his ideas with respect to Pan-Turkism more clearly. He said:

Neither Islamic union, nor Turanism can form a doctrine for us. Henceforth, the government policy of the new Turkey is to consist of living independently, relying on her sovereignty within her national frontiers.⁸⁷

These words were the harbinger of the new regime's attitude with respect to Pan-Turkism.

could not succeed at organizing a common resistance front among the Turkic peoples against the Bolsheviks. He died on 4 August 1922 in Bukhara, fighting against the Bolsheviks. For more information on Enver Pasha's actions in Russia, see Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *Makedonya'dan Orta Asya'ya Enver Paşa*, vol. 3 (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1998), pp. 540-653. And also see, Zeki Velidi Togan, *Hatıralar, Türkistan ve Diğer Müslüman Doğu Türklerinin Milli Varlık ve Kültür Mücadeleleri* (İstanbul: Hikmet Gazetecilik Ltd. Sti., 1969), pp. 384-396; 456-458.

⁸⁷ Charles Hostler, "Trends in Pan-Turanism" in *Middle Eastern Affairs* 3, no. 1 (January 1952) p. 3.

CHAPTER TWO

PAN-TURKISM IN THE REPUBLICAN ERA

The struggle for independence from foreign occupation, organized after the First World War under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal, culminated in the founding a new state and a republican regime under the governance of the *Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası* (Republican People's Party) (RPP) in 1923. The transformation from the Ottoman Empire into a republic reduced Turkey from a major power into, relatively, a small state. In other words, the new Turkey was smaller and had a fairly more homogeneous structure when compared to the Ottoman Empire. First of all, the demographic structure of Turkey had changed fundamentally. For instance, the Ottoman population within the present day Turkey was around 17-18 million in 1913 and, approximately, twenty per cent of this population was non-Muslim. However, according to the 1927 census, mainly due to the Armenian deportation, deaths in the wars and the population exchange between Turkey and Greece, the total population was 13.6 million, of which non-Muslims accounted for only 2.6 per cent.⁸⁸ Moreover, there was a serious

⁸⁸ Çağlar Keyder, *State and Class in Turkey: A Study in Capitalist Development Study* (London; New York: Verso, 1987), pp. 79-80.

imbalance in the population structure. Because of the large number of deaths among males, in 1927, the majority of the population was female, and widows, especially in western Anatolia, accounted for thirty per cent of the female population.⁸⁹ Due to these radical changes in the population, Turkey had lost an important part of its human resources, which were necessary for a country like Turkey with an economy based mainly on agricultural production. In addition, for more than a decade beginning in 1912, the infrastructure of the country had been ravaged badly due to a series of wars including the Balkan Wars, the First World War and the War of Independence.⁹⁰ Within this framework, the principal target of the new regime in Turkey was to reconstruct the country and to create an independent nation state within the new borders. During the İzmir Economic Congress, which was held in 1923, Mustafa Kemal himself explained the main priority of the new Turkey as follows: “The new Turkish state will not be a warrior state. However, the new Turkish state will be an economic state.”⁹¹

In other words, The Turkic peoples living in outside the new borders, therefore, were not on the agenda of the Kemalist regime in Turkey. Mustafa Kemal reiterated his negative approach to Pan-Turkism during his reign in the Republican era. In his famous six-day speech, *Nutuk*, given in 1927, he said:

It is unattainable goal to unite all the Turks on the earth in a one state by ignoring all boundaries. This is reality established by centuries and by the people who lived in the course of those centuries, through very painful and

⁸⁹ Frederic C. Shorter, “The Population of Turkey After the War of Independence” in *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 17 (1985) p. 429.

⁹⁰ For example, after the War of Independence, the infrastructure of the country was so bad that while the cost of transporting one ton of wheat from central Anatolia to Istanbul in 1924 was \$8.8, it was only \$5 from New York to Istanbul. Korkut Boratav, “Kemalist Economic Policies and Etatism” in *Atatürk, Founder of a Modern State*, ed. Aykut Kazancıgil and Ergun Özbudun (London: C. Hurst, 1981), p. 165.

⁹¹ “*Yeni Türkiye Devleti cihangir bir Devlet olmayacaktır. Fakat yeni Türkiye Devleti, bir İktisat Devleti olacaktır...*” Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *İkinci Adam (1884-1938)*, vol. 1 (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2000), p. 340.

very bloody events. There is nothing in history to show how the policy of Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism could have succeeded or how they could have found a basis for their realization on this earth.⁹²

Having said this, Mustafa Kemal explained his own national policy:

When I speak of national policy, I mean it in this sense: To work within our national boundaries for the real happiness and welfare of the nation and the country, by above all, relying on our own strength in order to retain our existence. We must not lead the people to follow fictitious aims, of whatever nature, which can only bring them misfortune, we except from the civilized world a civilized human treatment, friendship based on mutuality.⁹³

These words were a clear expression of the Kemalist regime's attitude with respect to Pan-Turkism. In this framework, many prominent Pan-Turkist intellectuals of the Ottoman period joined the ranks of the Kemalist regime by revising their ideas related to Pan-Turkism. For example, Yusuf Akçura, after the proclamation of the republic, declared that "the republic of Turkey was the embodiment of all Pan-Turkism's desires."⁹⁴ Besides, he never mentioned "the Russian Turks" in his writings during the 1920s.⁹⁵ That is to say, Akçura had abandoned "the ideal of great Turan" and

⁹² "...hiçbir hudut tanımayarak, dünyada mevcut bütün Türkleri bir devlet haline getirmek, gayri kabil-i istihsal bir hedeftir. Bu, asırların ve asırlarca yaşamakta olan insanları çok acı, çok kanlı hadisat ile meydana koyduğu bir hakikattir. Panislamizm, Panturanizm siyasetinin muvaffak olduğunu ve dünyayı saha-i tatbik yapılabildiğine tarihte tesadüf edilememektedir." Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, *Nutuk* (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1991), p. 387.

⁹³ "...Milli siyaset dediğim zaman, kasdettiğim mana ve melul şudur: Hudud-u milliyemiz dahilinde, her şeyden evvel kendi kuvvetimize müsteniden muhafaza-i mevcudiyet ederek millet ve memleketin hakiki saadet ve umarına çalışmak... Alelülak tül-i emeller peşinde milleti işgal ve ızzar etmemek... Medeni cihandan, medeni ve insani muameleye ve mütakabil dostluğa intikal etmektir.", *ibid.*, pp. 387-388.

⁹⁴ Landau, *Pan-Turkism*, p. 76.

⁹⁵ According to Georgeon, the only exception of Akçura's attitude was expressed in *Türk Yıllığı* (The Turkish Almanac) Georgeon, *ibid.*, p. 129. *Türk Yıllığı*, consisting of Akçura's articles with respect to Turkism, was published in 1928 in the Arabic alphabet. In addition to the history of Turkism and Turks in the Turkish Republic, the almanac also contained articles related to the outside Turks. For example, one of the articles in the almanac was "*Cumhuriyet Haricinde Bulunan Türkler*" (The Turks living outside of the frontiers of the rebuplic). In his work, although Akçura had stated that the almanac would also be published in the following year, he could not realize his project. Köroğlu, p. 103. fn. 44. Akçura, who had been an influential figure not only on Pan-Turkists in Turkey but also in the Turkic world, could not publish *Türk Yıllığı* again, most probably due to the Kemalist regime's negative attitude toward Pan-Turkism.

restricted his ideas to merely the new Turkey.⁹⁶ Other old Pan-Turkists, such as Ahmet Ağaoğlu, Mehmet Emin Yurdakul and Moiz Kohen abandoned Pan-Turkism and started to support the Kemalist regime. For example, in 1936, Moiz Kohen wrote a book, *Kemalizm* (Kemalism), which tried to explain Kemalist ideology. For Kohen, “Kemalism was not only a word, but maybe even the ideology which dominated the destiny of the state and the Turkish nation.”⁹⁷ As a consequence of this process, Pan-Turkism, which was rejected clearly by the Kemalist regime, was no longer a serious alternative ideology for the great majority of intellectuals in the country and it lost considerable momentum. However, it did not totally disappear in the country. There was still a vein that nourished Pan-Turkism. For instance, in 1923, Ziya Gökalp,⁹⁸ the main figure who had popularized the idea of the great Turan in the Ottoman period, summarized his own ideas with respect to Turkish nationalism in his famous book, which was published in Ankara under the title *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (The Principles of Turkism). In this book, Gökalp, having described Mustafa Kemal as “the greatest man of Turkism”,⁹⁹ defined nation by emphasizing a cultural unity instead of a racial one as follows:

“Nation is not a racial or ethnic or geographical or political or volitional group. Nation is a group, composed of individuals who share a common language, religion, morality and aesthetics, that is to say, who have received the same education.”¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ Georgeon, p. 129.

⁹⁷ “*Kemalizm, artık, sadece hakikati, yani temel inkılapları, Yüksek bir Önderin tahakkuk ettirdiği teceddüt hareketlerini ifade eden müphem bir tabirden ibaret değil, belki, devletin ve Türk milletinin mukadderatına hakim olan ideoloji haline gelmiştir.*” Tekin Alp, *Kemalizm* (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Gazete ve Matbaası, 1936), p. 19.

⁹⁸ Gökalp was also elected to parliament as deputy of Diyarbakır in 1923.

⁹⁹ Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1996), p. 15.

¹⁰⁰ “*Millet, ne ırki, ne kavmi, ne coğrafi, ne siyasi, ne de iradi bir zümre değildir. Millet, dilce, dince, ahlakça, ve güzellik duygusu bakımından müşterek olan, yani aynı terbiyeyi almış fertlerden mürekkep bulunan bir topluluktur.*” Gökalp, p. 22.

On the basis of this cultural framework, Gökâlp, restricted his program of Pan-Turkism,

which

co

35

me:

The prospect of uniting one hundred million Turks in a single nation is a source of great rapture for Turks. Turkism would not have spread so rapidly if the ideal of Turan had not existed. But, who knows? Perhaps it will be possible in the future to make the ideal of Turan a reality. The ideal is the creator of the future. A national state which was only a spectral ideal for the Turks yesterday, has today become the reality of Turkey.¹⁰²

In other words, Pan-Turkism, as a far dream, was still on Gökâlp's agenda. In addition to Gökâlp, Şemseddin Günaltay (1883-1961), a famous professor of Islamic history and one of the prominent members of the CUP,¹⁰³ published a book titled *Maziden Atiye* (From the past to the future) the same year. In his book, Günaltay, having described Cenral Asia as the motherland of the Turks,¹⁰⁴ continuously emphasized that the Turks, the noble and heroic nation of the Central Asia steppes, had founded various great civilizations and states in Asia. Moreover, for him, the Ottoman

¹⁰¹ Gökâlp, pp. 24-27.

¹⁰² "Yüz milyon Türkün bir millet halinde birleşmesi, Türkçüler için en kuvvetli bir vecid kaynağıdır. Turan mefkuresi olmasaydı, Türkçülük bu kadar süratle yayılmayacaktı. Bununla beraber, kim bilir ? Belkide gelecekte Turan mefkuresinin gerçekleşmesi de mümkün olacaktır. Mefkure, geleceğin yaratıcısıdır. Dün Türkler için hayali bir mefkure halinde bulunan milli devlet, bugün Türkiye'de bir gerçek halini almıştır.", Gökâlp, pp. 27-28.

¹⁰³ For more detailed information on Günaltay, see Fahrettin Altun, "M. Şemseddin Günaltay" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 6, *İslamcılık*, ed. Yasin Aktay (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004), pp. 160-173.

¹⁰⁴ Şemseddin Günaltay, *Maziden Atiye* (İstanbul: Marifet Yayınları, 1998), pp. 30-55.

Empire was only a pseudo-Turkish state since it had been governed by non-Turkish elements.¹⁰⁵ In this way, Günaltay became one of the inspiration sources of the Pan-Turkist ideology by directing his readers' attention to Central Asia, where there were still many Turkic peoples.

Another reason for this anti Pan-Turkist approach in the 1920s was the positive relationship between the Kemalist regime and the Soviet Union, which had started during the National Struggle. After the proclamation of republic, this relationship had continued on the basis of mutual interests. On 17 December 1925, the two countries signed a Treaty of Neutrality and Friendship, which would be renewed in 1929 and 1935.¹⁰⁶ As a result of the good relationship between Turkey and the Soviets, Pan-Turkism, which had always had an irredentist dimension that disturbed the Soviets, was frowned upon or discouraged by the Kemalist regime. In accordance with this foreign policy,¹⁰⁷ the Kemalist regime increased its control over the Turkish Hearths, which had been the principal center of the Pan-Turkist ideas in the Ottoman period.

The Hearths were reorganized in April 1924.¹⁰⁸ At the first congress of the Turkish Hearths, which was held on 23-25 April 1924 in Ankara, the Hearths adopted a liberal concept of Turkishness, stressing "sharing sentiments of Turkishness," without giving priority to language or religion.¹⁰⁹ At the congress, Hamdullah Suphi

¹⁰⁵ Günaltay, pp. 67-68; 173-175.

¹⁰⁶ *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası*, pp. 315-320.

¹⁰⁷ The reciprocal good relationship, especially in the economic area, between Turkey and the Soviet Unions continued during the first half of the 1930s. For instance, Prime Minister İsmet İnönü visited the Soviet Union in April 1932 and arranged for an eight million dollar loan, which was crucial for the industrialization of Turkey, which had been affected negatively by the great depression. In addition, in 1934, Turkey put the first five-year industrial plan into practice with the help of Soviet advisers. Yahya S. Tezel, *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000), p. 213.

¹⁰⁸ The Turkish Hearths had ended their activities in 1920 due to the pressure of the Britain. Sarımay, pp. 227-228.

(Tanrıöver), the president of the Turkish Hearths, described the main objective of the Hearths as preserving the Turkish culture and defending the Kemalist reforms.¹¹⁰ However, in spite of the Turkish Hearths' commitment to the Kemalist regime, they had still some Pan-Turkist tendencies, even if they were on the cultural basis. For example, the second article of the new charter of the Turkish Hearths, which were accepted at the first congress, emphasized all Turks, including the outside Turks as follows: "The purpose of the Turkish Hearth is to strive for the strengthening of the national consciousness, *among all Turks*,¹¹¹ to explore the Turkish culture and to provide for the civilized and hygienic evolution and the growth of the national economy."¹¹²

In 1927, despite the opposition by Hamdullah Suphi, the Turkish Hearths were placed under the control of the RPP by the fortieth article of the new party program. In addition, they were forced to redefine the geographical domain of its activities and the initial target group of all Turks was replaced by the population of the Turkish republic in an amendment of its program in 1927.¹¹³ Four years later, in March 1931, Mustafa Kemal declared that the Hearths would be incorporated in the RPP as follows:

Why are the Turkish Hearths being incorporated into the RPP? In the history of nations, there are some periods in which all moral and material forces must be amassed and oriented towards the same direction in order to reach specific aims. I saw it suitable that the Turkish Hearths, which ever since their foundation date faithfully have worked for the publication and propagation of principles of populism and nationalism in the scientific area and performed very valuable services in this way, should be incorporated in my party, which has realized the same principles in the political and

¹⁰⁹ Frank Tachau, "The Search for National Identity among the Turks" in *Die Welt des Islams*, vol. 8, no. 3, 1963, pp. 172-173.

¹¹⁰ Landau, *Pan-Turkism*, p. 77.

¹¹¹ Italics are mine.

¹¹² "Türk Ocağı'nın maksadı bütün Türkler arasında milli şuurun takviyesine, Türk harsının meydana çıkarılmasına, medeni sıhhi tekamüle ve milli iktisadın inkişafına çalışmaktır." Füsün Üstel, *İmparatorluktan Ulus-Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği: Türk Ocakları (1912-1931)* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1997), p. 162.

¹¹³ Üstel, pp. 227-231.

practical area. My decision is an expression of my faith and confidence about the national establishment. Forces of the same kind must unite in the common purpose.¹¹⁴

As a result of this declaration, at the general council of the Turkish Hearths, held on 10 April 1931, the Turkish Hearth abolished itself and incorporated with the RPP.¹¹⁵ After this decision, Hamdullah Suphi was sent into diplomatic exile as the Turkish Representative to the Bucharest Embassy. In 1932, the Hearths were replaced by the *Halk Evleri* (People's Houses), which were totally controlled by the RPP and established with the purpose of diffusing the Kemalist revolution to the people.¹¹⁶ When the Turkish Hearths were closed, they numbered 266 branches and 32,000 members.¹¹⁷

The main reason that motivated the Kemalist regime to close down the Turkish Hearths was not the Pan-Turkist tendencies of the Hearths. According to Mete Tunçay, Mustafa Kemal regarded the Hearths as an autonomous center of opposition to his own sovereignty and, consequently, decided to restrain them through incorporation.¹¹⁸ On the other hand, due to some reasons such as the negative effect of the world economic crisis of 1929-1930 (the Great Depression) on the Turkish economy,¹¹⁹ serious

¹¹⁴ "Türk Ocakları Halk Fırkası ile Niçin birleştiriliyor? Milletlerin tarihinde bazı devirler vardır ki, muayyen maksatlara erebilmek için maddi ve manevi ne kadar kuvvet varsa hepsini biraraya getirmek ve aynı istikamete sevk etmek lazımdır...Kuruluş tarihinden beri ilmi sahada halkçılık ve milliyetçilik akidelerini neşir ve tamime sadakat ve imanla çalışan ve bu yolda memnuniyete mucip hizmetleri sebkemiş olan Türk Ocaklarının aynı esasları siyasi ve tatbiki sahada tahakkuk ettiren fırkamla ve bütün manasıyla yekvücut olacak çalışmalarını münasip gördüm...Bu kararım ise milli müessese hakkında duyduğum itimat ve emniyetin ifadesidir. Aynı cinsten olan kuvvetler müşterek gayede birleşmelidirler." *Cumhuriyet*, 24-25 March 1931, cited in Büşra Ersanlı, *İktidar ve Tarih Türkiye'de "Resmi Tarih Tezi"nin Oluşumu (1929-1937)* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003), p. 113.

¹¹⁵ Üstel, p. 382.

¹¹⁶ Asım Karaömerlioğlu, "Tek Parti Döneminde Halk Evleri ve Halkçılık," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no: 88 (Spring 2001), pp. 164-165.

¹¹⁷ Sarımay, p. 245.

¹¹⁸ Mete Tunçay, *Türkiye'de Tek-Parti Yönetimi'nin Kurulması (1923-1931)* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999), pp. 306-309.

opposition to the regime had crystallized with the experiment of the *Serbest Fırka* (Free Party) in 1930,¹²⁰ the effect of the ideological atmosphere in Europe on the regime¹²¹ and the lack of interest in the revolution among the intelligentsia,¹²² the Kemalist regime, in particular from the early 1930s, started to gain a much more ideological stance.

¹¹⁹ The Great Depression, which started with the New York Stock Exchange crash of 1929 and spread throughout the world rapidly, influenced the Turkish economy, which was based on mainly agriculture, very negatively. First of all, there was a sharp decline in the prices of agricultural commodities. The prices of the leading crops, wheat and other cereals declined by more than 60 percent from 1928/1929 to 1932/1933. As for the prices of leading export crops such as tobacco and cotton, they also declined approximately 50 percent. Roger Owen, Şevket Pamuk, *A History of Middle East Economies in the Twentieth Century* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1998), p. 16. In addition, only within the year of 1929, 1,100 firms went bankrupt or ceased operations in the country. Çağlar Keyder, “The Political Economy of Turkish Democracy” in *Turkey Transition: New Perspectives*, ed. Irvin C. Schick and Ertuğrul Ahmet Tonak (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 62. As a result, due to the collapse of the economy, the great depression created, in particular more commercialized areas, a serious opposition to the RPP.

¹²⁰ The Free Party was found under the leadership of Fethi Okyar (1880-1943) with the permission and advice of Mustafa Kemal in August 1930. Because of the economic crisis in the country, the party was created mainly with the purpose of economic alternatives and criticism. Mustafa Kemal himself named the new party as the Free Party and approved its program, which advocated a more liberal economy policy when compared to that of the RPP. In addition, in order to prove his good faith, he also announced that his close friends, including his own sister Makbule, would join the new party. The Free Party met with unexpected support in various areas of the country, especially in the rich farming areas of the Western Anatolia. In October 1930, just two months after its foundation, local elections were held and the party managed to win 30 of the 512 mayoralities. Although it was a small figure, this unexpected success not only surprised but also disturbed the RPP and the Free Party dissolved itself in November 1930 as a result of pressure from the RPP. Zürcher, pp. 185-187. However, the Free Party experiment was further evidence of widespread discontent in the country and opposition to the RPP. For a good description of discontent among the people in the 1930s, see Ahmet Hamdi Başar, *Atatürk’le Üç Ay ve 1930’dan Sonra Türkiye* (İstanbul: Tan Matbaası, 1945)

¹²¹ In the inter-war period, many authoritarian or totalitarian regimes came to power in Europe. For example, the Fascists in Italy in 1922 and the Nazis in Germany in 1933 came to power. In 1932, Oliveira Salazar became Prime Minister in Portugal and founded an authoritarian regime; and in 1936, General Metaxas followed Salazar by establishing another authoritarian regime in Greece. That is to say, as noted by Eric Hobsbawm, Europe witnessed the “fall of liberalism” and the rise of authoritarian regimes. Eric Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991* (London: Abacus, 1995), pp.109-141. In this process, many Kemalist intellectuals like Mahmut Esat Bozkurt or Recep Peker were influenced by these regimes, in particular by Italian fascism, which aimed to suppress the class conflict in society by creating an organic society, and its youth organizations. In other words, the rise of authoritarianism in Europe was among the factors that inspired the Kemalist regime to create an authoritarian state apparatus. For the influence of Fascism on the mainstream Kemalist elite, see Cennet Ünver, “Images and Perceptions of Fascism among the Mainstream Kemalist Elite, 1931-1934” (Master’s thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2001)

¹²² After a long reform process in the country, the enthusiasm for revolution among the Kemalist intelligentsia was declining. For example, in 1934, Falih Rıfkı Atay and Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, two leading Kemalist of the time, complained about the lack of interest among the intelligentsia, arguing that even fashion exhibits interested the ruling elite more than the vital problems of the country. Asım Karaömerlioğlu, “The Village Institutes Experience in Turkey,” *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 25, no. 1 (May 1998), p.49.

In 1931, at the Third Party Congress, the RPP proclaimed the regime as a single-party state and the Six Arrows, (*Altı Ok*), the basic principles of the RPP, consisted of republicanism, nationalism, populism, secularism, etatism and revolutionism, were officially included the party program.¹²³ The Six Arrows were also incorporated in the Constitution in 1937. At the Fourth Party Congress, which was held in 1935, the Secretary-General of the RPP was combined with the Minister of the Interior and the governors were appointed as the presidents of the party organizations in the cities.¹²⁴ As a result, the Kemalist regime consolidated itself strongly by uniting the party with the state.

In these consolidation process, in addition to the closure of the Turkish Hearths, the *Türk Matbuat Birliği* (Union of the Turkish Press), the *Türk Kadınlar Birliği* (Turkish Women's Union), the *Türk İhtiyat Zabitleri Cemiyeti* (Turkish Reserve Officers' Association), the *Türk Mason Locaları* (Turkish Mason's Lodges), the *Milli Türk Talebe Birliği* (National Union of the Turkish Students), *Yarın* (Tomorrow) newspaper, which was edited by Arif Oruç and supported the Free Party, and *Kadro* journal, which was published by a group of intellectual such as Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Burhan Asaf Belge, Vedat Nedim Tör, İsmail Hüsrev Tökin and Mehmet Şevki Yazman in order to theorize Kemalism and revive the enthusiasm for it, were closed down or forced to dissolve themselves by the regime. In other words, the Kemalist regime took all political activities or organizations, including

¹²³ The definition of motherland in the RPP's program in 1931 was an obvious rejection of Pan-Turkist desires by the Kemalist regime one more time. According to the program, the Turkish motherland consisted of only the national borders at the time. "The motherland is the 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 depth of the soil." "*Vatan, Türk milletinin eski ve yüksek tarihi ve topraklarının derinliklerinde mevcudiyetlerini muhafaza eden eserleri ile yaşadığı bugünkü siyasi sınırlar içindeki yurttur.*" *CHF Nizamnamesi ve Programı (1931)* (Ankara: TBMM Matbaası, 1931), p. 29.

¹²⁴ Kemal H. Karpat, *Turkey's Politics: The Transition to a Multi-Party System* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1959), pp. 68-73.

cultural ones, under its own control in the 1930s.¹²⁵ Under these conditions, the Pan-Turkists in new Turkey found themselves in a position that was fundamentally different from that of the late Ottoman period and not only Pan-Turkish ideology lost momentum, but also the numbers of the Pan-Turkist publications decreased remarkably due to mainly the reasons mentioned above.

The Turkish History Thesis and Pan-Turkism

Parallel to this consolidation process, one of the main goals of the Kemalist regime in the 1930s was to create a new Turkish identity based on secular values. In this sense, the Turkish History Thesis, claiming that the Turkish nation was brachycephalic and belonged to the Aryan race that had come from Central Asia, which had established great civilizations in Egypt, Mesopotamia and Anatolia like the Hittites and Sumerians, was an important founding stone of this new Turkish identity.¹²⁶ The

¹²⁵ Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, in a speech, given to the parliament on 6 August 1951, commented on the Kemalist regime's this attitude by emphasizing the effect of the European authoritarian regimes on Kemalism at the time as follows:

"The National Union of Turkish Students, The Association of Teachers, the Turkish Hearths, the Turkish Press Union, the Turkish Reserve Officers' Association, the Turkish Women's Union, etc. A lot of self-destruction! These events are a very sorrowful stage of our recent history. The reason that has been declared is the aim to collect all forces in one hand. The example is clear. There are Narodnik and Komsomol under the order of a single party in Russia. The Hitler Jugend organization is under the order of a single party in Germany. The willpower of the chief is absolute. The single party of this chief Mussolini has founded, the Balilla organization, is under the order of the party. Marshal Antonescu leads the Iron Guard organization. These are examples and influential sources." *"Talebe Birlikleri, Muallimler Birliği, Türk Ocakları, Gazeteciler Cemiyeti, İhtiyar Subaylar Cemiyeti, Türk Kadınlar Birliği ve saire, bir sürü intihar! Bu vakalar yakın tarihimizin çok hazin bir safhasıdır. Sebep, ilan edilmiş olan sebep şu bütün kuvvetleri bir elde toplamak arzusudur. Misal saridir. Rusya'da bir Narodnikom ve Kumsamol var tek partinin emrinde. Almanya'da tek parti ve onun emrinde Hitler Jugend teşkilatı var. Şefin iradesi mutlakdır. Bu şef Mussolini'nin tek partisi de partinin emrinde Balilla teşkilatını kurdu. Mareşal Antonesku Demir Muhafızlar teşkilatının başındadır. İşte misaller, işte sirayet membarları."* Çetin Yetkin, *Türkiye'de Tek Parti Yönetimi 1930-1945* (İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi, 1983), p. 62.

¹²⁶ The thesis had been already created by a committee, mainly consisting of Afet İnan, Mehmet Tevfik Bıyıklıoğlu, Samih Rifat, Hasan Cemil Çambel, Sadri Maksudi Arsal, Reşit Galip, Yusuf Akçura and Semseddin Günaltay. Although the thesis was officially introduced to the public opinion at the first Congress of Turkish History, held in July 1932 in Ankara, it had been formerly depicted by the people, who were close to the Kemalist regime. For example, In the last meeting of the Turkish Hearths General Assembly, convened on 28 April 1930, Afet İnan, who was among the creators of the thesis, in the

principal objective of the Kemalist regime in the Turkish History Thesis was to prove that Anatolia had been the Turkish homeland from the earliest times that the Turks were European by race, and finally to legitimize the separation from the Ottoman past and Islam. Through the Turkish History Thesis, the regime could gain the theoretical framework that was essential to creating a new Turkish identity by otherizing the Ottoman heritage.¹²⁷ The Kemalist regime mainly benefited from the textbooks that were used in the high schools in order to indoctrinate the younger generation with the doctrine. Within this framework, the first attempt of the Kemalist regime to constitute an official history thesis was *Türk Tarihinin Anahatları* (the Main Lines of Turkish History), which was written in 1930. Although only 100 copies of *Türk Tarihinin Anahatları* were printed to introduce it to historians for criticism, it provided the main basis of the history textbooks that would be written in the next years. The objectives of the book were explained by the authors in the introduction part as follows:

This book has been written with regard to a certain aim. Until now most of the history books published in our country, and French history books that were the source of those books consciously or unconsciously, underrated the role of the Turks in world history. Receiving such false information about their own ancestors has been harmful for the Turks to know themselves and to improve their identities. The real purpose, which is aimed at in this book, is to correct these errors that are harmful for our nation that has regained its real position in the world and today lives consciously and, at the same time, this is the first step taken in front of the need to write a history for the Turkish nation, which feels the emotion of unity and identity in its spirit due

presence of Atatürk, made a speech, in which she declared the Turkish History Thesis to some extent in the following words: “The most superior and the first civilized groups of humanity are the Turks, whose motherland was Altai and Central Asia. Those who established the principles of Chinese civilization were the Turks. In Mesopotamia, in Persia even 7,000 years before Christ, the first human civilization was built and historical times were begun by the Turks, who were at the time given names such as Sumerians, Acadians and Elam. The autochthon inhabitants of the delta in Egypt and the founders of the Egyptian civilization were the Turks.” “*Beşeriyetin en yüksek ve ilk medeni kavmi, vatani Altaylar ve Orta Asya olan Türklerdir. Çin medeniyetinin esasını kuran Türklerdir. Mezopotamya’da İran’da milattan en aşağı 7000 sene evvel beşeriyetin ilk medeniyetini kuran ve beşeriyete ilk tarih devrini açan; Sümer, Akat ve Alam isimleri verilmekte olan Türklerdir. Mısır’da deltenin otkton sakinleri ve Mısır medeniyetinin kurucusu olan Türklerdir.*” Uluğ İğdemir, *Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında Türk Tarih Kurumu* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1973), pp. 68-69.

¹²⁷ Suavi Aydın, “Cumhuriyet’in İdeolojik Şekillenmesinde Antropolijinin Rolü: Irkçı Paradigmanın Yükselişi ve Düşüşü” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 2, *Kemalizm*, ed. Ahmet İnsel (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001), p. 345.

to the recent great events. With this, we want to open a way to the origins of our nation's creative abilities, uncover the secrets of genius and characters of the Turkish, show the peculiarity and strength of the Turkish to himself and to explain that our national progress depends on deep racial roots. Through this experience, we do not claim that we have written the national history that we need, but we only show a general way and target to those who will study this subject.¹²⁸

In order to reach these aims, the book, which consisted of 605 pages, or in other words, the Kemalist regime, directed its attention to Central Asia. For example, while the place allotted to Ottoman history was only fifty pages in the book, it allotted 205 pages to the Turkish civilization in Central Asia. In addition, the book indicated Central Asia as the real motherland of the Turks:

The Turks, who have spread civilization to the whole world, have founded high civilizations in Central Asia, which is their real motherland, in various periods. However, the Turkish civilization in Central Asia could not progress continuously. In order to understand the reasons for this, the climatic conditions in Central Asia should be considered.¹²⁹

Since Atatürk and some historians found it insufficient, *Türk Tarihinin Anahatları* was not distributed to schools. However, a year later, in 1931, 30,000 copies of a condensed version were printed and distributed to schools throughout the country under the name *Türk Tarihinin Anahatları: Medhal Kısmı* (The Main Lines of

¹²⁸ “Bu kitap muayyen bir maksat gözetilerek yazılmıştır. Şimdiye kadar memleketimizde neşrolunan tarih kitaplarından çoğunda ve onlara mehz olan Fransızca tarih kitaplarında Türklerin dünya tarihindeki rolleri şuurlu veya şuursuz olarak küçültülmüştür. Türklerin, ecdat hakkında böyle yanlış malumat alması, Türklüğün kendini tanımasında, benliğini inkişaf ettirmesinde zararlı olmuştur. Bu kitapta istihdaf olunan asıl gaye, bugün bütün dünyada tabii mevkinin istirdat eden ve şuurla yaşayan milletimiz için zararlı olan bu hataların tashihine çalışmaktır, aynı zamanda bu, son büyük hadiselerle ruhunda benlik ve birlik duygusu uyanan Türk milleti için bir tarih yazmak ihtiyacı önünde atılmış ilk adımdır. Bununla, milletimizin yaratıcı kabiliyetlerine giden yolu açmak, Türk deha ve seciyesinin esrarını meydana çıkarmak, Türkün husisiyet ve kuvvetini kendine göstermek, ve milli inkişafımızın derin ırki köklere bağlı olduğunu anlatmak istiyoruz. Bu tecrübe ile muhtaç olduğumuz o büyük milli tarihi yazdığımızı iddia etmiyoruz, yalnız bu hususta çalışacaklara umumi bir istikamet ve hedef gösteriyoruz.” Ersanlı, p. 122.

¹²⁹ “Bütün dünyaya medeniyet neşretmiş olan Türkler asıl vatanları olan Orta Asya’da muhtelif devirlerde yüksek medeniyetler tesis etmişlerdir. Fakat Orta Asya’da Türk medeniyeti normal bir suretle, fasılasız inkişaf edememiştir. Bunun sebeblerini anlamak için Orta Asya’nın iklimi ahvalini göz önünde tutmak gerekir.”, Ersanlı, p. 123.

Turkish History: Introduction Part)¹³⁰ In this condensed version, which consisted of 87 pages, the main emphasis was on Central Asia once again and the Ottoman Empire was totally absent.¹³¹

The Kemalist regime continued its revisionist approach to history by publishing various textbooks. In accordance with this attitude, in 1933, *Ortamektepler İçin Tarih* (History for the secondary schools) was published. In addition to emphasis on Central Asia, the book also exalted the Turks as a race. For instance, the second section of the book began with a comment on the importance of the Turkish race as follows:

The Turkish race, which has created the greatest currents of the history, is a race that has retained its own identity the most. Nevertheless, in both historical and prehistoric times, it mixed with neighboring races, which lived in the countries abroad, seized by the Turks, and in their frontiers. However, because the features of Turkish race have remained unaltered in the majority of this mixture, the Turkish race has not lost its own characteristic...The Turkish race, which has always exhibited a conspicuous unity in history, is a great human community to be called a nation today and has been so in the past with its obvious physical characteristics, common language and culture, which has been transmitted with that language, and common historical memories.¹³²

Büşra Ersanlı, who has written a comprehensive book on the Turkish Historical Thesis, writes that the history textbooks, published by the Kemalist regime “exalted the Turks as a “race” and stressed that they founded a great civilization and underlined the

¹³⁰ Ersanlı, pp. 121-124.

¹³¹ For more detailed information on the book, see *Türk Tarihinin Anahatları: Medhal Kısım* (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931).

¹³² “Tarihin en büyük cereyanlarını yaratmış olan Türk ırkı, benliğini en çok korumuş olan bir ırktır. Bununla beraber gerek tarih zamanlarında gerek tarihten evvelki zamanlarda yayıldığı geniş ülkelerde ve sınırlarında yaşayan komşu ırklarla da karışmıştır. Yalnız bu karışmanın ekserisinde Türk ırkının vasıfları olduğu gibi kaldığından Türk ırkı kendi hususiyetini kaybetmemiştir...Tarihte her vakit göze çarpan bir birlik gösteren Türk ırkı, daima üstün kalan bariz uzvi vasıflarıyla müşterek dilleriyle ve bu dille naklaedilmiş kültürleriyle, müşterek tarihi hatıralarıyla bugün olduğu gibi dün de budun denecek büyük bir insane topluluğudur.” *OrtaMektep İçin Tarih I*, third edition (Ankara: Marif Vekaleti, 1936), pp. 20-21.

Another reflection of the Turkish History Thesis was the Sun-Language Theory, which was officially introduced to Turkish public opinion at the third Language Congress, held in August 1936 in Istanbul. According to this theory, the first language in the world was a primitive language spoken by the Turks of Central Asia. The Turks, who had created the first word in order to explain the sun, had spread that language throughout the world through immigrations.¹³⁶ That is to say, Turkish was the mother of all languages in the world. The Kemalist regime, which had started a reform movement in the Turkish language by means of the Latinization of the Arabic alphabet and the expulsion of words of Arabic and Persian origin from Turkish in previous years, aimed not only to legitimize the separation of the Ottoman past and Islam,¹³⁷ but also to complement the Turkish History Thesis by benefiting from the Sun-Language theory. However, it also placed Central Asia at the center of the Sun-Language theory like the Turkish History Thesis.

Paralell to these theses exalting Cenral Asia, at the same time, symbols related to Central Asia such as the grey wolf (*Bozkurt*) were popularized by the regime itself in variuos media. For example, the grey wolf was printed on banknotes of 5 and 10 TL, which remained in circulation between 1927 and 1948¹³⁸ and, begin with 1922, it was also used on stamps.¹³⁹ Furthermore, the grey wolf was also the official emblem of the

¹³⁶ Etienne Copeaux, *Tarih Ders Kitaplarında (1931-1993) Türk Tarih Tezinden Türk-İslam Sentezine*, trans. Ali Berkay (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000), pp. 49-50.

¹³⁷ For example, Şemseddin Günaltay, in 1938, expressed one of the aims of the Sun-Language theory in his book, *Dil ve Tarih Tezlerimiz Üzerine Gerekli Bazı İzahlar* (Some Necesseray Explanations on Our Language and History Thesis) by saying “ Turkish language was rescued from the yoke of Islam through this Sun-Language theory.” Şemseddin Günaltay, Hasan Reşit Tankut, *Dil ve Tarih Tezlerimiz Üzerine Gerekli Bazı İzahlar* (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1938), p. 27.

¹³⁸ Cüneyt Ölçer, *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Kağıt Paraları: 1923-1983* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1983), pp. 40-42.

¹³⁹ Tahsin Ünal, *Türklüğün Sembolü Bozkurt* (Konya: Milli Ülkü Yayınları, 1976), p. 81.

“*Milli Türk Talebe Birliği*” (National Union of the Turkish Students) and the “*Türkiyat Enstitüsü*” (Institute of Turcology).¹⁴⁰

As a result of this lasting sublimation of Central Asia, although the Kemalist regime had explicitly rejected Pan-Turkism and targeted to reach a totally different objective by using the Turkish Historical Thesis, in the final analysis, it, paradoxically, also created fertile ground for Pan-Turkist ideas.¹⁴¹

Emphasis on the Concept of Race

Throughout the 1930s, the emphasis on the concept of race did not remain limited to history textbooks. It was also reflected in other, in particular biology, textbooks. For example, *Biyoloji ve İnsan Hayatı* (Biology and Human Life),¹⁴² which was the textbook of secondary schools in the country from 1934, had clear racist implications, including eugenics (*ırk hıfzısıhhası*).¹⁴³ In the book, there was a striking

¹⁴⁰ Özdoğan, “*Turan*”dan “*Bozkurt*”a, p. 86 ft. 95.

¹⁴¹ İsmail Hami Danişmend explains the Kemalist regimes’ this dilemma very well with his following words: “After learning that Turkishness which is described as a huge race in the form of one nation circulating from Lake Baykal to the shores of the Danube the in history books and as a result is received as the inspiration of Turanism in history courses, the young generation who has seen a definition of Turkish nation limited only by our contemporary political edges as the contrary in literature books, has always heard that Turanism is a fraud in literature courses by the official sources of the same Ministry of Education.” “*Tarih kitabında Türklüğün Baykal gölünden Tuna boylarına kadar yayılmış tek bir millet şeklinde büyük bir ırk olarak tarif edildiğini gördükten sonra Edebiyat kitabında bil’akis şimdiki siyasi hududlarımıza münhasır bir millet tarifi gören genç nesiller, netice itibariyle Tarih desinde Turancılık telkini aldıktan sonra, Edebiyat dersinde Turancılığın sahtekarlık olduğunu hep aynı Maarif Vekaletinin işte o resmi membalarından yıllarca dinleyip durmuşlar demektir.*” İsmail Hami Danişmend, *Türklük Meseleleri* (İstanbul: İstanbul Kitapçılık, 1966), p. 7.

¹⁴² According to Ahmet Yıldız, it was the translation of a book called Biology and Human Life, written by Benjamin G. Gutenberg. However, the 23rd section, entitled “*İnsanlar ve Arz*” (Human Beings and the Earth) that I refer to here was not included in the original text and it was added to the book in the Turkish translation. Ahmet Yıldız, “*Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyebilene*” *Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin Etno-Seküler Sınırları (1919-1938)* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004), p. 232 fn 11.

¹⁴³ The word “Eugenics,” a doctrine which advocates that the human race and hereditary qualifications can be improved through social intervention such as the selective control of breeding, physical education and nutrition, was coined for the first time in 1883 by the English scientist Francis Galton (1822-1911), who was a cousin of Charles Darwin. Galton took the word from a Greek root meaning “good in birth”

distinction between *kötü soy* (bad stock) and *iyi soy* (good stock) and the latter was evaluated by making a reference to the hereditary factor as follows:

Valuable qualities and peculiarities in the families are transmitted from generation to generation. When the geological trees of people who have a distinguished position in society through their high virtues are examined, it is seen that these virtues are shared by many members of those families. Some families have conferred society with scholars, some with politicians, some with artists from generation to generation.¹⁴⁴

In this framework, since the valuable qualities are transmitted hereditarily from generation to generation, the book recommended to its readers, that is to say, students, to protect their racial characteristics, which came from the superior Turkish race in the following words:

The Turkish race, of which we are proud to be members, has a distinguished position among the best, the most robust, the most intelligent and the most capable races in the world. The task of all of us is to protect the essential qualities and virtues of the Turkish race and to prove with the very manners

or “noble in heredity”. In the first half of the twentieth century, eugenic aims merged with misinterpretations of the new science of genetics to help produce cruelly oppressive and, in the era of the Nazis, barbarous social results. Daniel J. Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1985), pp. ix-x. In the Republican era, in particular in the second half of the thirties, the number of works on eugenics remarkably increased and some scientists, who were close to the Kemalist circles, paid special attention to the concept of eugenics. For example, Prof. Dr. Mazhar Osman (Uzman), a famous doctor of the time, in a conference he gave in 1939, stressed the importance of eugenic for the country as follows:

“Birçok çepheden yapıya muhtaç vatani da soyu bozuklarla doldurmak, darülacezeler, bimarhane ve hapishaneler için nesil yetiştirmek te hiç şayanı temenni değildir. Onun için sağlamları çoğaltmağa teşvik ve mecbur etmeliyiz, çürüklere de sen yetersin, senden nesle lüzum yok demeliyiz.” Mazhar Osman Uzman, *Öjenik* (Ankara: CHP Konferanslar Serisi, Kitap: 2, 1939), p. 5. A year later, Prof. Dr. Fahrettin Kerim Gökay, governor of Istanbul between 1949 and 1957, praised Germany’s eugenics applications, especially its sterilization policy, in his conference in the following words: “Evlenirken en kıymetli servet olarak ruh, beden sıhhati aramak suretiyle Türk cemiyetine nesilden nesile en kıymetli miras olarak zinde çocuklar hediye etmek milli bir vazifedir. Almanya gibi bazı memleketler ırk hıfzısıhhasının emrettiği bu lazimeyi kısırlaştırma adı verilen bir kanunla tatbika çalışıyorlar. Demokrat memleketler irşat ve vesaya ile evlenme istişare odaları tesis etmek suretiyle vatandaşları aydınlatmak yoluyla hedefe varmaya çalışıyorlar. Bizim de bu ciheti göz önünde bulundurmamız lazımdır.” Fahrettin Kerim Gökay, *İrk Hıfzısıhhasında İrsiyetin Rolü ve Nesli Tereddiden Koruma Çareleri* (Ankara: CHP Konferanslar Serisi, Kitap 12, 1940), p. 11. In addition, many articles related to eugenics were published in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* (Ulus) and *Ülkü* during the 1930s. For a short summary of the articles, see Ünver, pp. 95-104. For another source that discuss eugenics in Turkey, see Ayça Alemdaroğlu, “Öjeni Düşüncesi” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), pp. 414-421.

¹⁴⁴ “Kıymetli evsaf ve hususiyetler ailelerde nesilden nesle devam eder. Yüksek meziyetleri ile cemiyette mümtaz mevki tutmuş insanların birçoğunun aile tarihleri tetkik edilince bu meziyetlerin o ailelerin birçok fertlerinde tebarüz ettiği görülür. Bazı aileler cemiyete nesilden nesile bir takım ailimler, bazıları siyasilere, bazıları sanatkarlar vermişlerdir.” *Biyoloji ve İnsan Hayatı*, vol. 2, (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1934), p. 319, cited in Yıldız, p. 233.

that we are worthy of belonging to it. For this reason, it is one of our national tasks to protect ourselves well, to avoid totally things that are harmful to our health, to make a principle of life meritoriously in physically and spiritually terms by applying biological information that we have learnt to our lives. Because, the future of Turkey will depend on the Turkish generation of high value to be brought up in families that will be formed in the future by the young people living such a life today.¹⁴⁵

In addition, among the questions to be asked at the end of the 23rd section of the book, question nine was striking: “What are the high abilities of Turkish race? In terms of which abilities is the Turkish race superior to other races?”¹⁴⁶ In other words, the book showed the Turkish race as superior. These kinds of racist implications could be also seen at the universities. The 1930s, in particular the second half the 1930s, was a period in which the Kemalist regime tried to consolidate itself ideologically. Two prominent Kemalist intellectuals, Recep Peker (1888-1950) and Mahmut Esat Bozkurt (1892-1943), played important roles in this period. In order to indoctrinate and to diffuse the Kemalist Revolution to the vast mass of the people, especially to the youth, Recep Peker, who was the Secretary General of the RPP during the period of 1931-1936 and empowered to speak on the behalf of the permanent chief of the RPP, Atatürk,¹⁴⁷ gave lectures at Istanbul and Ankara Universities between 1934 and 1942.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁵ “Mensup olmakla iftihar ettiğimiz Türk ırkı dünyanın eniyi, en sağlam, en zeki ve en kabiliyetli ırkları arasında mümtaz bir mevki sahibidir. Hepimizin vazifesi Türk ırkının asli evsaf ve meziyetlerini muhafaza etmek ve bu ırka layık fertler olduğumuzu her halimizle ispat eylemektir. Bunun içindir ki, kendimizi iyi korumak, sağlığınıza zara verecek şeylerden tamamilen çekinmek, öğrendiğimiz biyoloji malumatını kendi hayatımıza tatbik ederek bedence ve ruha liyakatli yaşamayı kendimize hayat düsturu yapmak milli vazifelerimizin birincilerindendir. Çünkü Türkiyemizin istikbalı bugün böyle yaşayacak gençlerin ileride teşkil edecekleri ailelerle yetiştirecekleri yüksek kıymetli Türk zürriyetine dayanacaktır.” *Biyoloji ve İnsan Hayatı*, vol.2, p. 321, cited in Yıldız, p. 234.

¹⁴⁶ *Biyoloji ve İnsan Hayatı*, vol. 2, p. 323, cited in Yıldız, p. 234.

¹⁴⁷ According to the second article of the Regulation and Program of the RPP in 1931, the permanent general chief of the RPP is Ghazi Mustafa Kemal, the founder of the party. The 23rd article states that the Secretary General fulfils his duty on the behalf of the general chief. *CHF Nizamnamesi ve Programı (1931)*, p. 3. Recep Peker prepared the drafts of the RPP's programs in 1931 and 1935. He was also the principal spokesman who explained the 1931 and 1935 party programs. According to Taha Parla, there can be no difference between Peker's program explanations and the ideology of the RPP's programs just as there can be no difference between Atatürk's ideas and the RPP's programs. Taha Parla, *Türkiye'de*

In these notes, although Peker rejected and criticized a nationalism based on race and blood, he, nevertheless, stressed the purity of the Turkish blood and race as an important factor in the formation of the new Turkey. According to Peker, within the last period of the Ottoman Empire:

Only one thing that was impossible to deteriorated, the Turkish blood, has remained clean within all noise. The western Turks have protected and hidden the purity of their blood within that corruption. In spite of the badness of the state administration, the highness of the Ottoman army, which showed the world the example of brevity, originated from highness in the blood of the gentleman Turkish nation that created these armies.¹⁴⁹

As for Mahmut Esat Bozkurt,¹⁵⁰ who was the Minister of Justice between 1924 and 1930 and a professor of law at the University of Ankara,¹⁵¹ he, in his famous book *Atatürk İhtilali* (The Atatürk Revolution),¹⁵² which was compiled from his lectures given on the directive of Atatürk, advocated the idea that the Kemalist Revolution must remain in the hands of the genuine Turks (Öz Türk):

If a revolution is done on the behalf of a nation, it must be done absolutely by the genuine children of that nation and must remain in their hands. For instance, the Turkish Revolution must remain unconditionally in the hands of the genuine Turks. The revolution, which was done with the help of foreigners remains indebted to foreigners. This debt cannot be paid. The worst of the Turks is better than the best of the non-Turks. In the past, the

Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları, vol. 3, *Kemalist Tek-Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP'nin Altı Ok'u* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1995), p. 150. In other words, he was the third man of the Kemalist regime.

¹⁴⁸ The lecture notes of Recep Peker were published in 1935 under the name of *İnkılap Dersleri* (The Lectures of Revolution).

¹⁴⁹ “Bozulması mümkün olmayan tek bir şey, Türk kanı, bütün bu gürültüler içinde temiz kalmıştı. Batı Türkleri bu çöküntü içinde kanının arlığını korudu ve sakladı. Dünyaya batırlık örneği gösteren Osmanlı ordusunun yüksekliği, devlet idaresinin kötülüğüne rağmen, bu orduları yaratan bay Türk ulusu’nun kanındaki yücelikten ileri geliyordu.” Recep Peker, *İnkılap Dersleri* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1984), p. 16. Peker also enumerates “the difference of blood between the two nations” among the factors he used to differentiate the English Revolution from the French one. Peker, p. 31.

¹⁵⁰ He was among the writers who contributed to the three journals, respectively *Ergenekon*, *Bozkurt* and *Gök-Börü* that were published by Reha Oğuz Türkkkan between 1938 and 1943.

¹⁵¹ Reha Oğuz Türkkkan was one of his students at the University of Ankara.

¹⁵² The book was published for the first time in 1940. See Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, *Atatürk İhtilali* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İnkılap Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1940)

ill-fortune of the Ottoman Empire was, in most cases, the fact that its destiny was ruled by non-Turks.¹⁵³

Having stated this, Bozkurt explained his desire for the new Turkish state as follows:

We must not give the affairs of the Turkish state to those other than Turks. The state affairs of the new Turkish republic must be governed absolutely by Turks. We will not trust anyone but Turks.¹⁵⁴

Although various authoritarian-totalitarian regimes came into existence in Europe such as Fascism and National Socialism which had also affected the Kemalist regime to some extent, in the last analysis, racism did not become a systematic policy of state in Turkey in the 1930s.¹⁵⁵ However, as noted by Baskın Oran, Tanıl Bora and Hugh Poulton, the Kemalist regime increased its emphasis on the race and gained a racist-ethnic dimension, which were crystallized in the words of leading Kemalist figures like Peker and Bozkurt, in the formation process of a new Turkish identity.¹⁵⁶ In this

¹⁵³ “Bir, ihtilal, hangi milletin hesabına yapılırsa, mutlaka o milletin öz evladının eliyle yapılmalı ve onun elinde kalmalıdır. Mesela, Türk ihtilali, öz Türklerin elinde kalmalıdır. Hem de kayıtsız ve şartsız. Yabancıların yardımıyla başarılan ihtilaller, yabancılara borçlu kalırlar. Bu borç ödenmez. Türkün en kötüsü, Türk olmayanın en iyisinden iyidir. Geçmişte Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun bahtsızlığı, ekseriya, mukadderatını Türklerden başkasının idare etmiş olmasıdır.” Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, *Atatürk İhtilali* (İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi, 1967), pp. 215-216.

¹⁵⁴ “Türk devleti işlerini Türkten başkasına vermeyelim...Yeni Türk Cumhuriyetinin devlet işleri başında mutlaka Türkler bulunacaktır. Türkten başkasına inanmayacağız.” Bozkurt, pp. 353-354. In fact, some applications of the Kemalist regime were in a great harmony with Bozkurt’s discourse. For example, the 19th article of 1924 Constitution gave the right to become a civil servant to every Turk, who had all political rights, not every Turkish citizen. Yıldız, p. 234. Parallel to this, according to the fourth article of *Memurin Kanunu* (Law of Civil Servant), enacted on 18 March 1926, “to be Turkish” was among the necessary preconditions for becoming a civil servant and that article remained in force in Turkey until 1965. Ayhan Aktar, *Varlık Vergisi ve Türkleştirme Politikaları* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001), pp. 118-120. Depending on these articles, moreover, non-Turkish people’s registration in all military schools was prevented by the Kemalist regime. As a result of this policy, the minorities living in Turkey lost their rights to become military officers and civil servants.

¹⁵⁵ Ergun Özbudun, “Milli Mücadele ve Cumhuriyetin Resmi Belgelerinde Yurttaşlık Sorunu” in *Cumhuriyet, Demokrasi ve Kimlik*, ed. Nuri Bilgin (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 1997), pp. 68-70.

¹⁵⁶ Baskın Oran, *Atatürk Milliyetçiliği Resmi İdeoloji Dışı Bir İnceleme* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1999), pp. 201-208. Tanıl Bora, “Cumhuriyetin İlk Dönemlerinde Milli Kimlik” in *Cumhuriyet, Demokrasi ve Kimlik*, ed. Nuri Bilgin (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 1997), pp. 55-57. Hugh Poulton, *Top Hat, Grey Wolf and the Crescent: Turkish Nationalism and the Turkish Republic* (New York, New York University Press, 1997), p. 114.

process, the Kemalist regime not only exalted the Turk as a race by using so-called scientific theories such as the Turkish History Thesis and the Sun-Language theory,¹⁵⁷ but also put some acts, discriminating against the minorities living in the country into practice. It also contributed to the creation of a youth that was open to racist ideas.

Turkic Emigrants' Contribution to Pan-Turkism

In the early years of the Republican era, the first publications showing a close interest in the culture and the history of the Turkic peoples living outside of Turkey were published by Turks who had emigrated from the Soviet Union to Turkey. After the consolidation of the Bolshevik regime in Russia, many Russian Turks, including a group of intellectuals such as the Azeris Mehmet Emin Resulzade, Mehmedzade Mirza Bala and Ahmet Çaferoğlu, the Tatars Sadri Maksudi Arsal, Abdullah Battal Taymas,

¹⁵⁷ The Kemalist regime also supported anthropological studies on the racial characteristics of the Turks. One of the examples of this support can be seen in the research of the *Türk Antropoloji Mecmuası* (The Turkish Journal of Anthropology), which was published by the University of Istanbul between 1925 and 1939 in Istanbul. For instance, in 1926, the government backed up a group of doctor writers of the journal, doing an antropometric research on “the different races in Istanbul” by giving a directive certain officials and schools to help the researchers. According to Nureddin Ali Berkol, one of the participants of the research, they investigated 2,200 Greeks, 1,600 Armenians, 1,340 Jews, 720 Levantines and indeterminate races during the process of research. In addition, the army also supported these kinds of anthropological studies on the Turkish race by permitting anthropologists to measure soldiers as sample groups. For example, in 1931, Şevket Aziz Kansu, one of the leading antropologist of the time and one of the writers of the journal, in his research on “the differences between Anatolian Turks and Rumelian (Thracian) Turks” used the soldiers in the Third Army Corps. Nazan Maksudyan, *Türklüğü Ölçmek: Bilimkurgusal Antropoloji ve Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Irkçı Çehresi 1925-1939* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2005), pp. 92-97. However, the clearest evidence of the Kemalist regime's support for the anthropological studies on the Turkish race is Afet İnan's Ph.D. thesis, which was prepared at the University of Geneva under the directorate of Eugène Pittard in 1939. In her thesis, which was prepared on the directive of Atatürk, Afet İnan tried to prove the claim that the Turkish nation was brachycephalic and it was the autoctonous people of Anatolia by identifying the racial characteristics of the Turks. For this reason, she conducted a great field research, covering 64,000 subjects in Thrace and Anatolia with the support of the government. According to İnan, the Prime Ministers of the time, İsmet İnönü and Celal Bayar, the director of the Institute for Statistics, Celal Aybar, the Minister of Health, Refik Saydam and Şevket Aziz Kansu were among the main supporters of her research. Afet İnan, *Türkiye Halkının Antropolojik Karakterleri ve Türkiye Tarihi: Türk Irkının Vatanı Anadolu* (64,000 kişi üzerinde anket) (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1947), pp. 67-69.

Muharrem Fevzi Togay and Akdes Nimet Kurat and Baskirs like Zeki Velidi Togan¹⁵⁸ and Abdülkadir İnan, came to Turkey.¹⁵⁹ These people tried to stimulate interest in the cultures, life-styles, ethnographies and political histories of the different Turkic groups that they represented mainly by publishing various journals and articles.¹⁶⁰ The first publication was *Yeni Kafkasya* (The New Caucasus), which was published in ninety-one issues as a bi-monthly in Istanbul by Azeri immigrants between September 1923 and November 1927. The masthead of the journal, which paid special attention to Azeri culture and history, was “literary, social and political magazine.”¹⁶¹ Soon afterwards, *Yeni Türkistan* (The New Turkestan), a monthly journal which was published in thirty-nine issues irregularly in Istanbul between 1927-1931, appeared.¹⁶² In addition to these magazines, *Odlu Yurt* (Fiery Fatherland) (1929-1931) and *Azeri Türk* (Azerbaijani Turk)(1928-1929) were published under the editorship of Mehmet Emin Resülzade.¹⁶³

¹⁵⁸ Zeki Velidi Togan (1890-1970) was born in the Kuzen village of Bashkiria in Russia on 10 December 1890. He completed his primary education at medrese. His father, who was a teacher, was a regular reader of *Tercüman*, which was published by İsmail Gasprinski in order to create a cultural unity among the Turkic peoples living in Russia. He continued his education in public schools and graduated from the University of Kazan. After his graduation from university, he started to teach Turkish literature and history at the Kasımiye Medresesi in Kazan (1909-1913). In 1915, he entered into politics and represented the Muslim population of Ufa in the Duma. After the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, he worked for the freedom of the Bashkiria and was the president of the Bashkirian government until 1920. In those years, he organized a resistance movement against the Bolsheviks and contacted Enver Pasha, who was in Bukhara at the time. However, the resistance movement failed and Togan left Bashkiria and went to Berlin. In 1925, he was invited by the Turkish government to Ankara, where he worked as a member of *Telif ve Tercüme Heyeti* (the Board of Publication and Translation) between 1925 and 1927. In 1927, he was appointed to the *Darülfünun* as a lecturer of Turkish history. Togan played a crucial role in the spread of Pan-Turkist ideas in Turkey. Ayşe Gün Soysal, “Zeki Velidi Togan” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), pp. 488-495. For more information on Togan, see Tuncer Baykara, *Zeki Velidi Togan* (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1989).

¹⁵⁹ Ayşe Gün Soysal, “Rusya Kökenli Aydınların Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliği’nin İnşasına Katkısı” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), pp. 483-505.

¹⁶⁰ Özdoğan, “*Turan*”dan “*Bozkut*”a, p. 201.

¹⁶¹ Lowell Bezanis, “Soviet Muslim émigrés in the Republic of Turkey”, *Central Asian Survey* 13, no. 1 (1994), p. 123.

¹⁶² Landau, *Pan-Turkism*, p. 86.

Odlu Yurt, which was published in thirty-one issues in Istanbul as a “monthly magazine advocating the concept of national Azerbaijan,” had a very clear Pan-Turkist discourse. For example, the journal described itself as nationalist, Pan-Turkist, populist, radical, republican and pro-independence. Furthermore, apart from defending an independent Azerbaijan, working to familiarize the Turkic people with each other was among the goals of the journal.¹⁶⁴ *Odlu Yurt*, along with *Yeni Türkistan*, was closed down by the Kemalist regime in 1931 for openly supporting the idea of national independence against the Soviet Union and hence jeopardizing the relationship between Turkey and the Soviet Union.¹⁶⁵ After these journals, the last journal published in the first decade of the Republican era by the Turkic emigrants was *Azerbaycan Yurt Bilgisi* (Civic of Azerbaijan), which was published in thirty-six issues by Ahmet Çaferoğlu, a well-known Turcologist at the University of Istanbul, as a monthly in Istanbul from 1932 to 1934.¹⁶⁶ Although the title of the journal evoked only Azerbaijan, it gave information not only about Azerbaijan, but also about other Turkic groups living in the Soviet Union. The prominent contributors of the journal were Mehmet Fuat Köprülü, Zeki Velidi Togan, Abdülkadir İnan and Akdes Nimet Kurat. Since it began to publication after the closure of *Odlu Yurt* and *Yeni Turkistan*, the journal consciously avoided giving clear political or Pan-Turkist messages and concerned itself only with cultural

¹⁶³ Mehmet Emin Resülzade (1884-1955) was the prominent founder and leader of the Musavat Party in Azerbaijan. After the 1917 revolution in Russia, he worked for the establishment of an independent Azerbaijan and he was elected the president of the National Republic of Azerbaijan, between 1918 and 1920. After the occupation of Azerbaijan by the Red Army and the overthrow of the Azerbaijan government in April 1920, he came to Istanbul in 1922. His activities as an author in Istanbul, according to Charles W. Hostler, aroused the protest of the Soviets and were protested by the Soviet Legation in Turkey on which he immigrated to Western Europe in 1931. Charles Warren Hostler, *Turkism and the Soviets: the Turks of the World and Their Political Objectives* (London: G.Allen & Unwin; New York: F. A. Praeger, 1957.), pp. 215-217.

¹⁶⁴ Bezanis, pp. 124-125.

¹⁶⁵ Özdoğan, “*Turan*”dan “*Bozkurt*”a, p. 205.

¹⁶⁶ Landau, *Pan-Turkism*, p. 87.

subjects such as ethnography, linguistics and history.¹⁶⁷ However, *Azerbaycan Yurt Bilgisi* stopped publication in 1934 due to most probably the pressure of the government.

The exception of *Odlu Yurt*, which had described itself explicitly as a Pan-Turkist journal, the journals published by the Turkic immigrants, in the final analysis, did not have a clear Pan-Turkist message. However, the Kemalist regime did not hesitate to close them when they published items that were judged harmful to the relationship between Turkey and the Soviet Union. For instance, *Yeni Kafkasya* and *Azeri Türk* were respectively prohibited in 1927 and 1928. The Turkish Press Law, which was enacted on 25 July 1931, played a crucial role in suppressing all publications, including Pan-Turkists ones, which had content disturbing the Kemalist regime. The fiftieth article of the press law entitled the government to close or suspend daily journals and magazines in case the government found their content contrary to its policy.¹⁶⁸ In addition to this article, which was used by the government to close Pan-Turkist journals, the Kemalist regime banned the importation of publications printed outside of Turkey by Turkic immigrants, by making a modification in the Press Law in 1934.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁷ Bezanis, pp. 125-126.

¹⁶⁸ “Newspapers and journals can be suspended temporarily by the decision of the Council of Ministers because of publications affecting the general politics of the country. The eighteenth article is applied about those who continue to publish newspapers or journals that have been closed for this reason. The party responsible for the newspaper which has been closed by this reason cannot publish a newspaper under a different name during the suspension period.” “*Memleketin umumi siyasetine dokunacak neşriyattan dolayı İcra Vekilleri Heyeti kararıyle gazete veya mecmualar muvakkaten tatil olunabilir. Bu suretle kapatılan gazete veya mecmuanın neşrine devam edenler hakkında 18 inci madde hükmü tatbik olunur. Bu suretle kapatılan bir gazetenin mesulleri tatil müddetince başka bir isimle gazete çıkaramaz.*” Murat Güvenir, *Siyasal İktidarın Basını Denetlemesi ve Yönlendirmesi: 2. Dünya Savaşında Türk Basını* (İstanbul: Türkiye Gazeticiler Cemiyeti Yayınları, 1991), p. 40.

¹⁶⁹ Özdoğan, “*Turan*”dan “*Bozkurt*”a, p. 205. As a result of this change in the Press Law, in the last months of 1934, *Yaş Türkistan* (Young Turkestan), the official organ of the National Council of Turkestan, issued in Berlin; *Şimali Kafkasya* (Northern Caucasus), the monthly organ of the Popular Party of the people of the Caucasus, published in Warsaw; *Yeni Milli Yol* (The New National Road), the

Nihal Atsız and the Pan-Turkist Movement

During the first decade of the Republican era, the Kemalist single-party regime did not permit any political activity outside its domain, imposed serious restrictions on the press and even took independent organizations of cultural activities under its own control. In other words, due to the regime's this monopolistic tendency in the political arena, the Pan-Turkist movement was subjected to non-favorable circumstances in order to disseminate its ideology and ideas at the time. The Pan-Turkists in Turkey, therefore, used journals as a main means of propaganda, despite official suspension many times.¹⁷⁰ In this sense, the most important person who tried to keep Pan-Turkist ideology and sentiments vivid in the 1930s was undoubtedly Hüseyin Nihal Atsız (1905-1975), who published two journals with very clear Pan-Turkist messages and ideas.¹⁷¹

organ of the National Idel-Ural Committee, published in Berlin; *Kurtuluş* (Liberation), the official organ of Azerbaijan Musavat Party, appeared in Berlin; and *Türkistan* (Turkestan), published in France, were prohibited in Turkey by the decision of the Council of Ministers. This policy was also maintained by the regime during the 1930s. For example, in 1935, *Prométhée*, published in France as the official organ of the Promethean League, a semi-clandestine anti-Soviet organization, established and sponsored by President Pilsudsky, the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the General Staff as an umbrella-organization in order to provide financial and political co-ordination for the anti-communist government in exile; and *Emel Mecmuası* (The journal of hope), the monthly of the Crimean Turkish Committee, appeared in Romania published by the Crimean Turks; in 1936, *Milli Bayrak* (The national flag), published by Turkish Tatars, and finally in 1937, *Hakikat* (The Truth), published in Berlin by Mehmet Emin Resulzade, were banned in Turkey by the government. Landau, *Pan-Turkism*, pp. 81-82; Önen, p. 265.

¹⁷⁰ Özdoğan, "Turan"dan "Bozkurt"a, p. 181.

¹⁷¹ Hüseyin Nihal Atsız (1905-1975) was born in Istanbul on 12 January 1905. Although he started his primary education in foreign schools, first at a French and then a German school in Istanbul, he completed it at a Turkish school. Having graduated from the Istanbul Lycee, in 1922, he started his higher education at the Military School of Medicine. However, in 1925, Atsız was expelled from the school due to his undisciplined behavior, which were originated from his fights with foreign students at the school. In 1926, he restarted his higher education at the High School of Teaching (*Yüksek Muallim Mektebi*) and also at the Literature Department of the *Darülfünun*. At university, Zeki Velidi Togan was the most influential academic on Atsız and Pertev Naili Boratav, Sabahattin Ali, Orhan Şaik Gökyay and Nihad Sami Banarlı were among his close friends. Atsız graduated from the university in 1930 and became the assistant of Prof. Mehmet Fuat Köprülü at the Institute of Turcology. Meanwhile, he started to edit a monthly journal, *Atsız Mecmua*. However, since he supported Zeki Velidi Togan, who had criticized the Turkish History Thesis in the first Congress of Turkish History, held in Ankara in 1932, Atsız was

Atsız Mecmua, the first journal published by Atsız, appeared as a monthly journal just a month after the disbandment of the Turkish Hearths in Istanbul between 15 May 1931 and 25 September 1932. Fuat Köprülü, Zeki Velidi Togan, Pertev Naili Boratav, Sabahattin Ali, Nihat Sami Banarlı, Orhan Şaik Gökyay, Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, Ali İhsan Sabis and Abdülkadir İnan were among the writers who contributed the journal. The motto of the journal was “*Ben, Sen O Yok...Biz varız*” (Not one for each, but one for all) up to the seventh issue. After that issue, the motto was changed to “*Bütün Türkler Bir Ordu, Katılmayan Kaçaktır*” (All Turks are an army, he who does not join it is a deserter).¹⁷² The figure of the *Bozkurt* (Grey wolf), printed on the cover of the journal, was the symbol of *Atsız Mecmua*.

The journal paid special attention to the Turks abroad. For example, in addition to Turkish history and literature, Azeri literature, the daily life of Kazakh women, Uzbek and Turkmen music and the folk songs of Turkmen living in Kirkuk were among the subjects of the journal. In addition, a series of articles related to the population of the Turks living in the Soviet Union were published by Abdülkadir İnan in the first five issues of the journal. According to these statistics, there were 16,462,381 Turks in the Soviet Union.¹⁷³ According to Atsız, in the twentieth century, every nation had to increase its population in order to live.¹⁷⁴ For this reason, a Pan-Turkist union was a

dismissed from his office at the university in March 1933. After this, Atsız continued his life as a teacher of Turkish literature at various schools. During his life, he published many journals, books, articles, pamphlets and poems, advocating a political and cultural unity among the whole Turkic peoples. Osman Fikri Sertkaya, *Hüseyin Nihal Atsız* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1987), pp. 1-13. For detailed information on Nihal Atsız see, Sakin Öner, *Nihal Atsız* (İstanbul: Toker Yayınları, 1977)

¹⁷² These discourses had been used by Ziya Gökalp beforehand. For example, his poem *Altun Yurt* (The gold fatherland) had the same meaning as *Atsız Mecmua*'s motto. “*Türk bir millet, bir ordu, katılmayan kaçaktır.*” Tansel, *Ziya Gökalp Külliyyatı-1*, pp. 77-78.

¹⁷³ *Atsız Mecmua*, no: 1, 15 May 1931, p. 9.

¹⁷⁴ “In the twentieth century, every nation has to increase its population. The nations, consisting of three, five even eight millions cannot be considered a nation. The Turkish nation, which has played crucial roles in every period of history, cannot imagine being a Sweden or Holland as a national ideal.” “*Yirminci asırda her millet çoğalmağa mecburdur. Üç beş hatta sekiz on milyonluk milletlere millet*

vital necessity for Turkey, which had a population of 14 million.¹⁷⁵ In this context, in the last issue of *Atsız Mecmua*, the Pan-Turkist message was very clear. In this issue, published on 25 September 1932, a map of the Turkish world, mostly consisting of the Soviet territories in which the Turkic people lived, was published under the name “*Kurtulmamış Türkeli*” (Unredeemed Turkish country) and Nihal Atsız, sent a call for the war to the Turkish youth as follows:

Turkish youth! Look at the sketch of the map above. The places colored black show the places in which your unredeemed brothers live. Even only looking at this black sketch tells you how much your mission is big, difficult and heavy... This black map is to be engraved on your mind and heart, to learn your today and tomorrow enemies, prepare yourself for the great war for which you will give your blood and life!”¹⁷⁶

In the same issue, Atsız also revealed his militarist, fascist tendencies by proposing an ideal model for society, which would be created by the new generations as follows:

1. All Turks will gather under the same state as a single state.

denemez. Tarihin her devresinde birinci derecede rol oynamış olan Türk milleti bir İsveç veya bir Hollanda olmayı milli mefkure olarak düşünemez.” Nihal Atsız, “Milli Mefkure” Atsız Mecmua, no. 14 (15 June 1932), p. 26.

¹⁷⁵ “I oppose a separate Turkestan, a separate Azerbaijan and a separate Crimea. I think, the Turkish nation from either will be united from Western Thrace to Yakutisthan or will disappear in 30-40 years time. While the hundreds of million nations are founding in the world, the 14 million of Turkey which contains a variety of foreign elements, the 13 million of Turkisthan, even the 3 million of Azerbaijan and 300 thousands of Crimean cannot stand alone. Separate independence, separate governance, autonomy, federation...those are all void words. There is a great Turkish country. This country will always be governed by one center. The question is not of a federation or union, but only that ‘the center is in Anatolia or Yedisu’.” “*Ben ayrı bir Türkistan’a, ayrı bir Azerbaycan’a muarızım, ayrı bir Kırımı muarızım. Kanaatimce Türk milleti 30-40 yıla kadar ya Garbi Trakya’dan Yakutistan’a kadar birleşecek, yahut ta yeryüzünden kalkacaktır. Yer yüzünde yüz milyonluk milletler meydana gelirken arasında bir çok ta yabancı unsurlar olan 14 milyonluk Türkiye, 13 milyonluk Türkistan, hele 3 milyonluk Azerbaycan ve 300 binlik Kırım tek başına yaşayamaz. Ayrı istiklal, ayrı idare, muhtariyet, federasyon... bunlar hep laftır. Bir büyük Türk ili vardır. Bu il daima bir tek merkezden idare olunacaktır. Münakaşa olunacak mesele federasyon mu, ittihat mı meselesi değil ancak merkez ‘Anadolu’da mı, Yedisu’da mı’ meselesi olabilir.” Nihal Atsız, “Çokayoğlu Mustafa Bey’e Son Cevap” *Atsız Mecmua*, no. 17 (25 September 1932), p. 164.*

¹⁷⁶ “*Türk genci! Yukarıdaki harita taslağına bak. Karaya boyanmış yerler senin kurtulmamış kardeşlerinin yaşadığı yerleri gösteriyor. Yalnız bu kara taslağa bakmak bile vazifenin ne kadar büyük, ne kadar güç, ne kadar ağır olduğunu sana anlatsın...Bu harita beynine ve gönlüne kazılsın, bugünkü, yarınki düşmanlarını iyi belle, uğrunda kanını, canını vereceğin büyük savaşa hazırlan!*”, Nihal Atsız, “*Kurtulmamış Türkeli*” *Atsız Mecmua*, no. 17 (25 September 1932), p. 172.

2. No institutions that are against the Turkish customs, science and development will exist within the frontiers of the great Turkey. (*Türkili*)
3. From the beginning of the earliest ages, all Turkish children will receive a national-militarist education in the great Turkey's boarding schools.
4. Since they are public schools, cinemas and theaters will be subjected to control like schools.
5. Publications that are detrimental to the nationality, culture and morality of Turkishness will be prohibited.
6. The great businesses and capitale will belong to the state.
7. Science will have national aims and only the sciences which strive for Turkishness will be Turkish science.
8. Free physicianship and advocacy will be abolished and these professions will be transformed into official posts.
9. Society will also participate in inheritance.¹⁷⁷

After this issue, *Atsız Mecmua* was closed down by the government due to Atsız's attitude against the debate between Zeki Velidi Togan and Reşit Galip during the first Congress of Turkish History (2-11 July 1932), which was convened in Ankara in order to introduce the Turkish History Thesis to the Turkish public opinion.¹⁷⁸ At the congress, Togan's principal point of objection was the thesis that Central Asia had

¹⁷⁷ 1. *Bütün Türkler bir devlet halinde, tek bir bayrak altında toplanacaktır.*

2. *Türk türesine, ilme, tekamüle mugayir hiç bir müessese Türkili sınırlarının içinde yaşayamayacaktır.*

3. *Terbiye ilminin müsaade ettiği en küçük yaştan itibaren bütün Türk çocukları Türkilinin yatılı mekteplerine girerek milli-askeri terbiyeyi alacaktır.*

4. *Sinema ve tiyatrolar halk mektepleri olduğundan mektepler gibi konturola tabi tutulacaklardır.*

5. *Türklüğün milliyet, hars ve ahlakına zararlı neşriyat men edilecektir.*

6. *Büyük işler ve sermayeler devletin elinde olacaktır.*

7. *İlmin milli gayeleri olacak ve ancak Türklük için çalışan ilimler Türk ilmi olacaktır.*

8. *Serbest doktorluk ve avukatlık kalkacak, bunlar ancak devlet memuriyeti halini alacaktır.*

9. *Mirasa cemiyet te iştirak edecektir.* "Kurtulmamış Türkeli", *Atsız Mecmua*, no: 17 (25 September 1932), p. 173. Due to this program, he was accused of being fascist and Nazi during the 1940's. However, Atsız claimed that he had prepared this program in 1925, when nobody knew anything about Hitler or Fascism in Turkey. Nihal Atsız, *En Sinsi Tehlike* (İstanbul: Aylı Kurt Yayınları, 1943), pp. 51-52.

¹⁷⁸ For this debate, see *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi, Konferanslar, Münakaşalar* (Ankara: T.C. Maarif Vekaleti, 1932), pp. 167-193; and pp. 369-400. Also see Nadir Özbek, "Zeki Velidi Togan ve Türk Tarih Tezi" *Toplumsal Tarih* 8, no. 45 (September 1997), pp. 15-23.

undergone a great drought that had caused waves of immigrations towards the west, which was the vital point of the Turkish History Thesis. However, Reşit Galip and others, like Sadri Maksudi Arsal and Şemseddin Günaltay, as the creator of the thesis, criticized Togan harshly.¹⁷⁹ After this debate, Togan resigned from his work at the *Darülfünun* and left the country.¹⁸⁰

After the congress, Nihal Atsız supported Zeki Velidi Togan by declaring, in a telegram sent to Reşit Galip, that he was proud of being Togan's student.¹⁸¹ Moreover, having sent a telegram to Reşit Galip, in *Atsız Mecmua*, Nihal Atsız published an article in which he accused many of the lecturers of history and literature at the *Darülfünun*, except Ahmet Refik (Altınay) and Fuat Köprülü, of being academically incompetent when compared to Zeki Velidi Togan.¹⁸² After this article, in addition the closure of *Atsız Mecmua*, in March 1933, Nihal Atsız was dismissed from the *Darülfünun*, at which he was the assistant of Fuat Köprülü, and appointed as teacher of Turkish at the

¹⁷⁹ For example, Şemseddin Günaltay accused Togan of hindering Turkic unification in Russia after the Bolshevik Revolution. *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi, Konferanslar, Münakaşalar*, p. 400.

¹⁸⁰ Togan, in 1934, wrote that he had decided to leave Turkey before the debate at the first Congress of Turkish History due to not being able to obtain permission from the *Darülfünun* to continue his research at the University of Vienna. Ahmet Zeki Velidi Togan, *On Yedi Kumaltı Şehri ve Sadri Maksudi Bey* (İstanbul: Bürhaneddin Matbaası, 1934), pp. 5-6. However, as noted by Mete Tunçay and Haldun Özen, his opposition to the Turkish History Thesis and the debate at the first Congress of Turkish History played a crucial role in his leaving Turkey. Mete Tunçay, Haldun Özen, "1933 Darülfünun Tasfiyesi veya Bir Tek-Parti Politikacısının Önlenemez Yükselişi ve Düşüşü" *Tarih ve Toplum* 2, no. 10 (October 1984), p. 11.

¹⁸¹ Before the first Congress of Turkish History, Atsız had already opposed the Turkish History Thesis by rejecting the idea that the Turks belonged to the Aryan race and the Hitittes were the ancestors of the Turks. According to Atsız, the Turks belonged to the Turan-Idle race like the Mongols. Besides, for him, the theory that the Turks belonged to the Aryan race, which included the Gypsies, was only a claim that insulted the Turks. Whereas, the Mongols, who was accepted as barbaric invaders, had high military abilities just like the Turks. Nihal Atsız, "Türkler Hangi Irktandır" *Atsız Mecmua*, no. 1 (15 May 1931), pp. 6-7. Atsız, also continued this approach to the Turkish History Thesis in his second journal *Orhun*. For Atsız, there was a continuity within Turkish history. Therefore, different states such as Gök-Türk, Oghuz, Cenghiz, Uigur, Seljuk and Ottoman were, in fact, the same state due to the dynasties ruling them having descended from the same racial stock. In other words, there was only one state in the long Turkish history. For Atsız's view, see a series of articles entitled "Türk Tarihi Üzerinde Toplamalar" *Orhun*, nos. 1-9 (5 November 1933-16 July 1934). Atsız published these articles in 1935 as a book under the same title. See Nihal Atsız, *Türk Tarihi Üzerinde Toplamalar* (İstanbul: Arkadaş Basımevi, 1935).

¹⁸² For this article, see Nihal Atsız, "Darülfünun'un Kara, Daha Doğru Bir Tabirle, Yüz Kızartacak Listesi" *Atsız Mecmua*, no. 17 (25 September 1932), pp. 166-170.

High School of Malatya.¹⁸³ In fact, in the final analysis, this was more opposing the regime by proposing another history thesis, which had a strong Pan-Turkist implicatinü, than advocating a historian. While the Kemalist regime was trying to prove the Turkishness of Anatolia from ancient times even if it had made a strong reference to Central Asia, on the other hand, in his journal, *Atsız* was showing Central Asia (it can be read as Turan) as the real motherland to his readers by rejecting the Turkish History Thesis. In other words, while the first was rejecting Pan-Turkist ideas by limiting Turkishness to only Anatolia, the latter was expanding Turkishness from Anatolia to the Pacific Ocean.

The second journal edited by Nihal Atsız in the first years of the 1930s was *Orhun*, which were published, monthly, in nine issues between November 1933 and July 1934 in Istanbul.¹⁸⁴ In addition to Nihal Atsız, who wrote the majority of the writings in the journal, Orhan Şaik Gökyay, Nihat Sami Banarlı, Ali İhsan Sabis, Fethi Tevetoğlu and Fevziye Abdullah Tansel were the other prominent contributors to the journal. Nihal Atsız continued to use the same symbol of the grey wolf (*Bozkurt*) and the same motto “*Ben, Sen, O yok...Biz varız*” (Not one for each, but one for all) and “*Bütün Türkler Bir Ordu, Katılmayan Kaçaktır*” (All Turks are an army, he who does not join it is a deserter) in *Orhun*, too. However, while *Atsız Mecmua*’s masthead was “*Aylık fikir Mecmuası*” (Monthly journal of idea), *Orhun*’s masthead had been changed to “*Aylık Türkçü dergi*” (Monthly Turkist journal). Indeed, in *Orhun*, Nihal Atsız was more outspoken about Pan-Turkism. For example, the editorial of the first issue ended

¹⁸³ Sertkaya, p. 6.

¹⁸⁴ After the High School of Malatya, Atsız was appointed by the Ministry of Education as a teacher of literature at the High School of Edirne. Therefore, the journal was prepared in Edirne, but published in Istanbul.

with Nihal Atsız's remark: "The Turks came into this world to carry out a lofty mission and it will only be completed when the whole world becomes a Turkish land."¹⁸⁵

In addition, the cover pages of the seventh and eighth issues of *Orhun* were published with a map showing all Turks in Turkish lands, starting from the Mediterranean through Central Asia and nearly as far as the Pacific Ocean. This view was also emphasized in Nihal Atsız's article on Eastern Turkestan, in which he clearly declared, "Turkestan is ours!", "All of Turkestan and all the Turkish lands are ours!"¹⁸⁶

In this journal, Nihal Atsız claimed that neither citizenship nor common language could be accepted as the principal criterion of nationhood. For him, the basic criteria that formed a nation were "people of the same racial origin, belonging to the same blood, and a consciousness of racial unity." In this sense, he consistently stressed the importance of racial unity. According to him, one who said "I am Turkish" had to come from Turkish stock. For this reason, the Kıpçaks of Lithuania were Turkish by blood; but people of "*alien blood*,"¹⁸⁷ even if they lived in Turkey and spoke only Turkish, were not Turkish.¹⁸⁸ On the basis of this definition, Atsız passionately advocated the idea that the population of Turkey was mixed racially posing a serious

¹⁸⁵ "Türkler, bu dünyaya yüce bir vazifeyi yerine getirmek için gelmişlerdir ve ancak bütün dünya Türk yurdu haline geldiğinde tamamlanmış olacaktır.", "Orhun" *Orhun*, no. 1 (5 November 1933), p. 3.

¹⁸⁶ Nihal Atsız, "Şarki Türkistan" *Orhun*, no. 4 (20 February 1934), p. 88.

¹⁸⁷ Italics are mine.

¹⁸⁸ "First of all, nationality is a case of blood for the Turks. That is to say, he who says that he is a Turk should be of Turkish stock. Turkish stock means Turks who are famous and known from history. A Saka who lives in an icy corner of Siberia and a Kıpçak who lives in Lithuania is a Turk. The language of the Saka can be different from ours; the Lithuanian Kıpçak can speak in the language of Lithuania by forgetting his native language. But as they are Turks by blood, they are Turks. Because of that we feel close to them. But one who even cannot speak anything but Turkish is not Turk." "Türkler için milliyet her şeyden önce bir kan meselesidir. Yani Türküm diyecek olan adam Türk neslinden olmalıdır. Türk nesli de tarihten malum ve meşhur olan Türklere dir. Sibiryanın buzlu bir bucağında yaşayan bir Saka veya Litvanya'da yaşayan bir Kıpçak Türktür. Sakanın dili bize pek aykırı gelebilir, Litvanyalı Kıpçak çoktandır öz dilini unutup Litvanya diliyle konuşmuş olabilir. Fakat onlar kanca Türk oldukları için Türktürler. Bunun için biz onlara yakınlık duyarız. Fakat yabancı kan taşıyan bir insan Türkçe'den başka bir dil bilmeseyse bile, o Türk değildir." Nihal Atsız, "Yirminci Asırda Türk Meselesi II Türk Irkı=Türk Milleti" *Orhun*, no. 9 (16 July 1934), p. 157.

problem of disloyalty to national unity. Furthermore, Atsız claimed that Turkey, in this way Turkish unity, had been all the time betrayed by non-Turkish people, which he called “*Türkümsü*”(Pseudo-Turkish).¹⁸⁹

Orhun was also closed by the government with the demand of Şükrü Kaya, the Minister of Interior of time, in July 1934. Şükrü Kaya, in a note sent to *İcra Vekilleri Heyeti* (the Council of Ministers) on 14 July 1934, demanded the closure of *Orhun* due to its fifth issue in which Atsız had claimed that “the guidance of civilization can be made by only Germans and Scandinavians not by Russians”,¹⁹⁰ and its Pan-Turkist editorial policy, which harmed the foreign policy of the country.¹⁹¹ The reasons of

¹⁸⁹ “Those who are enemies of Turks and say this clearly are not very dangerous for Turkishness. The real great danger is foreign people who are pseudo-Turks. They cannot be differentiated from Turks because they can speak fluent Turkish and mostly they do not know any language except Turkish. *These are toadies, liars.* They are soft soaps. They do not hesitate to be tied to organizations and ideas which harm Turks through their personal benefits because they are not Turks. We can give hundreds of examples of how pseudo-Turks harm Turks in cases...A man should be stupid to believe pseudo-Turks. *Tomorrow, in our first bad day, they will betray us. This is the spoiled blood in their veins that makes them do this...*Consequently, their betrayals are natural. Thus, we understand that *there is and there should be no way except having Turkish blood for being Turk...*” “*Türke düşman olanlar ve bunu açıkça söyleyenler Türklük için o kadar tehlikeli değildir. Asıl büyük tehlike Türkümsü olan yabancılardır. Bunlar iyi Türkçe konuştukları ve çok defa Türkçe’den başka dil bilmedikleri için Türkten ayırt edilemezler. Bunlar dalkavuktur yalancıdır. Yüze gülerler. Türk olmadıkları için ufak bir şahsi menfaat uğrunda Türke içten içe kötülük eden fikirlere ve teşkilatlara bağlanmaktan çekinmezler. Türkümsülerin, icabında Türke nasıl fenalık ettikleri hakkında yüzlerce misal söyleyebiliriz... İnsanın Türkümsülere inanması için ancak aptal olması lazımdır. Yarın ilk kara günümüzde yine bize ihanet edeceklerdir. Onlara bunu yaptıran damarlarındaki kanın bozukluğudur. Binaenaleyh ihanetlerini tabii görmek lazımdır...Onun için artık bizce anlaşılmıştır ki Türk olmak için kanı Türk olmaktan başka çıkar yol yoktur ve olamazda...*” Nihal Atsız, “Yirminci Asırda Türk Meselesi II Türk Irkı=Türk Milleti” *Orhun*, no. 9 (16 July 1934), pp. 158-159. (Emphasis added)

¹⁹⁰ In the fifth issue of *Orhun*, published on 21 March 1934, Atsız published an article under the title “Komunist, Yahudi ve Dalkavuk” (The Communist, the Jew and the Toady). In the article, having described these three concepts as the greatest enemies of the Turkish nation within the national borders, he made a comment related to Communism, which Şükrü Kaya stated in his note, as follows:

“The answer for the Communists is that: If there is a wealth injustice and rich people who gain money by illegal ways, communism is not the way of correcting this. If communism is a progressive attack, the underdeveloped and clumpish *mujik* cannot lead this attack. *If Germans and Scandinavians who are the most progressive nations claim to be the leaders of civilization, they qualify for it. But the Russians, never!*” “*Komünistlere verilecek cevap şudur: Türkiye’de servet haksızlığı ve gayrı meşru surette kazanan zenginler varsa bunu düzeltmenin yolu komünizm değildir. Komünizm ileri bir hamle ise bu hamleye geri, kaba ve ahmak mujik kılavuzluk edemez. Beşeriyetin rehberliğini Almanlar ve İskandinavlar gibi en ileri milletler iddia ederlerse hak kazanabilirler. Fakat Ruslar, asla!*”

Nihal Atsız, “Komünist, Yahudi ve Dalkavuk” *Orhun*, no. 5 (21 March 1934), pp. 93-94. (Emphasis added)

¹⁹¹ Önen, *ibid.* pp. 262-263.

Orhun's closure were a clear evident that the Kemalist regime would not permit any Pan-Turkist movement within the country.

After the collapse of Pan-Turkist ideology in the First World War, Nihal Atsız became the most important person who tried to revive and spread Pan-Turkist ideas in Turkey in the first decade of the republican period. In addition to trying to keep the idea of a Turkic unification vivid, the contribution of *Atsız Mecmua* and *Orhun* to the Pan-Turkist movement in Turkey was very important. Through these journals, Pan-Turkism gained a new dimension based primarily on the Turkish race and, hence, new features like racism and xenophobia. For example, while the figures of the first generation of the Pan-Turkist movement such as Yusuf Akçura, Moiz Kohen¹⁹² and Ziya Gökalp¹⁹³ considered race within the framework of culture and tradition and did not give priority to it in their writings at the time, for Nihal Atsız, race was the most important part of the concept of nationhood.¹⁹⁴ Although his publications were closed down by the regime, as noted by Günay Göksu Özdoğan, the symbols, mottos and contents of the journals published by Nihal Atsız were a harbinger of what was to appear in Pan-Turkist journals in the forties in Turkey.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹² Although Moiz Kohen had supported Pan-Turkism in the last decade of the Ottoman Empire, he never emphasized a racial unification in his studies. In addition, for him, race was not a vital point for Pan-Turkist unity. For example, in his famous book, "Türkler Bu Muharebede Ne Kazanabilirler?" (What can the Turks win in this battle?), published in 1915, he explained this approach clearly: "Community of race is of extremely small importance in this modern age. The English and Germans are of the same race, and yet they are the bitterest enemies. Similar situation exists in Serbian-Bulgarian relations...The Turks' national ideal cannot be the race theory because this theory is no more than an utopian dream." Landau, *Tekinalp*, pp. 218-219.

¹⁹³ Ziya Gökalp, in a series of articles entitled "Yeni Türkiye'nin Hedefleri" (The targets of the new Turkey), which was published just before his death, explained his "principles of democracy" to each of which he devoted an article. In these articles, Gökalp emphasized the necessity of "İrkların Müsaviliği" (Equality of races), "Milletlerin Müsaviliği" (Equality of Nations), "Milletlerin Sevişmesi" (Affection Among Nations), "Kadınla Erkeğin Müsaviliği" (Equality of Sexes) etc. in order to live a democratic world. These concepts were definitely not on Nihal Atsız's agenda. Parla. pp. 96-98

¹⁹⁴ Kemal Karpat argues that racist ideas penetrated into Turkey after 1935 under Nazi influence. See Karpat, *Turkey's Politics*, p. 263. However, as mentioned above, Nihal Atsız was using an explicitly racist discourse before the year of 1935.

CHAPTER THREE

REHA OĞUZ TÜRKKAN AND THE PAN-TURKIST MOVEMENT

The Kemalist regime, during the period of Atatürk, considered Pan-Turkism as a serious threat to Turkey's relations with the Soviet Union and, basically, for this reason, Pan-Turkism was officially rejected. In addition, since the RPP and the Kemalist elite aimed to direct the cultural and political life in the country from one center, the Pan-Turkists, who had lost their credit during the Great War and the Turkish War of Independence, could not find a chance to reorganize themselves by establishing cultural

¹⁹⁵ Özdoğan, "*Turan*"dan "*Bozkurt*"a, p. 207.

or political organizations, which were essential to disseminate Pan-Turkist sentiments and ideas. In other words, the Pan-Turkist movement, in the period of Atatürk, was limited for the most part to publishing activities, which also faced limitations and repeated suspensions. The change of leadership in the country in 1938¹⁹⁶ did not create considerable change in the regime's attitude related to Pan-Turkism. However, after a four-year silence following the closure of *Orhun* in 1934, the Pan-Turkist movement began to gain a new impetus, starting from late 1938. At this time, the main figures who tried to revive Pan-Turkist ideas were not the old Pan-Turkists of the first decade of the Republican era such as Nihal Atsız or Zeki Velidi Togan, but members of a new generation

One of the factors that had a positive effect on Pan-Turkism's revival was İsmet İnönü's new policy against the politicians and personages who opposed to Atatürk and himself in the former years. Having been selected the president, İnönü pursued a policy of reconciliation with such people and, as a result of this policy, Dr. Rıza Nur¹⁹⁷ and

¹⁹⁶ After the death of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk on 10 November 1938, İsmet İnönü was unanimously elected president by the Turkish Grand National Assembly on 11 November 1938. In addition, a month later, at the extraordinary congress of the RPP, which convened on 26 December 1938, the constitution of the RPP was also modified. According to this modification, Atatürk was declared the "Eternal Chairman" of the RPP (Article 2). On the other hand, İsmet İnönü, was accepted as the "Changeless Chairman" of the RPP. Following this process, "National Chief" became İnönü's official title. Cemil Koçak, *Türkiye'de Milli Şef Dönemi (1938-1945)*, vol.1 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996), pp. 154-165.

¹⁹⁷ Dr. Rıza Nur (1879-1942) was born on 30 August 1879 in Sinop. Having completed his primary education, he went to Istanbul to continue his education. He graduated from *Askeri Tıbbiye* (the Military School of Medicine) in 1901 and became an assistant in the Military Hospital of Gülhane. In the Second Constitutional period, he became a member of parliament (MP) from the Union and Progress in 1908. However, after a short while, he joined *Osmanlı Ahrar Fırkası* (Party of Ottoman Liberals), which advocated a decentralization policy in the Empire. Following "the 31st March incident" (1909), he was arrested and dismissed from his office in the Military Hospital of Gülhane. After this event, he continued his opposition to the Unionists by joining another opposition party, *Hürriyet ve İtilaf Fırkası* (The Party of Freedom and Understanding) in 1911. However, after the Unionists consolidated their power in the Empire, he was exiled to Sinop in 1913. Rıza Nur supported the National Struggle and became a MP in the first Grand National Assembly from Sinop in 1920. During the War of Independence, he acted as the Minister of Education and Minister of Health and supported the secularization policy and abolition of the Caliphate. He was also one of the Turkish delegates who signed the Treaty of Moscow in 1921 and Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. He published his popular book *Türk Tarihi* (The Turkish History), which consisted of eleven volumes, between 1924 and 1926. Due to his opposition to Atatürk, he had to leave the country and, in 1926, he went abroad and lived in Paris and Alexandria. In this period, he published a journal *Türkbilik Revüsü* (Revue de Turcologie), which paid close interest to the culture of Turkic

Zeki Velidi Togan returned to Turkey in December 1938.¹⁹⁸ This political change, at least in a spiritual sense, gave a new momentum to the Pan-Turkist movement. On the other hand, the Turkish History Thesis, the Sun-Language theory and the history textbooks of the time, which made a strong reference to Central Asia, created fertile ground for Pan-Turkist propaganda. Moreover, the Kemalist regime's conspicuous emphasis on the concept of race, together with the racist implication of the textbooks of the time and some of the prominent Kemalist elites' discourses emphasizing the importance of the Turkish race, were other factors which facilitated the adoption of the racist discourse of the Pan-Turkist movement in the first half of the 1930s by the younger generation.

In addition, the third factor that made Pan-Turkist sentiments and ideas popular among the younger generations, was educational institutions, in particular high schools and teacher colleges, which were a medium of Pan-Turkist ideas. First of all, in the early thirties, nearly all active Pan-Turkist figures and personages who had sympathy for a cultural unity among all Turkic peoples, such as Nihal Atsız, Nihat Sami Banarlı, Orhan Şaik Gökyay, Arif Nihat Asya, Hüseyin Namık Orkun and Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, were teachers of history or Turkish literature.¹⁹⁹ As noted by Özdoğan, the

peoples, in Paris and Alexandria between 1931 and 1938. After Atatürk's death, he returned to Turkey in December 1938 and was welcomed by Nihal Atsız. In May 1942, he started to edit a weekly Pan-Turkist journal, *Tanrıdağ*, which was published in 18 issues until his death on 8 September 1942. Faruk Alpkaya, "Rıza Nur" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), pp. 374-377. Rıza Nur was considered an outstanding personage for Pan-Turkists for his contribution to the Turkist movement. According to Hüseyin Namık Orkun, he was a "spiritual guide who wanted to indoctrinate a consciousness of national history and morality to the Turkish youth." In addition, the personal affinity between Rıza Nur and Nihal Atsız was so great that he declared Nihal Atsız as his adopted son. *Sevenlerinin Kalemile Rıza Nur*, ed. Ziya Yücel İlhan (İstanbul: B. Kervan Matbaası, 1970), pp. 1-30. On the other hand, Rıza Nur was also an important figure for the Pan-Turkists among the younger generation. For example, Reha Oğuz Türkkan, in his book *Türkçülüğe Giriş* (An Introduction to Turkism), which was published in 1940, praised Rıza Nur for his contribution to the idea of Turkic unity and Turkish racism. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş* (İstanbul: Arkadaş Matbaası, 1940), p. 67.

¹⁹⁸ Günay Göksu Özdoğan, "Türk Ulusçuluğunda Irkçı Temalar: 1930 ve 1940'ların Türkçü Akımı" *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 29 (May 1996), p. 22.

relationship between the teachers who had adopted a cultural or political Pan-Turkism, and students who had learnt about Central Asia as motherland from history textbooks, was not only one of training or transformation of information but also an implantation of Pan-Turkist ideas and sentiments.²⁰⁰ For example, this can be seen explicitly in a letter Nihal Atsız sent to his brother Necdet Sancar (1910-1975), who was also a teacher, on 12 February 1939, in the following words:

The case of Turanism is progressing stealthily. Teachers have a great role in this. Especially your duty is more important; since you are a teacher at a Teachers' College. I am propagating Turanism and racism in civic and literature lessons as much as I can.²⁰¹

Necdet Sancar, a year later, described the main mission of Turkish teachers in the schools as follows:

The first duty before the transmission of knowledge and indoctrination of reading pleasure is to inculcate a national spirit; to make them think about nationalism; to bring in them a national character; to make them think about their own society and nation before everything and to make them adopt Turkism.²⁰²

These teachers and academics played a crucial role in the creation of a young audience with Pan-Turkist tendencies.²⁰³ In the period between 1939 and 1944, the

¹⁹⁹ Zeki Velidi Togan and Abdülkadir İnan were the representatives of the Pan-Turkist movement at university. For example, Nihal Atsız, Nihat Sami Banarlı and Orhan Şaik Gökyay were among the students of Togan and İnan at *Darülfünun*.

²⁰⁰ Özdoğan, "*Turan*"dan "*Bozkurt*"a, p. 217.

²⁰¹ "*Turancılık davası sessiz sessiz yürüyor. Bunda muallimlerin büyük rolü vardır. Hele sen muallim mektebinde olduğun için vazifen daha mühimdir. Ben Yurt bilgisi ve Edebiyat derslerinde mümkün olduğu kadar turancılık ve ırkçılık propagandası yapıyorum.*" "Son Tahkikat Kararı", *Ayın Tarihi* (September 1944), p. 36.

²⁰² "*Bilgi aktarmak, okuma vezki aşulamaktan önce ilk vazife, milli ruh vermek; cemiyetçilik ve milliyetçilik üzerine düşündürmek; milli şahsiyet kazandırmak, herşeyden önce cemiyetini ve milletini düşünmesini sağlamak, Türkçülüğü benimsetmektir.*" Necdet Sancar, "Türk Öğretmeninin Vazifesi", *Kopuz*, no. 4 (July 1940), p. 141-143; cited in Özdoğan, "*Turan*"dan "*Bozkurt*"a, p. 217.

²⁰³ The main readers of Pan-Turkist journals in the thirties, in general, were students and teachers. This situation increased in the forties. For example, According to a list of subscribers, which was published in *Bozkurt*, edited by Reha Oğuz Türkkan, there was a considerable teacher and student group of readers

most prominent and active Pan-Turkist among the younger generation was, no doubt, Reha Oğuz Türkkan.

Reha Oğuz Türkkan and Pan-Turkism

Reha Oğuz Türkkan was born in Istanbul on 12 October 1920.²⁰⁴ He started his primary education at Saint-Joseph Lisesi (Saint-Joseph High School). Having graduated from Saint-Joseph, he entered Kabataş Erkek Lisesi (Kabataş High School for Men) with the demand of his father.²⁰⁵ After that, he attended Galatasaray High School. However, when Türkkan was in his tenth year of school, due to the duty of his father, who was appointed General Director of the Land Registration and Cadastre in Ankara, he went to Ankara and entered Ankara Gazi High School, where Fevziye Abdullah Tansel would play an important role in his Pan-Turkist tendencies. In 1938, Türkkan went to France and attended classes in the History and Anthropology departments of Sorbonne University,²⁰⁶ but he returned to Turkey in December of the same year due to the danger of war in Europe and continued his education at the Faculty of Law of Ankara University.

from various parts of Turkey, such as Kars, Erzurum, Kütahya, Eskişehir, Balıkesir, Sivas, Bursa, Konya, Ankara and İstanbul. *Bozkurt* 1, no. 10 (June 1941), p. 247.

²⁰⁴ Although he was born on 12 October, as Atatürk's use of 19 May, Türkkan used "3 May" as his birth date due to the spritual importance of the incidents that occurred on 3 May 1944, for him. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005. For the 3 May incidents, see Chapter Four.

²⁰⁵ Since his father, Halit Ziya Türkkan, was disturbed by the cosmopolitan atmosphere of Saint-Joseph High School, he continued his education at *Kabataş Erkek Lisesi*, which was famous for its nationalist teachers such as Behçet Kemal Çağlar and Mükremin Halil Yinanç. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005.

²⁰⁶ Türkkan says that the main factor that motivated him to attend the history and anthropology departments at the Sorbonne was his close interest to the concept of race at the time. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005.

According to Türkkan, the main sources of his Pan-Turkist conviction and ideas were the French orientalist Léon Cahun's two books, *La Bannière Bleue* (1876)²⁰⁷ and *Introduction a l'histoire de l'Asie. Turcs et Mongols des origines a 1405* (1896); Nihal Atsız's two journals, *Atsız Mecmua* and *Orhun*; the monthly journal *Birlik*, which had been published by "Milli Türk Talebe Birliği" (National Union of the Turkish Students);²⁰⁸ the books and poems of Ziya Gökalp and Rıza Nur's *Türk Tarihi* (The Turkish History), which consisted of twelve volumes.²⁰⁹ Türkkan started to give his first intellectual products by publishing some articles in the monthly journal *Filiz*, which was published by the students of Ankara Gazi High School. Türkkan, in his article, "*Ülkü ve Hayat*" (The ideal and the life), advocated that "true happiness is materialized only by the individual's dedication to an ideal, which must be only the love of country."²¹⁰ This article took attention of Hasan Ali Yücel, who, at the time, was the editorial writer of *Ulus*, which was the semi-official publication organ of the RPP, and Yücel wrote an article that praised Türkkan in *Ulus*.²¹¹ However, after a

²⁰⁷ *La Bannière Bleue*, which exalts the pre-Islamic culture and life-style of the Turks living in Central Asia, was published for the first time in 1876 in France. The novel was translated into Turkish by Necip Asım in 1912. The first translation of the book in the Latin alphabet was published by Galib Bahtiyar in 1933 under the name *Gök Bayrak*. For more information on the book, see Léon Cahun, *Gök Bayrak*, trans. Galip Bahtiyar (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitaphanesi, 1933).

²⁰⁸ *Milli Türk Talebe Birliği* (1913-1936) used the grey wolf as its official emblem in the thirties with the approval of the government. The union also paid close attention to the Turkish minorities living outside of Turkey and organized some demonstrations in favor of them and the annexation of Hatay (Alexandretta). Mehmet Ali Ağaoğulları, "The Ultranationalist Right" in *Turkey in Transition: New Perspectives*, ed. Irvin C. Schick and Ertuğrul Ahmet Tonak (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), pp. 202-204. The official publication organ of the union was the *Birlik* (The Union), which was published, monthly, in fourteen issues between July 1933 and August 1934. The journal, which had clear racist tendencies, advocated that Kemalism was based on only the Turkish race. In this framework, the minorities living in Turkey were described many times by the journal as the ungrateful elements that sucked the blood of the Turkish nation. For more detailed information on the *Birlik*, see M. Çağatay Okutan, *Bozkurt'tan Kur'an'a Milli Türk Talebe Birliği (1916-1980)* (İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004)

²⁰⁹ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, *Kuyruk Acısı* (İstanbul: Stad Matbaası, 1943), pp. 54-57.

²¹⁰ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, "Ülkü ve Hayat (Türk Gençliğine)" *Filiz*, no. 1 (January 1938), p. 15.

while, the thought of the superiority of the Turkish race suppressed the thought of the love of country. In other words, Türkkan began to show the first signals of his actions in the future in his article “*Ruh mu Bilgi mi?*” (Sprit or Knowledge?), in which he exalted the Turkish race passionately in the following words:

Turkish! Turkish! Again Turkish! At war, knowledge, civilization, sprit, yesterday and today, Turkish is always the most superior! Always Turkish like a giant that breaks his bonds, our terrible sir.²¹²

Türkkan, along with his close friends at Ankara Gazi High School such as Cihat Savaş Fer, Hikmet Tanyu, Ceyhun Atıf Kansu, Mustafa Kızılsu, Fikret Kılıçoğlu, founded a secret organization under the name of *GÜREM*, which meant “the unity of people”²¹³ in the first months of 1938.²¹⁴ For Türkkan, the principal target of this organization was to disseminate the Pan-Turkist sentiments and ideas to the vast masses of the people.²¹⁵ In order to reach this goal, Türkkan benefited from journals as the previous Pan-Turkist had done. Türkkan explained his main reason for using the medium of magazines in his article over Turkish press, which was published in 1950, as follows:

The rigid control of newspapers by the authorities, particularly after 1934 to 1935, sapped their vitality and minimized their political influence. Magazines, on the other hand, were able to express themselves more freely. Since the capital investment was not large, any group could put out a

²¹¹ Hasan Ali Yücel, “Ülkü ve Hayat,” *Ulus*, 5 March 1938. Türkkan says that after Yücel’s article in *Ulus*, Yücel and he fraternized and saw each other many times. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005.

²¹² “*Türk! Türk! Gene Türk! Savaşta, bilgide, medeniyette, ruhta, dün, bugün, daima Türk en üstünümüz! Daima Türk, bağlarını koparıp atan bir dev gibi, dehşetli efendimiz.*” Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “*Ruh mu Bilgi mi?*” *Filiz*, no. 4 (April 1938), p. 9.

²¹³ According to Türkkan’s explanation, he found the name of the secret organization in *Osmanlıcadan Türkçeye Söz Karşılıkları Tarama Dergisi* (A Collection of Turkish Equivalents for Ottoman Turkish Words), which had been published for the first time in 1934 by the Turkish Language Association. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, *Tabutluktan Gurbete* (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 1975), pp. 413-414.

²¹⁴ Türkkan claims that because the Kemalist regime did not give permission for the establishment of any organization without its own control, he and his friends had founded *GÜREM* as a secret organization. However, the organization, according to Türkkan, was dissolved in 1942. Türkkan, *Tabutluktan Gurbete*, pp. 413-420.

²¹⁵ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005.

periodical, and if it was suspended for any reason, it was not difficult to start over again with a new weekly or monthly.²¹⁶

Although he was very young, the main factor that made Türkkan a prominent figure among the Pan-Turkist circles was the three journals, *Ergenekon*, *Bozkurt* and *Gök-Börü*, which were published between November 1938 and May 1943 under his editorial control.

Ergenekon

After the closure of Nihal Atsız's *Orhun*, the first journal with explicit Pan-Turkist and racist tendencies was *Ergenekon*,²¹⁷ published in four issues in Ankara, as monthly, between 10 November 1938 and 10 February 1939.²¹⁸ The motto of the journal was “*Her Irkın Üstünde Türk Irkı*” (The Turkish race above every race), which would also be the motto of the other journals that would be published by Türkkan in the following years. After the third issue, another motto, “*Ülkümüz Irkdaşlarımızın Saadetidir*” (Our ideal is the happiness of all members of our race), was added to the journal. The journal had on the cover of each issue a figure of the grey wolf, which had been the symbol of nearly all Pan-Turkist publications published in the former period. Although the owner of the journal was Cihat Savaş Fer, Türkkan, whose signature and pseudonyms such as “Reha Kurtuluş”, “Avni Motun”, “Ergenekoncu” and “A. Mete

²¹⁶ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “The Turkish Press”, *Middle Eastern Affairs* 18 (May 1950), pp. 143-144.

²¹⁷ Before publication of the journal, Türkkan contacted Nihal Atsız in order to convince him to contribute to the journal, but Atsız rejected Türkkan's offer. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005.

²¹⁸ Since the fourth issue of *Ergenekon* was collected by the government, there are only the first three issues of the journal in the libraries. Therefore, many scholars, such as Özdoğan, Hostler, Koçak and Güvenir, argue that only three issues were published. However, the fourth issue of the journal can be found in Türkkan's collection.

Turanlı” appeared on most of the articles, covering a wide variety of subjects such as philosophy, anthropology and history, was the real editor of the journal.

In addition to Türkkan, the prominent authors who contributed to *Ergenekon* were the Turkic emigrants Abdülkadir İnan, Muharrem Fevzi Togay and Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer, and members of parliament like Necip Ali Küçüka and Mahmut Esat Bozkurt. The journal paid close attention to the history and culture of Turkic peoples living in the Soviet Union, as the Pan-Turkist journals of the previous decade had done. In addition, Türkkan introduced Mete Khan to his readers as the first Pan-Turkist in history, since he had united all Turks under a great Empire in the B.C. 200s.²¹⁹ On the other hand, Türkkan attacked roundly Communism and, having described it as a “death seed for the Turks”, swore an oath to exterminate all people who disseminated Communism in Turkey.²²⁰ He also condemned Fascism and National Socialism as severely as he did Communism. For instance, in an article titled “*Faşizm Tehlikelidir*” (Fascism is dangerous), he portrayed those two ideologies as the most dangerous ideologies for Turkey in the following words:

My bretheren of blood! After I returned from my Europe journey,²²¹ I understood this reality with its all terror. It is very dangerous and a traitorous attempt to try to imitate Fascism, in particular NATIONAL SOCIALISM in Turkey. Even National Socialism is a much closer and more threatening danger than Communism.²²²

²¹⁹ Reha Kurtuluş, “Türkler ve Panturanizm” *Ergenekon*, no. 3 (January 1939), pp. 23-24.

²²⁰ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Kandaşlarım” *Ergenekon*, no. 2 (December 1938), p. 18.

²²¹ In fact, since he had participated in his father’s European journey, the first issue of *Ergenekon* was published in the absence of Türkkan. During the journey, he went around various countries, including Germany and Italy. In the meantime, he also had the chance to listen to Hitler and Mussolini. Türkkan argues that he saw some maps, which included Turkey and were named as the Great Roman Empire in the future, in Rome. As for Germany, he also faced the same desires. For this reason, he felt that these countries wanted to obtain some parts of Turkey. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005.

²²² “Kandaşlarım! Avrupa seyahatımın dönüşünde, bu hakikati bütün dehşetiyle anlamış bulunuyorum. Türkiye’de Faşizmi ve- bilhassa NASYONAL-SOSYALİZM’i- taklide kalkışmak, fevkaalede tehlikeli ve hainane bir teşebbüştür. Hatta Nasyonal-Sosyalizm, bizim için, komünizmden daha yakın ve daha

In the third issue of the journal, Türkkan, even though he accepted that Fascism and National Socialism had some positive features when compared to Communism, he went further and declared that Italy and Germany had some desires over Anatolia.²²³ Another subject that Türkkan emphasized continuously was Atatürk and his importance in Turkish history. For example, the second issue of the journal, which was published just a month after the death of Atatürk, was dedicated to the great leader. Türkkan, in his article “*Atatürk’ü Niçin En Büyük Dahi Tanırız?*” (Why do we accept Atatürk as the greatest genius?), having compared Atatürk with other important figures in history such as Christ, Mohammed, Marx, Nietzsche, Kant, Shakespeare, Bismarck, Lenin, Napoleon, Hitler and Mussolini, described him as the greatest genius in world history, since he was a greater intellectual, soldier, diplomat and revolutionary than any of them.²²⁴ Moreover, Türkkan, seriously, offered that an anthropological research be

korkunç bir tehlikedir.” Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Faşizm Tehlikelidir” *Ergenekon*, no. 2 (December 1938), p. 2.

²²³ “Fascism is dangerous. Why? What for? Is it a regime that impedes the progress of society? (National Socialism, Fascism, they are all the same) Is fascism a regime that kills nations and brings rotten ideologies like Communism? Is it dangerous from this angle? No. Communism is dangerous ideologically (it drags societies to underdevelopment and disaster) and also it brings Russian dominance with its propaganda. But fascism is not like that. Most of the ideologies (nationalism, populism etc.) are very valuable. These principles are sublime. Fascism raises Italy as well as National Socialism raises Germany. But its danger originates from malevolence. The aims of fascist countries on Anatolia and the economic maneuvering and regime propaganda, which they show as the solution of the application of this aim, are very harmful and unfortunately powerful weapons for us. We can only struggle against the second weapon, propaganda...If we, those who see the danger, do not cry out, our silence is baseness.” “*Faşizm Tehlikelidir. Niçin? Niye? Cemiyeti gerileten bir rejim midir? (Nasyonal-Sosyalizm, Faşizm hepsi bir) komünizm gibi faşizm de milletleri öldüren ve bozuk ideolojiler taşıyan bir rejim midir? Tehlikeliği bu bakımdan mıdır? Hayır. Komünizm hem ideoloji bakımından (Cemiyetleri geriliğe ve felakete sürükler) hem de propagandasıyla Rus çizmesini getirdiği için ayrıca tehlikelidir. Faşizm öyle değildir; ideolojilerin çoğu (milliyetçilik, cemiyetçilik vs.) gayet değerlidir. Bu prensipler yüksektir. Faşizm İtalya’yı Nasyonal-Sosyalizm Almanya’yı yükseltmiştir. Fakat tehlikesi kötü niyetler bakımındandır. Faşist devletlerin, Anadolu üzerindeki emelleri ve bu ülkenin tahakkuk çaresi olarak gösterdikleri iktisadi manevra ve rejim propagandası bizim için çok muzır ve maalesef kuvvetli silahlardır. Bizim elimizden ancak ikinci silahlı-propaganda-yla mücadele etmek geliyor... Tehlikeyi gören bizler haykırmazsak, susuşumuz alçaklık olur.*” Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Faşizm Tehlikelidir Yazısı Etrafında” *Ergenekon*, no. 3 (January 1939), p. 36.

²²⁴ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Atatürk’ü Niçin En Büyük Dahi Tanırız” *Ergenekon*, no. 2 (December 1938), p. 1-2.

conducted on Atatürk's skull in order to learn the ideal measurement of the Turkish race.²²⁵

However, only two issues later, this irrational admiration gained a totally different dimension. In the fourth issue of *Ergenekon*, the influence of the Turkish History Thesis and the regime's strong emphasis over Central Asia on Türkkan crystallized in his article, entitled "*Atatürk ve Panturanizm*" (Atatürk and Panturanism). In his article, Türkkan described Atatürk as a sincere Pan-Turkist who dreamed about establishing a great Turanian state in Asia by depending on the Turkish History Thesis. According to Türkkan, Atatürk had not been able to articulate his ideas related to Pan-Turkism due to political reasons. However, his death was not a barrier for the Turanian empire. It would be established in the future as Gökalp had dreamed.²²⁶ After this issue, published on 10 February 1939, *Ergenekon* was suspended and the fourth issue was seized by the government. According to Türkkan, the main reason for the

²²⁵ "Prof. Şevket Aziz Kansu'dan Bir Rica" *Ergenekon*, no. 2 (December 1938), p. 20.

²²⁶ "Atatürk, the last genius of our race, knew that Turkishness cannot be limited to the borders of Turkey; Atatürk also knew that 20 million masses become weak in front of the one hundred million enemy forces and believed that Turkishness cannot continue in this situation...Think about that: Why did the great chief insist on the "history of our race"?...Why? Why did he tell us that "the most important part of our history is in Central Asia!" and remind us of those of the same race there? Because of politics, he could not say clearly. He wanted to inspire in this way. Because of those unlovable politics, he could not say directly, 'Brethrens of blood, we have millions of brothers in Central Asia, they are crying under captivity. One day, we will release them and found a great Turk Union!'. But he got his idea and belief across to us indirectly... Atatürk was the most sincere Pan-Turanist and had the power to apply it...He died! But the holy movement which was created by Turkishness did not die and cannot die!" "*Atatürk, ırkımızın bu son dahisi, Türklüğün Türkiye sınırları içerisinde hapsedilemeyeceğini biliyordu; Atatürk, 20 milyonluk kütlelerin, yüz milyona varan düşman kuvvetleri karşısında zayıf duruma düşeceğini de biliyor ve Türklüğün bugünkü haliyle kalmayacağına iman ediyordu...Düşünün bir kere: Büyük şef ne diye 'ırk tarihimiz' üzerinde bu kadar ısrarla durdu?...Neden? Niçin durmadan bize: 'tarihimizin en mühim kısmı Orta Asya'dadır!' dedi ve oradaki ırkdaşları bize hatırlattı? -siyaset dolayısıyla- açıkça bağırmadığı şeyleri bu yolla telkin etmek istiyordu. Gene o sevimsiz politika denilen nesne yüzündendir ki bize doğrudan doğruya: 'Kandaşlar, Asya'da milyonlarca kardeşlerimiz var; esaret altında inliyorlar. Bir gün gelip onları kurtaracağız ve büyük Türk birliğini kuracağız!' diyemedi. Fakat bir çok yerlerde bu fikrini ve bu inanışını sezdirdi...Atatürk en samimi bir Panturanistti ve bunu tahakkuk ettirebilecek bir kudretteydi...O öldü! Fakat Türklüğün yarattığı yüce cereyan ölmedi ve ölemez!" Reha Oğuz Türkkan, "Atatürk ve Panturanizm" *Ergenekon*, no. 4 (February 1939), p. 13.*

suspension of the journal was his writings against Italy and Germany, which had been found dangerous for Turkey's foreign relations by the government.²²⁷

Bozkurt

Following *Ergenekon*'s closure, Türkkan organized another monthly journal, *Bozkurt*, published in nineteen issues in Istanbul between May 1939 and July 1942.²²⁸ In the journal, which was published irregularly due to repeated suspensions by the government, Türkkan also maintained the use the same motto "The Turkish race above every race" and the symbol of grey wolf. While the masthead of the journal was the "Monthly journal of ideas and youth" up to the ninth issue, published in December 1940, after that issue it was changed to the "Monthly Turkist Journal." The journal was closed by the government just a month after its first publication. In the second issue of the journal, Türkkan, in his article "*En Büyük Dava: Türk Köylüsü*" (The Greatest Case: The Turkish Villager), he accused almost all of the people in the country who used a peasantist discourse of being hypocrites and pseudo-nationalists as follows:

Words such as "the development of village " and "the villager is our master" have been so mumbled that we suspect these stereotyped expressions. We hear these stereotyped words from the people who oppress and exploit the villagers at most like many high-ranking people who shout "use domestic goods!", but wear clothes which are made from English fabric. "The villager our master!" Is hypocrisy such a good thing that cannot be left? Why these

²²⁷ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005. At first glance, when the Turkish foreign policy of the time is considered, Türkkan's claim seems reasonable. However, there were no anti-German or anti-Italian writings in the fourth issue of the journal. On the other hand, because the Kemalist regime had not encouraged any Pan-Turkist publications since its consolidation in the country, the journal's explicit Pan-Turkist messages must be also kept in mind as a serious reason for its closure. In addition, there is another evidence to consider like that. For example, in the first issue of *Bozkurt*, the second journal edited by Türkkan, he published all writings, including poems which had been published in the fourth issue of *Ergenekon*, in the journal but, interestingly, "Atatürk ve Panturanizm" was not among them.

²²⁸ Since Türkkan left the journal after the sixteenth issue appeared on 26 March 1942, the last three issues of the journal were published under the editorship of Nihal Atsız.

people do not directly and honestly tell their purposes and they insist on using this lie mask which none of us believe? Why?...The greatest rascals who say that our villages are so developed that they can be models for the villages in Europe and these miserable rascals who consider themselves revolutionists, but actually, our greatest enemies, shut up anymore!...The condition of our villages is so bad that those whose believe are weak may have drifted to Communism. But no need to be flustered. Not to lose our way the bretheren of blood! This greatest case is solved by only and only the genuine nationalists. And we will solve it.²²⁹

After this issue not only was the journal closed, but Türkkan was put on trail.²³⁰

Following *Bozkurt*'s suspension, Türkkan, in October 1939, established an association under the name of “*Kitapsevenler Kurumu*” (Booklover's Association).²³¹ Türkkan, in a retrospective evaluation, explained that his main aim in establishing the association was to gather the scattered Turkists under one roof and to republish the historical and literary treasures of Turkish national culture, which remained in the old alphabet, in the new alphabet and, in this way, to counterbalance the Western classics, which were published by the Ministry of Education, ruled by Hasan Ali Yücel.²³² While Türkkan had the general secretary post of the association, Fethi Okyar, the Minister of Justice of the time, was its honorary chairman.²³³ Besides, in addition to some members of

²²⁹ “ ‘Köy kalkınması’; ‘Köylü efendimizdir’ sözleri o kadar çok gevelendi durdu ki, bu basma kalıp tabirlerden artık kuşkulandır olduk. ‘Yerli Malı Kullan’ diye bar bar bağırان nice yüksek kimselerin üstlerindeki elbisenin İngiliz kumaşından oluşu gibi, köylüyü en fazla ezenlerin ve istismar edenlerin de ağzından bu klişe sözleri işitiyoruz. ‘Köylü efendimizdir!’ İki yüzlülük bu kadar hoş bir şey mi ki bir türlü terkedilemiyor! Neden bunlar açıkça, namusluca maksatlarını söylemiyorlar da, hiç birimizin inanmadığı bu yalan maskesine bürünmekte ısrar ediyorlar? Neden?...Avrupa köylerine numune olacak kadar köylerimizin tekamül etmiş olduğunu’ söyleyen o en büyük alçaklar, inkılapçı geçinen fakat aslında en büyük düşmanımız olan o sefil dalkavuklar seslerini kessinler artık!... Köylümüzün durumu o kadar kötüdür ki, imanı zayıf kimseleri derhal komünizme kadar sürükleyebilir. Fakat telaşa mahal yok. Yolumuzu şaşırmayalım, kandaşlar! Bu en büyük davayı yalnız hakiki milliyetçiler halledebilir. Ve halledeceğiz!” Ergenekon Köylüsü (Reha Oğuz Türkkan), “En Büyük Dava: Türk Köylüsü” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 2 (June 1939), pp. 43-44.

²³⁰ Landau argues that the journal was closed down due to its Pan-Turkist publication policy in the first two issues. Landau, *Pan-Turkism*, p. 89. However, the editorial of the third issue of the journal, published in May 1940, obviously states that it was closed down because of the article, “En Büyük Dava: Türk Köylüsü”. See “Ergenekondan Çıkan Bozkurt”, *Bozkurt* 1, no. 3 (May 1939), p. 65.

²³¹ “Kitapsevenler Kurumu”, *Bozkurt* 1, no. 4 (May-June 1940), p. 105.

²³² Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Türkçülüğün Tarihi”, *Yeni Orkun*, no. 9 (November 1988), p. 16-17.

parliament such as Besim Atalay, Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, Necip Ali Küçük, Hıfzı Oğuz Bekata and Şevket Raşit Hatipoğlu, some Pan-Turkist figures like Zeki Velidi Togan, Abdülkadir İnan, Hüseyin Namık Orkun and Hüseyin Hüsnü Emir Erkilet were among the members of the association.²³⁴ The association republished Ahmet Hikmet Müftüoğlu's *Çağlayanlar* and Ziya Gökalp's *Türkçülüğün Esasları* for the first time in the Latin alphabet. However, the association could not survive long and after a few months, on 27 April 1940, the RPP forced it to dissolve itself and incorporate with the People's Houses among whose goals were also the publication of similar books.²³⁵

Succeeding the closure of *Kitapsevenler Kurumu*, Türkkan, who had been acquitted in the court, restarted to issue *Bozkurt* in May 1940. This time, Türkkan enlarged the contributors of the journal and Nihal Atsız, Zeki Velidi Togan, Hüseyin Namık Orkun, Peyami Safa, Nusret Köymen, İsmet Rasin Tümtürk, Arif Nihat Asya, Nejdîet Sancar and Dr. Mustafa Hakkı Akansel, Orhan Seyfi Orhon and Yusuf Ziya Ortaç²³⁶ began to write in *Bozkurt*. In the first issue, the journal sent a message to the

²³³ Türkkan was working at the Ministry of Justice as a trainee at the time.

²³⁴ According to Türkkan, he had also invited Nihal Atsız to be affiliated with the association, but he had rejected that offer saying "I do not like joining associations that have a chairman. I work alone." Reha Oğuz Türkkan, *Kuyruk Acısı*, p. 74.

²³⁵ Özdoğan, "*Turan*"dan "*Bozkurt*"a, p. 212.

²³⁶ Orhan Seyfi Orhon and Yusuf Ziya Ortaç, approximately a year later, started to publish *Çınaraltı*, which appeared in 136 issues, as weekly, in Istanbul between 9 August 1941 and 15 July 1944 by The journal's motto was *Dilde, Fikirde, İşte Birlik* (Unity in Language, Thought and action), formulated for the first time by İsmail Gasprinski. The prominent authors of the journal were Hüseyin Namık Orkun, Peyami Safa, Hüseyin Hüsnü Emir Erkilet, Nihal Atsız, Nejdîet Sancar, Muharrem Fevzi Togay and Mustafa Hakkı Akansel. In addition to the history of the Turkic people living in the Soviet Union, a cultural unity based on the Turkish language among all Turkic peoples and the superiority of the Turkish race were among the subjects that the journal emphasized frequently. Because the journal did not stress a Pan-Turkist irredentism, however, it was more moderate concerning Pan-Turkism when compared with the journals edited by Atsız and Türkkan. Besides, because the two journals described themselves as Turkist journals, *Çınaraltı* and *Bozkurt* supported each other by advertising one another. On the other hand, according to Ali Kemal Meram, Nuri Killigil, stepbrother of Enver Pasha, was the financier of *Çınaraltı*. Ali Kemal Meram, *Türkçülük ve Türkçülük Mücadeleleri Tarihi* (İstanbul: Kültür Kitabevi, 1969), p. 235.

government, explaining it would not engage in politics again.²³⁷ Moreover, Nusret Köymen, who was the publication director of the Ministry of Agriculture, published an article, which had an allusive title, “*Köycülük Ülküsü Türkçülük Ülküsüdür*” (The ideal of Pesantism is the ideal of Turkism).²³⁸ However, the political atmosphere had changed radically not only in Turkey but also in the world because of the Second World War, which had broken out with the German invasion of Poland in September 1939. The ruling elite of Turkey at the time was largely of the generation that had experienced the First World War, the War of Independence. The destructive circumstances and events of those years had a deep impact on them. For example, Suat Hayri Ürgüplü, a prominent deputy of the time and the Prime Minister between 1965 and 1966, described the atmosphere among the leading cadres at the time in the following words: “Most of the leading cadres of the 1939-1945 period had lived through the hardship and humiliations of the First War. Therefore the foremost consideration was: how could Turkey find a way to stay out? We were mostly of the generation which had lived, known and suffered the First World War.”²³⁹

As a natural result of the political atmosphere among the ruling elites, the main target of Turkey at the time was to remain outside the war. Although Turkey had signed a tripartite alliance in October 1939 with France and Britain, Turkey remained neutral during the war, resisting strong pressure from both Germany and Allied forces. However, the war, no doubt, also stimulated Pan-Turkist desires as the First World War had done in the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, the journal, in particular *Türkkan*, was using a more outspoken language with respect to Pan-Turkism. For example, in the

²³⁷ “Ergenekondan Çıkan Bozkurt” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 3 (May 1940), p. 65.

²³⁸ For the article, see Nusret Köymen, “*Köycülük Ülküsü Türkçülük Ülküsüdür*” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 3 (May 1940), p. 66.

²³⁹ Selim Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War: An Active Neutrality* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 58.

third issue, Türkkan defined Turkism as a high ideal that could not be restricted to only Anatolia by emphasizing the Turkic peoples living in the Soviet Union.²⁴⁰ In addition, in the sixth issue of the journal, he declared that they, the Pan-Turkists in Turkey, would found the great Turkish unity through the war as follows: “We will not rescue these forty-five million Turks who moan in captivity through beggings and requests. We will achieve the great Turkish unity of sixty million not with agreements, tears, peace promises but with blood and sword, cannons and rifles, tanks and fighter planes, that is to say, with the sublime and blessed war: The right is not given, it is seized!”²⁴¹

However, *Bozkurt* was suspended by the government one more time due to the editorial, written by Nihal Atsız in the ninth issue. Atsız, in his article, “İki Yıl Dönümü” (The two anniversaries), having reiterated his own history thesis, which claimed there had been only a Turkish state, governed by various dynasties in the long Turkish history, explained his deep grief by describing Turkey as “hero, noble, high but orphan,” since the 900th anniversary of the present Turkish state, which had been founded in 1040 in Khorasan, was not celebrated in the country.²⁴² In this way, Atsız despised the importance of the new Turkish republic. A few months later, Türkkan applied to the General Directorate of Press and Publications in order to be allowed to reissue *Bozkurt*. In the letter of application, he promised that the journal would be published without disturbing the government as follows:

²⁴⁰ “Turkism is for every Turk without regard to political borders. The Turks of Anatolia, Azarbaijan, Idle-Ural, Turcomen, Kirghizes, Baskirs, Turkestanis...All of them are the targets of Turkism. When a Turkist mentions ‘the development of the Turks,’ he means all of these Turks” “*Türkçülük, siyasi hudutlar gözetmeden bütün Türkler içindir. Anadolu Türkü, Azerbaycan Türkü, İdil-Ural Türkü, Türkmenler, Kırgızlar, Başkurtlar, Türkistanlılar...hepsi Türkçüşüğe muhattaptırlar. Türkçü, ‘Türklerin yükselmesi’ dediği zaman bütün bunları anlar.*” Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Türkçülük Deyince Ne Anlarız?” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 4 (May-July 1940), p. 89.

²⁴¹ “Biz, esarete inleyen bu 45 milyon Türkü, yalvarmalar ve ricalarla kurtarmayacağız. Biz, 60 milyonluk Büyük Türk Birliğini, mukavelelerle, göz yaşlarıyla, sulh vaadleriyle değil, kanla ve kılıçla, topla ve tüfekle, tankla ve uçakla, yani ulu ve kutlu savaşla elde edeceğiz: Hak verilmez, alınır!” Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Savaşçılık: Savaş Bir Felaket midir?” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 6 (September 1940), p. 133.

²⁴² Nihal Atsız, “İki Yıl Dönümü”, *Bozkurt* 1, no. 9 (December 1940), p. 201.

Bozkurt review, of which publication was stopped temporarily three months ago by the decision of the Council of Ministers, promises to publish without leaving the exalted directions of our national chief and requests respectfully you to allow the publication again on behalf of the requirement of our national and common ideal, because of effective and useful publishing on the patriotic youth in contemporary conditions.²⁴³

In April 1941, with the approval of Selim Sarper, the Director of the General Directorate of Press and Publications of the time, the government allowed Türkkan to publish *Bozkurt* again. However, the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union on 22 June 1941 changed the atmosphere among Pan-Turkist circles radically.²⁴⁴ Since a Soviet defeat in the war would give a chance for them to realize their dream of Turan, the Pan-Turkists greeted the Nazi attack with great enthusiasm.²⁴⁵ The aggressive tone of the Pan-Turkist

²⁴³ “*Vekiller heyeti kararı ile muvakkaten 3 ay evvel tatil edilen Bozkurt mecmuası, bugünkü ahvalde vatanperver Gençlik kütlesi üzerinde çok müessir ve faydalı neşriyat yapabileceğinden, milli şeflerimizin yüksek direktiflerinden çıkmadan neşriyat yapacağımızı vaad eder; yeniden intişarına mücadele edilmesi hususunda delalet buyurmanızı milli ve müşterek mefkuremiz icabı saygılarımızla rica ederiz.*” Önen, *Ibid*, p. 275.

²⁴⁴ Just four days before the attack, Germany signed a Treaty of Friendship and Non-Aggression with Turkey on 18 June. However, in harmony with its neutrality policy, Turkey had also signed with the Soviet Union a Reciprocal Declaration of Neutrality against belligerence of a third party on 24 March 1941. Günay Göksu Özdoğan, “II. Dünya Savaşı Yıllarındaki Türk-Alman İlişkilerinde İç ve Dış Politika Aracı Olarak Pan-Türkizm” in *Türk Dış Politikasının Analizi*, ed. Faruk Sönmezoğlu (İstanbul: Der Yayınları, 2001), p. 480.

²⁴⁵ In fact, those who greeted the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union in Turkey with enthusiasm were not limited to only Pan-Turkist figures, and a pro-German sympathy was quite widespread in Turkey at the time. For instance, Faik Ahmet Barutçu, a prominent deputy from Trabzon at the time, described the atmosphere in the parliament in his memoirs as follows:

“The German-Soviet war had created a festive atmosphere in the country. Everybody congratulates each other. All of the hearts have throbbed for German victory with the happiness and eagerness of five centuries of historical revenge. I said:

-May your political holy war be blessed, to Saraçoğlu, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the corridor of the Parliament in the afternoon. He answered:

-Ours! The deputies said to each other: May your feast be blessed.”

“*Alman-Sovyet harbi memlekette bir bayram havası vücuda getirmiştir. Herkes birbirini tebrik ediyor. Beş yüz senelik tarihi bir intikamın sevki ve sevinci ile kalpler derhal Alman zaferi içim çarpmaya başladı. Öğleden sonra Meclis koridorunda Dışişleri Bakanı Saraçoğluna:*

-Siyasi gazanız bir kere daha mübarek olsun, dedim. Saraçoğlu:

-Hepimizin! cevabını verdi. Mebuslar birbirlerine:

-Bayramınız mübarek olsun diyorlar.” Faik Ahmet Barutçu, *Siyasi Hatıralar*, vol. 1, *Milli Mücadeleden Demokrasiye* (Ankara: 21. Yüzyıl Yayınları, 2001), p. 494. For another source that describes the pro-German tendencies of the Turkish press and deputies after the invasion of the Soviets by German armies, see Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, *Politikada 45 Yıl* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), pp. 144-152.

journals increased.²⁴⁶ For example, the eleventh issue of *Bozkurt*, appeared just a month later the Nazi attack on the Soviets, had a map on its cover that showed the frontiers of Turkish nation, starting from Turkey through Cenral Asia up to nearly the shores of the Pasific ocean. Moreover, the journal was sending an obvious call for the war to the president İnönü under the name of “*Türklük Bekliyor!*” (The Turkishness is waiting!) as follows:

The world is boiling. The most important and vital incidents are being prepared, are outbreaking and new ones are being prepared. All nations’ futures are in a formation process. The greatest law of nature is dominating with its all strength in this fabulous life struggle of which centuries cannot show another example:

-You will kill or be killed!

The nations that do not want the second choice should be seen beyond the darkness, immediately seized very rare opportunities that could appear...War is a burglar that heralds the time to act for the independence days of nations, the unique and great opportunity day, the sacred day on which we would shed our blood! O İNÖNÜ, who ihas been selected by history for this great day! We are ready to shed our blood for the sacred independence of Turkish world! All of the Turkish world is waiting for your signal! The right is not given; it is seized! ²⁴⁷

²⁴⁶ After the invasion of the Soviets, Germany started spreading Pan-Turkist propaganda in order to create pro-German public opinion in Turkey and to facilitate Turkey’s entry into the war on the side of itself by stimulating Turkey’s imperialist tendencies. The intensity of Pan-Turkist propoganda increased as German armies conquered the areas of the Soviet Union inhabited by Turkic peoples. In this process, the German ambassador, Franz von Papen, who had served in the Ottoman army as an officer in the First World War, contacted some old Pan-Turkists, such as Hüseyin Hüsnü Emir Erkilet and Nuri Killigil, who went to Germany in order to organize Turkic prisoners of war against the Soviets in September 1941. (Zeki Velidi Togan was also invited by the German authorities to Germany but the Turkish government did not permit him to go to Germany in spite of his personal request to Fevzi Çakmak, the president of the general staff of the time, and Numan Menemencioğlu, the under secretary of the foreign ministry of the time) In this framework, Johannes Glasneck argues that *Bozkurt* was financed by Nazi capital. Johannes Glasneck, *Türkiye’de Faşist Alman Propagandası*, trans. Arif Gelen (Ankara: Onur Yayınları, n.d.), p. 204. In fact, Ribbentrop, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Germany at the time, in a secret message sent to von Papen in 5 December 1942, stated that 5 million marks would be sent to Turkey in order to support pro-German personages. *Alman Dış İşleri Dairesi Belgeleri, Türkiye’deki Alman Politikaları (1941-1943)*, trans. Levent Konyar (İstanbul: Havass, 1977), p. 87. However, when the money sent to Turkey, *Bozkurt* had already ceased its publication. In addition, Türkkan, in contrast to support Germany in the war, had published many writings, passionately advocating the defeat of Germany in the war, since he considered Germany as one of the greatest hindrances for Pan-Turkist unity and as an imperialist word power, planning to occupy Turkey. Finally, Türkkan himself definitely rejects this claim. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005.

²⁴⁷ “*Dünya kaynıyor. En mühim ve hayati hadiseler hazırlanıyor, patlıyor, yenileri hazırlanıyor. Bütün milletlerin istikballeri tam bir oluş halindedir...Asırların eşini gösteremeyeceği bu müthiş hayat dövuşünde, en büyük tabiat kanunu, o onca kuvvetiyle hakim oluyor:*
-Ya öldüreceksin, yahut öleceksin!

After this issue *Bozkurt* was suspended for the third time by the government due to its editorial policy, which was totally against the official Turkish foreign policy. However, Türkkan managed to reissue *Bozkurt* one more time and, in December 1941, the new issue of the journal was published with the official permission of the government. This time, there were some changes in the journal. First of all, Nihal Atsız and his brother Nejdet Sancar were no longer among the authors and their positions were replaced by new names such as Ali İhsan Sabis, Dr. Osman Turan and Altemur Kılıç. In addition, the journal started to be published as a weekly. As for its editorial policy, Türkkan continued his previous attitude with respect to Pan-Turkism. For example, he proclaimed his racist and Pan-Turkist ideology explicitly by using a militarist discourse one more time in his article “*Bozkurtçunun Amentüsü*” (The grey wolf’s creed) as follows:

- Who are we?
- We are the grey wolves!
- What is our ideology?
- The grey wolf Turkism.
- What do the grey wolves believe in?
- The superiority of the Turkish race and nation over the other races and nations!
- What is the source of this superiority?
- The Turkish blood.
- Is the Turk superior by birth?
- The Turk is superior by birth. The Turk receives his intelligence, bravery, military genius and his great ability and capacity in every way from his blood.
- When does this superiority disappear totally?
- If the Turkish blood mixes with foreign blood. In this situation, the generations that would be born as hybrid and mixed blood do not have the physical and spiritual characteristics of the Turk and cannot be from a superior stock like a genuine Turk.

İkinci şıkkı istemeyen milletler, karanlıkların ötesini görebilmeli, zuhur eden ender fırsatları derhal yakalayabilmeli...Savaş milletlerin kurtuluş günülleri için atılma anının geldiğini müjdeleyen bir borudur. Büyük ülkü günü, büyük ve eşsiz fırsat günü, kanlarımızı dökeceğimiz mukaddes gün! Ey tarihin büyük gün için seçtiği İNÖNÜ! Türklüğün mukaddes istiklali için kanımızı dökmeğe hazırız! Bütün Türklük senin işaretini bekliyor! Hak verilmez, alınır!“, “ Türklük Bekliyor” Bozkurt 1, no. 11 (July 1941), p. 249.

- Are the grey wolves Pan-Turkist?
- Yes! It is sacred ideal of the grey wolf Turkism to see the Turkish state as a nation of sixty-five millions.
- What will this right depend on?
- The grey wolves long ago proclaimed the principle in this matter: 'The right is not given, it is seized!'
- War?
- Yes! War, when necessary! War is the great and blessed law of nature. We are the grandchildren of warriors. The grey wolves have believed that war, militarism and heroism should be raised to the highest degree of reverence.
- What are the grey wolves? A party? A group? A clique? An association?
- The grey wolves are a spiritual unity; founded by the genuine Turks who believe in the grey wolf Turkism, adopt that opinion, are sincere in that ideal, do not target any personal interest, fight and strive for this blessed way.²⁴⁸

However, after this issue, Türkkan could not continue writing at the journal for a long time. Although he had been the founder of the journal, there was a serious struggle for the ownership of the journal between him and Nurullah Barıman, who was the official owner of the journal and acted with Atsız. At the end of that struggle, Türkkan

²⁴⁸ “-Biz kimiz?

-Bozkurtçularız!

-İdeolojimiz nedir?

-Bozkurt Türkçülüğü.

-Bozkurtçular neye inanır?

-Türk ırkının ve Türk milletinin, her ırktan ve her millettten üstün olduğuna!

-Bu üstünlüğün kaynağı nedir bizce?

-Türk kanıdır?

-Türk doğuştan mı üstündür?

-Türk doğuştan üstün ve kabiliyetlidir. Türk; zekasını, yiğitliğini, askeri dehasını ve her hususta büyük kabiliyet ve istinadını kanından alır...

-Bu üstünlük ne vakit büsbütün kaybolabilir?

-Eğer Türkün kanı, yabancı kanlara bulanırsa. Bu takdirde, melez ve karışık kanlı olarak doğacak nesiller, Türkün maddi manevi hususiyetlerini taşımazlar ve öz bir Türk gibi üstün soydan olamazlar...

-Bozkurtçular pantürkist midir?

-Evet! Türk Devletini 65 milyonluk bir millet görmek, Bozkurt Türkçülüğünün mukaddes ülküsüdür.

-Bu hangi hakka dayanacak?

-Bozkurtçular, bu davada çoktandır haykırmışlardı: 'Hak verilmez, alınır!'

-Savaş mı?

-Evet! Gerektiği anda savaş! Savaş, büyük ve kutlu bir tabiat kanunudur. Biz, savaşçıların torunuyuz. Bozkurtçular, savaşı, askerliği ve kahramanlığı en yüksek hürmet mevkîine çıkartılması gerektiğine inanmışlardır...

-Bozkurtçular nedir? Bir fırka mı? Bir grup mu? Hizip mi? Cemiyet mi?

-Bozkurtçular, Bozkurt Türkçülüğüne inanan, bu görüşü benimseyen, bu ülküde samimi olan, şahsi menfaat gütmeyen ve bu kutlu yolun başarılması yolunda çalışmayı ve çarpışmayı göze alan her öz Türkün manevi birliğidir.“ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Bozkurtçunun Amantüsü“ *Bozkurt* 2, no. 1 (March 1942), p. 6.

proved unable to save his position and Atsız obtained the control with Barıman's help. Consequently, after the sixteenth issue of the journal, published on 26 March 1942, Türkkan left the journal. After that, only three more issues of *Bozkurt* were published under the editorship of Nihal Atsız and, on 25 June 1942, publication ceased due to the remarkable fall in its circulation.²⁴⁹

The Rivalry between Nihal Atsız and Reha Oğuz Türkkan

Nihal Atsız, no doubt, was the most important representative of the Pan-Turkist movement in the first decade of the Republican era. Although he remained silent after the closure of *Orhun* in 1934, he had played a crucial role in spreading Pan-Turkist ideas among the young generation through the journals he edited. On the other hand, Reha Oğuz Türkkan was the most active Pan-Turkist during the period between 1938 and 1943. Despite the fact that he adopted the Pan-Turkist ideas which were shaped by Nihal Atsız in the early thirties, there were some important differences between his and Atsız's ideas. First of all, Türkkan, since he was member of a younger generation that was educated in the thirties, was taught the official Turkish History Thesis and the effect of the thesis could be obviously seen in him. For example, in contrast to Nihal Atsız, he advocated the thesis that Greek, Egyptian, Hitite, Roman and Sumerian civilizations had been established by the Turks who had emigrated from Central Asia to the west in his works.²⁵⁰ In addition, Atsız rejected and criticized Türkkan's

²⁴⁹ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005.

²⁵⁰ Türkkan explained his thesis in the following words: "The Turk brought civilization wherever he went: Sumer, Hittite, Egypt, Greek and Rome civilizations were sprouted." "*Türk her gittiği yere medeniyet götürdü: Sümer-Eti, Mısır, Grek ve Roma medeniyetleri fişkırdı.*" Reha Kurtuluş, "Türkler ve Panturanizm" *Ergenekon*, no. 3 (January 1939), p. 23. He lasted to support this idea in his other studies. For example, in *Türkçülüğe Giriş* (Introduction to Turkism), published in 1940, he started the history of Turkism from the Sumerian. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, pp. 44-46.

enumeration of the Georgian among the Turanian race.²⁵¹ However, despite these “so-called scientific” differences and Atsız’s refusal to cooperate with Türkkan, Türkkan convinced Atsız to write in *Bozkurt* in September 1940. In this process, the relationship between Atsız and Türkkan was good and Türkkan was describing Atsız as “a brave and intellectual Turkist”.²⁵² However, this situation did not last long and the first problem between them appeared after the suspension of *Bozkurt* in December 1940 due to Atsız’s article, “İki Yıl Dönümü” (The two anniversaries). According to Türkkan, the main reason for the conflict between them was his demand to control Atsız’s writings before publication in order to prevent the journal from being suspended by the government.²⁵³ Atsız, naturally, reacted this demand but went on writing in the journal. However, his novel *Dalkavuklar Gecesi* (The Night of the Toadies)²⁵⁴ separated Atsız and Türkkan’s ways totally.

In the tenth and eleventh issues of *Bozkurt*, Atsız’s book had announced to the readers that it would be published as a *Bozkurt* publication, but Türkkan, having read the book, refused to allow Atsız to publish the book as a *Bozkurt* publication since it caricatured Atatürk and other personages. However, Atsız published the book with

²⁵¹ For Türkkan’s claim about the Georgian, see Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Gürcülerin Irkı Hakkında”, *Bozkurt* 1, no. 5 (August 1940), pp. 115-119; and “Gürcülerin Irkı Hakkında II” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 6 (September 1940), pp. 142-143.

²⁵² Türkkan, *Türkçüğüne Giriş*, pp. 74-75. For another article on Atsız, written by Türkkan see, Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Türkçüleri Tanıyalım II: Atsız” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 7 (September 1940), pp. 138-139.

²⁵³ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005.

²⁵⁴ The book was a caricaturization of many prominent personages such as Reşit Galip, Sadri Maksudi Arsal, Afet İnan, Şevket Aziz Kansu and Hasan Ali Yücel. In the book, on the one hand, while Atsız portrayed these personages as toadies, who gathered around a king, most probably Atatürk, by using pseudo-names, on the other, he praised some figures of the book, representing himself and Zeki Velidi Togan. In this way, he was making a reference to the discussion between Zeki Velidi Togan and Reşit Galip at the first Congress of Turkish History and the Turkish History Thesis. For more detailed information, see Nihal Atsız, *Dalkavuklar Gecesi* (İstanbul: Arkadaş Matbaası, 1941). Niyazi Berkes, in his memoirs, claims that the book was a bestseller among the members of parliament at the time. Niyazi Berkes, *Unutulan Yıllar* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1997), p. 268.

another publishing house and it drew many negative reactions.²⁵⁵ For this reason, Türkkan, since he had advertised the book in *Bozkurt* beforehand, declared that there was no relation between *Bozkurt* and the book and its author by publishing an announcement in the newspaper *Tasvir-i Efkar*.²⁵⁶ When *Bozkurt* started publication in December 1941 again, Atsız was not among the author cadre of the journal. However, Atsız managed to obtain the control of *Bozkurt* and Türkkan was forced to leave the journal.

Türkkan continued his struggle with Atsız by publishing another journal *Gök-Börü*. In the first issue, in an article titled, “*Hesap Veriyoruz!*” (We are rendering our account), he declared that his way had completely parted with that of *Çınaraltı*²⁵⁷ and Nihal Atsız.²⁵⁸ Atsız retaliated by publishing a booklet titled “*Hesap Böyle Verilir*” (The account is rendered like this). These reciprocal accusations continued with Türkkan’s booklet, *Kuyruk Acısı* (Rancour). In this process, Türkkan and Atsız focused on each other’s racial origins and both accused the other not being genuinely Turkish.

²⁵⁵ Türkkan describes the negative reaction which they received because of *Dalkavuklar Gecesi* as follows: “Hundreds of letters from all sides of the country cursed us. Most of our subscribers declared to cut their relations without observing the remain of their money. Most of our columnists-in this respect Sami Özerdin- told us not to publish their articles in a review against Atatürk, if *Bozkurt* has ever been published again. First, we couldn’t understand, we surprized. Then we realized that: We declared in our 11st issue that “The Night of Toadies” would be published as the publication of *Bozkurt*. They thought that this novel has really been published by us and hated *Bozkurt*. The situation was really fragile.” “*Memleketin her tarafından yüzlerce mektup bize lanetler yağdırdı. Abonelerimizin çoğu: paralarının bakiyesini bile aramadan, bizimle alakalarını kestiklerini bildirdiler. Bir çok yazarımız-ve bu bağlamda Sami Özerdin- Atatürk aleyhtarı bir dergide katiben yazılarını -eğer Bozkurt bir daha çıkarsa-neşretmemizi söylediler. İlkin anlayamadık, şaşıktık. Sonra işin farkına vardık: Dalkavuklar Gecesi’nin (Bozkurt yayını)meyamında çıkacağını 11. sayımızda ilan etmiştik. Bu romancığ hakikatten bizim neşrettiğimizi sanıyorlar ve Bozkurt’tan nefret ediyorlardı. Vaziyet gerçekten nazikti.*” Türkkan, *Kuyruk Acısı*, p. 128.

²⁵⁶ For Türkkan’s announcement see, *Tasvir-i Efkar*, 17 September 1941.

²⁵⁷ Cihat Savaş Fer and Türkkan, since the circulation of *Çınaraltı* increased in the absence of *Bozkurt*, accused the journal of trying to hinder the publication of *Bozkurt* again by sending letters to the General Directorate of Press and Publications in Ankara.

²⁵⁸ Cihat Savaş Fer, “Hesap Veriyoruz” *Gökbörü* 1, no. 1 (5 November 1942), pp. 3-4.

For example, while Atsız accused Türkkan of being Armenian,²⁵⁹ Türkkan claimed that Atsız did not have a brachicephalic skull as the great majority of Turkish race had.²⁶⁰

The principal reason for the rivalry between these two leading Pan-Turkists was the leadership of the Pan-Turkist movement. Atsız saw himself as an older and more experienced Pan-Turkist than Türkkan and found his writings and attempts to become the leader of the Pan-Turkist movement too ambitious and impudent for a young novice.²⁶¹ As for Türkkan, he claimed that the main factor that had revived the Pan-Turkist movement, starting from the late thirties had been his efforts and journals. According to him, while Atsız and his journals in the early thirties, which had had inconsiderable circulation levels of between 500 and 700, had been totally forgotten among the young generation, it was his journals and efforts that had made Atsız a

²⁵⁹ Nihal Atsız, Hamza Sadi Özbek, *Hesap Böyle Verilir* (İstanbul: Aylı Kurt Yayınları, 1943), pp. 14-15.

²⁶⁰ Türkkan, *Kuyruk Acısı*, p. 44. Türkkan also accused Atsız of imitating Adolf Hitler in dress and manner. Türkkan, pp. 100-101. Karpat confirms Türkkan's accusation in his book, Karpat, p. 266, ft. 43.

²⁶¹ Atsız, in his article, titled "*Türkçülükte Ahlak*" (Morality in Turkism), which was published in the first issue of *Bozkurt* after Türkkan's leaving, criticizes Türkkan in the following words: "All of the old Turkists, I mean real Turkists, even if they had more or less personal defects, had a common virtue of not to ignoring other Turkists, especially the former ones. It is a moral case. It is obvious that every faith improves with morality; it is the first condition that there is a strong morality in Turkism... Turkism is the idea form of the life principles living in the soul, blood and brain of Turkish race. Therefore, it cannot neglect the essentials of "sequence" and "respect." Because of that, Turkists should respect the older Turkists. The ones who cry, not minding the sequence or respect, and the ones who follow the dream of raising themselves by bringing down the older ones cannot be either Turkists or Turks, or even an ordinary human. We always doubt their Turkishness because the Turkish race never ignores the old and never underrates the old people who served it... Turkishness has a hard morality. The Turkist never considers himself important, is modest and if he offends or makes a mistake, he confesses. He is affiliated with the past and old values. He never thinks to rise by overthrowing the old Turkists." "*Eski Türkçülerin hepsinde (tabiidir ki hakiki Türkçülerden bahsediyorum) belki az çok şahsi kusurlar bulunsa da müşterek olan bir meziyetleri vardır ki o da öteki Türkçüleri, hele kendinden öncekileri inkar etmemek faziletidir. Bu, ahlaki bir meseledir. Her iman ahlakla yürüyeceğine göre Türkçülükte de sağlam bir ahlakın bulunması birinci şarttır...Türkçülük, Türk ırkının ruhunda, kanında, beyninde yaşayan hayat prensiplerinin fikir haline gelmiş bir şeklidir. Bundan dolayı da 'sıra' ve 'saygı' esaslarını ihmal edemez. Türkçülerin daha eski Türkçülere saygı göstermesi bunun için şarttır. Sırayı, saygıyı gözetmeden çığırkanlık edenler, hele daha eskileri batırarak kendisini yükseltmek hayali ardında koşanlar, Türkçü değil, Türk değil, alelade insan bile olamazlar. Türk ırkı eskiyi inkar eden, kendine hizmet etmiş eski insanları küçük gören bir ırk olmadığı için böyle yapanların Türklüğünden daima şüphe ederiz...Türkçülüğün sert bir ahlakı vardır. Türkçü kendisini mühimsemez, mütevazıdır; suç yapmışsa veya yanlışsa itiraf eder. Maziye ve eski kıymetlere bağlıdır. Eski Türkçüleri devirerek yükselmeyi düşünmez."* Nihal Atsız, "*Türkçülükte Ahlak*" *Bozkurt* 2, no. 5 (11 June 1942), p. 83.

prominent figure in the country.²⁶² Because the principal criterion of Turkishness was Turkish blood for the Pan-Turkist movement of the time, both Atsız and Türkkan tried to demonstrate the other as a person who did not descend from pure Turkish stock. He, in this way, could not have the right to speak for Pan-Turkism.

This struggle was tranquilized by Zeki Velidi Togan, whom both Atsız and Türkkan respected. Since the rivalry between them harmed the Pan-Turkist movement, according to Türkkan, in a meeting at Togan's home in March 1944, they came to an agreement not to dispute in the public.²⁶³ Türkkan and Atsız's ways, however, parted completely and they never collaborated with each other again. In other words, this rivalry broke up the cooperation between the old Pan-Turkists and the Pan-Turkists of the new generation that had been realized in *Bozkurt* to some extent and hence injured the Pan-Turkist movement.

Gök-Börü

With the outbreak of the Second World War, there was a clear resurgence of Pan-Turkist publishing in Turkey. Pan-Turkist ideas and sentiments were especially encouraged by the attack of German armies on the Soviet Union in June 1941 and the number of the Pan-Turkist journals appreciably increased during the period, starting from the war between Germany and the Soviet Union. In this process, in addition to the journals edited by Türkkan, *Çınaraltı*, *Tanrıdağ*²⁶⁴ and *Türk Amacı* (The Objective of

²⁶² Türkkan, *Kuyruk Acısı*, pp. 89-93.

²⁶³ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, *Tabutluktan Gurbete*, pp. 35-36.

the Turkish) ²⁶⁵ began publication respectively. Besides, there was a remarkable increase in their circulations. For instance, while the circulation of *Atsız Mecmua* and *Orhun* had been only 1000, the Pan-Turkist journals of the forties such as *Gök-Börü* and *Tanrıdağ* reached 3,000, and *Çınaraltı* 5,000.²⁶⁶ In addition, although Pan-Turkist journals were repeatedly suspended by the government, Şükrü Saraçoğlu, who became Prime Minister after the sudden death of the Refik Saydam on 7 July 1942, led to an important rise in the expectations of the Pan-Turkists in the country. The new Prime Minister in a speech to the Parliament on 5 August 1942 asking for the vote of confidence for the new government, declared the new government as Turkist by making an explicit reference to blood as follows:

We are Turkish, Turkist and always will remain Turkist. For us, Turkism is as much an issue of blood as that of conscience and culture. We are not Turkist who are being diminished and who cause to diminish, but who increase and cause to increase; we will always endeavor in this direction.²⁶⁷

²⁶⁴ *Tanrıdağ* was published in eighteen issues as a weekly in Istanbul between 8 May 1942 and 4 September 1942 by Rıza Nur. The main contributors to the journal were Nihal Atsız, Nejdett Sancar, Hüseyin Namık Orkun, Fethi Tevettoğlu, Hasan Ferit Cansever and Mustafa Hakkı Akansel. In the journal, Rıza Nur identified Turkism with nationalism as well as with Pan-Turkism. Rıza Nur, “Türk Nasyonalizmi” *Tanrıdağ*, no. 1 (8 May 1942), pp. 1-4. The editorial policy of the journal was in harmony with Rıza Nur’s that idea.

²⁶⁵ *Türk Amacı* was published eight issues as a monthly magazine in Istanbul between July 1942 and February 1943 by Ahmet Çaferoğlu, who had been published *Azerbaycan Yurt Bilgisi* between 1932 and 1934. With the exception of Ahmet Çaferoğlu, the main writers of the journal were Turkic emigrants such as Muharrem Fevzi Togay, Abdülkadir İnan, Ali Genceli and Kadir Kafı. The masthead of the journal was “Türk Kültür Birliği Mürevvici” (Promoter of Turkish Culture). The journal supported the thought of a cultural Pan-Turkism based on a common language among the all Turkic peoples and, in the first issue, the journal explained “attainment of a cultural unity among the all Turks” as one of the its main targets.” “Birkaç Söz” *Türk Amacı*, no. 1 (July 1942), pp. 1-2.

²⁶⁶ Özdoğan, “*Turan*”dan “*Bozkurt*”a, p. 222.

²⁶⁷ “Biz Türküz, Türkçüyüz ve daima Türkçü kalacağız. Bizim için Türkçülük bir kan meselesi olduğu kadar ve laakal o kadar bir vicdan ve kültür meselesidir. Biz azalan ve azaltan Türkçü değil, çoğalan ve çoğaltan Türkçüyüz ve her vakit bu istikamette çalışacağız.” *Ulus*, 6 August 1942. According to Hüseyin Namık Orkun, Şükrü Saraçoğlu was one of the founders of a Turkist society, *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Homeland), which was established by the young Turkish students in Geneva in 1913. In other words, he was a dedicated Turkist from the earlier times. Hüseyin Namık Orkun, *Türkçülüğün Tarihi* (Ankara: Kömen Yayınları, 1977), pp. 108-110.

The Pan-Turkist circles received Saraçoğlu's speech very well; at least his stress on blood was in a harmony with the Pan-Turkist's racist discourse to some extent.²⁶⁸ In this, relatively, positive atmosphere, Türkkan published his third and the last journal under the name of *Gök-Börü*, which appeared in thirteen issues in Istanbul between 5 November 1942 and 23 May 1943.²⁶⁹ The motto and symbol of the journal were the same as that of *Ergenekon* and *Bozkurt* but *Gök-Börü* was published biweekly. The principal authors who contributed to the journal were Zeki Velidi Togan, Abdülakadir İnan, Şevket Raşit Hatiboğlu, who was the Minister of Agriculture at the time; Besim Atalay, Dr. Mustafa Hakkı Akansel, Reşat Nuri Güntekin, Prof. Mahmut Ragıp Kösemihal, Prof. Süreyya Aygün and Cihat Savaş Fer.

As mentioned above, the journal was a medium Türkkan used in order to express his accusations against Nihal Atsız other Pan-Turkist figures as well as his own ideas. On the other hand, *Gök-Börü* was undoubtedly the journal that allotted the most space to the Turkic peoples living in the Soviet Union among the journals edited by Türkkan. In addition, the independence struggles of Turks living abroad were among the topics to which the journal paid considerable attention. However, not only Türkkan but also other authors in the journal were very careful about Pan-Turkism and for this reason the journal did not have an explicit message related to the topic. In other words, the journal was obviously more moderate when compared to the former journals of Türkkan.²⁷⁰ In

²⁶⁸ For example, Yusuf Ziya Ortaç, in his article in *Çınaraltı*, claimed that the principles of nationalism, which was one of the six arrows of the RPP, for the first time had come to mean more than a clause in the party program and would lead the state affairs. Yusuf Ziya Ortaç, "Biz Türküz! Türkçüyüz!", *Çınaraltı*, no. 46 (8 August 1942). In addition, Hasan Ferit Cansever started to publish *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Homeland) again in September 1942. In the first issue, the journal, allotted a special place to the speech of Saraçoğlu by stressing its encouragement of further Turkist activities. See "Türklük Haberleri" *Türk Yurdu*, no. 1 (1 September 1942), cited in Özdoğan, "*Turan*"dan *Bozkurt*"a, p. 95 fn. 6.

²⁶⁹ *Gök-Börü* and *Bozkurt* had the same meaning, "grey wolf", and Türkkan, in the first issue of *Gök-Börü*, expressed this information to his readers in order to emphasize the continuity between the two journals. See, "Gök-Börü Tabiri ve Anlamları" *Gök-Börü* 1, no. 1 (5 November 1942), p. 2.

addition, in contrast to *Ergenekon* and *Bozkurt*, Türkkan in the seventh issue, which appeared on 15 February in 1943, published an article praising “the Soviet miracle” in the war against Germany. He enumerated the principal reasons of the Soviets’s success in the war as a strong belief and state apparatus, a rigid punishment system that kept the Russian nation vivid and national economy.²⁷¹ However, Türkkan’s appraisal of the Soviet resistance seemed more an appreciation of the reasons that lead to the Soviets’ success in the war than a change in his anti-communist thoughts.

Another subject on which the journal focused was the concept of race and racism as the previous journal, edited by Türkkan had. In the journal, while Türkkan rejected all accusations that Turkish racism and racists imitated German racism,²⁷² Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, in one of his articles, defended Türkkan by proclaiming that Turkish nationalism was, in essence, racist because it gave priority to “blood” as one of the basic constituents of Turkish nation as well as “language” and “culture.” According to Bozkurt, there was not equality among the races and that the Turk was the most superior human in the world.²⁷³ In addition, since Türkkan was keenly aware of the consequences of criticizing the government, the journal did not have any article or implication criticizing the government. On the contrary, in the fifth issue of *Gök-Börü*, which appeared on 15 January 1943, Türkkan announced the application of “the Wealth Tax” (*Varlık Vergisi*)²⁷⁴ to his readers as “a great revolution” by praising the

²⁷⁰ Özdoğan argues that *Gök-Börü* was quite militant in tone and persisted in advocating entry into the war on the side of the Axis powers. Özdoğan, “*Turan*”dan “*Bozkurt*”a, p. 170. However, there is neither an article nor an implication concerning that topic in the journal.

²⁷¹ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Rus Mucizesinden Ders” *Gök-Börü* 1, no. 7 (15 February 1943), pp. 3-5.

²⁷² Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “İrk ve Irkçılık” *Gök-Börü* 1, no. 9 (25 March 1943), pp. 3-5.

²⁷³ Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, “Milliyetçilerin Cevabı!” *Gök-Börü* 1, no. 4, (1 January 1943), pp. 12-14.

²⁷⁴ Although Turkey managed to remain neutral and stay out of the Second World War, it increased its army from a peacetime strength of 120,00 to more than a million. Equipping and feeding this huge army cost the government a tremendous amount and the government tried to finance this extra expense by raising taxes and by having the central bank print money. As a result of this process, not only inflation

government. In addition, he recommended every Turkish to fulfill his own obligation for the Turkish economy, which would arise at the end of that great revolution. As for minorities in the country, Türkkan's proposal for them was to give thanks for the Wealth Tax, since it rescued them from the hatred of the Turks.²⁷⁵

Türkkan's journal was closed down after the thirteenth issue, which was published on 23 May 1943. The last issue of the *Gök-Börü* memorialized Azerbaijan's 23rd anniversary of occupation by the Soviet Union and hence it was dedicated to Azerbaijan. The reason for the closure of the journal was Türkkan's article, entitled "*Büyük Türklük*" (The Great Turkish World).²⁷⁶ Türkkan, in his article, having summarized how the great Turkish unity had been disintegrated in the historical process, described the annexation of Azarbaijan by Bolshevik Russia, which had adopted imperialist policies of the old regime, the tsardom, as a "national calamity." He ended his article with this demand:

The desire of Turkists is to establish a cultural relation among all Turkishness. Beyond this is a matter of politics and state. We are not interested in this side of the matter. Our desire is to make this cultural approach a reality. This desire is the most natural and necessary right among the brethren nations.²⁷⁷

increased rapidly but also a black market economy, which created huge profit opportunities, came into existence in the country. In November 1942, the government enacted a "Wealth Tax" in order to solve its fiscal problems and to prevent wartime profiteering. However, the application of the tax was transformed into an anti-minority application in a short time due to the government's attitude. First of all, since the government did not have enough information about the taxpayers, some local commissions, consisting of mainly local government officials and representatives of local chambers of commerce, were founded in order to determine the tax assessment, but there was no fixed tax rate. On the other hand, the tax nearly was paid by the traders in big cities, in particular in Istanbul. For example, seventy percent of the total revenue of the tax was collected in Istanbul and approximately more than eighty percent of it came from non-Muslim taxpayers, which constituted eighty seven percent of the total taxpayers in Istanbul. Besides, non-Muslims did not have the chance to pay their payments in installment and, as a result, some of them had to sell their real estate and businesses to mainly Muslim traders in order to pay their taxes. In this process, an important accumulation of capital was transferred from the non-Muslim bourgeoisie to the Muslim bourgeoisie. Furthermore, 1,299 non-Muslim taxpayers who were unable to pay their taxes were deported to forced labour camps in Erzurum, 21 of whom died in there. The Wealth Tax was abolished in March 1944 due to most probably the criticism of England and the United States, which were the victors of the war. Aktar, pp. 135-214.

²⁷⁵ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, "Büyük Bir İnkılap: Varlık Vergisi" *Gök-Börü* 1, no. 5 (15 January 1943), p. 11.

²⁷⁶ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005.

In fact, the article was a clear evidence of how Türkkan had limited his own Pan-Turkist project to a great extent within just a year. Türkkan, who had advocated the great Turkish unity of 65 million and who had called for the war to realize it between 1940 and 1942, was now using only a cultural discourse with respect to Pan-Turkism. Of course, he was still as sincere a Pan-Turkist as he was between 1940 and 1942, but the turn of the war against Germany and the Soviets' success in the war had explicitly diminished Pan-Turkist enthusiasm and desires in the country. In other words, Türkkan was keenly aware of the realpolitics in the world.

On the other hand, this change in the war had also affected the political atmosphere in Turkey and the leftist intellectuals started to express their opinions more freely. In June 1943, Faris Erkman published a pamphlet, titled *En Büyük Tehlike* (The Greatest Danger),²⁷⁸ in order to draw attention to the danger of the Pan-Turkist movement in Turkey. In the pamphlet, Erkman described Pan-Turkist figures as racist and Turanist puppets whose strings were controlled by foreign hands, in particular by Germany.²⁷⁹ Furthermore, in addition to Turkic emigrants such as Zeki Velidi Togan, Muharrem Fevzi Togay and Mehmet Emin Resulzade and Ahmet Caferoğlu, he especially attacked Nihal Atsız, Reha Oğuz Türkkan, Yusuf Ziya Ortaç, Orhan Seyfi Orhun and Hüseyin Hüsnü Emir Erkilet by accusing them of working to lead Turkey into the war on the side of Germany in order to found a Turanian state in spite of

²⁷⁷ “Türkçülerin emelleri, bütün Türklük arasında bir kültür bağının kurulmasıdır. Ötesi, bir siyaset ve devlet işidir. Biz bu tarafı ile ilgili değiliz. İstedığımız, bu kültür yaklaşmasının hakikat olmasıdır. Bu istek ise, milletdaşlar arasında en tabii ve zaruri haktır.” Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Büyük Türklük” *Gök-Börü* 2, no. 1 (23 May 1943), pp. 3-6.

²⁷⁸ Although the pamphlet was published under the signature of Faris Erkman, its real author was Reşat Fuat Baraner, the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Turkish Communist Party, which was illegal at the time. Suat Derviş, Faris Erkman, *Kırklı Yıllar-1 En Büyük Tehlike, Niçin Sovyet Birliğinin Dostuyum* (İstanbul: Türkiye Sosyal Tarih Arştırma Vakfı, 2002), pp. 7-8; *Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 6 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1988), p. 454.

²⁷⁹ Faris Erkman (Reşat Fuat Baraner), *En Büyük Tehlike* (İstanbul: Ak-Ün Matbaası, 1943), p. 4.

Turkish foreign policy, formulated by Atatürk himself as “the peace in the homeland, the peace in the world”.²⁸⁰

This pamphlet, undoubtedly, increased the intensity of the ideological polarization between the Pan-Turkists and leftists in the country, which had already become evident since the beginning of the Second World War. Following *En Büyük Tehlike*, some of personages who had been accused by Erkman immediately responded to him by publishing their own pamphlets. The first answer was Atsız’s *En Sinsi Tehlike* (The Most Sneaky Danger), in which he accepted Erkman’s accusation of racism and Pan-Turkism with great honour. He, having emphasized that the Turks had had a consciousness of race for ages, explained the difference between German racism and Turkish racism. According to Atsız, while German racism was against only the Jews, the latter was against all nations in the world.²⁸¹ Hence, for him, there was no relationship between the two. Türkkan’s reply was to publish two pamphlets, titled respectively *Solcular ve Kızılar* (The Leftists and the Reds), and *Kızıl Faaliyet* (The Red Activity). In the first pamphlet, Türkkan tried to analyze the general position of Communism in the world at the time. He, having described Communism as an ideology, formed by the Jews and Freemasons, claimed that it was only a tool of Russian imperialism. According to Türkkan, although the Communists in Russia had overthrown the tsarist regime, they pursued the old regime’s imperialist policies by presenting Communism as an ideology that would remove all disparities in the world.²⁸² For him, the Soviet Union continuously enlarged its territories by using a Communist discourse and hence Communism meant Russian imperialism. Türkkan ended his

²⁸⁰ Erkman (Baraner), pp. 11-29.

²⁸¹ Nihal Atsız, *En Sinsi Tehlike*, p. 50.

²⁸² Reha Oğuz Türkkan, *Solcular ve Kızılar* (İstanbul: Bozkurtçu Yayını, 1943), pp. 1-10.

analysis by accusing all of the leftists in the world of being traitors who served Russian imperialism in the following words:

Shortly, leftists are the ones who are traitors, enemies of nationality, destroyers, murderers and have sold out to enemies everywhere. Their color and degrees can be different to mislead better. But they have only one identity in everywhere and every time: Reds are foreign spirited people who want to destroy their homelands and are given orders by Internationalist Judaism, Free-Masonry, Internationalist new Russian Imperialism.²⁸³

As for Türkkan's second pamphlet, his main target was the leftist figures in Turkey. In the pamphlet, he introduced many prominent intellectuals and authors such as Ahmet Cevat Emre, Niyazi Berkes, Abidin Dino, Zekeriya and Sabiha Sertel, Abidin Nesimi, Kerim Sadi, Adnan Cemgil, Behice Boran and Suat Derviş to his readers as Communists who were agents of Russian imperialism in Turkey. For him, these people, the majority of whom did not have Turkish blood or origin, were the representatives of Russian fifth column activities.²⁸⁴ Türkkan's proposal to eradicate the Red danger in Turkey was to make a consensus among the government, Turkists and all those who loved the Turkish nation against the Reds.²⁸⁵

²⁸³ "Hülasa, solcular, her yerde vatan haini, milliyet düşmanı, tahripçi, katledici ve düşmana satılmış insanlardır. Renkleri ve derceleri-daha iyi aldatmak için- farklı olabilir. Fakat her yerde ve her zaman, tek bir hüviyetleri vardır: Kızıklar; bulundukları memleketi yıkmak isteyen ve Beynelmilelci Yahudilikten, Masonluktan, Beynelmilelci yeni Rus emperyalizminden emir alan yabancı kanlı, yabancı ruhlu insanlardır!" Türkkan, *ibid.*, p. 24.

²⁸⁴ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, *Kızıl Faaliyet* (İstanbul: Bozkurtçu Yayını, 1943), pp. 1-25. For Türkkan's accusation of fifth column activities in Turkey he made beforehand see, "Türkçülerin Şimdiki Baş Vazifesi: 5. Kola Dikkat" *Bozkurt* 1, no. 4 (May-July 1940), p. 91; "Son Vaziyet Kaşısında Türkçüler" *Bozkurt* 1, no. 7 (October 1940), p. 153; and "Üzerindeki Şüpheyi Dağıtmak İçin Beşinci Koldan Bahsedenler!" *Bozkurt* 1, no. 7 (October 1940), pp. 154-155.

²⁸⁵ Türkkan explained "We do not know how the conditions in the world will be tomorrow, towards end of the war. Our reds are trying to create an appropriate milieu and preparing black lists for that day. Today, they have more than half of the journals in the country. The danger is not small. On the contrary, it is big, very big...Those who love the Turkish nation and want it not to die have to start a merciless fight against that traitor microbe by cooperating with the government and the Turkists. Attention! Always attention!" "Yarın, bu savaşın sonlarına doğru dünyanın ne manzara alacağını bilmiyoruz. O gün için, Kızıklarımız muhit hazırlıyorlar, kara listeler tertip ediyorlar. Bugün matbuatın yarısından fazla mecmuası onlarındır. Tehlike, küçük değil, büyük hem de çok büyüktür...Türk milletini sevenler ve ölmemesini isteyenler, hükümetle ve Türkçülerle el ele verip, bu hain mikroba karşı amansız bir mücadele açmalıdır. Dikkat! Daima dikkat!" Türkkan, *Kızıl Faaliyet*, p. 62. Orhan Seyfî Orhun also published a pamphlet

These mutual accusations were also conveyed to the agenda of the parliament by Cevdet Kerim İncedayı, the Secretary General of the RPP of the time and deputy of Sinop. İncedayı, in a speech made on 5 July 1943 in the parliament, rejected explicitly the presence of a Pan-Turkist movement in Turkey in the following words: “I know neither a current nor a concept of nationalism like that in our country. Even if there are some currents due to inculcation, I do not believe that they have a serious ground and growth.”²⁸⁶

Having said this, İncedayı asked the government members whether the danger was real or not and his question was replied by Numan Menemencioğlu, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the time. Menemencioğlu, in his speech, claimed that there was not a Pan-Turkist movement in Turkey, as İncedayı had, by saying, “there is neither a serious nationalism and racism in our country as this book mentions, nor have we witnessed a manifestation in this line.” Besides, he stressed that, “the Turkish government wishes only happiness and prosperity to the Turks living outside of Turkey’s borders” and went on “aside from this, all our policies and Turkism concern only the Turks in the borders of the Turkish Republic.”²⁸⁷

However, parallel to the Soviets’ advance against Germany in the war, the Turkish government gradually increased its control on not only Pan-Turkist, but also anti-Communist publications, since they had a potential to disturb the Soviet Union. For example, Türkkan’s two anti-Communist pamphlets, mentioned above were collected in September 1943 by the decision of government.²⁸⁸ In 1944, the Soviets’s victory in the

criticizing Faris Erkman and his collaborators. For more detailed information on the pamphlet, see Orhan Seyfi Orhun, *Maskeler Aşağı: En Büyük Tehlike’nin İçyüzü* (İstanbul: Çınaraltı Yayınları, 1943).

²⁸⁶ “Ben memleketimizde ne böyle bir cereyan ne de bu şekilde bir milliyetçilik meşhuru bilmiyorum. Veleh ki bir takım telkinat ile olsa bile, bu kabil cereyanların herhengi ciddi temeli ve inkişafı olduğuna kani değilim.” *Ulus*, 6 July 1943.

²⁸⁷ *Ulus*, 6 July 1943.

war became evident and this meant that the end of the great Turkish unity of 65 million for Pan-Turkist figures in Turkey. In other words, the Second World War, in particular the war between Germany and the Soviet Union, created fertile ground for Pan-Turkism and it had gained a remarkable momentum between 1939 and 1942. However, with the success of the Soviet armies in Stalingrad (November 1942) and its aftermath, the Soviet victory in the war became a reality that prevented Pan-Turkist desires and Pan-Turkism began to lose momentum, starting from late 1942. In this process, the last blow for Pan-Turkism came with the government's decision to arrest all prominent Pan-Turkist personages, such as Reha Oğuz Türkkan, Nihal Atsız and Zeki Velidi Togan following the demonstrations that occurred in Ankara on 3 May 1944 after the defamation case between Nihal Atsız and Sabahattin Ali. As a result of the government's decision, a famous case, "the case of racism-Turanism", which was a turning point for not only the Pan-Turkist movement, but also the Pan-Turkist figures in Turkey, started with wide publicity in Turkish press in May 1944.

The Main Tenets of Reha Oğuz Türkkan's Discourse Between 1938 and 1944

Reha Oğuz Türkkan, no doubt, was the most active Pan-Turkist in the period between 1938 and 1944, which is considered to have been the golden age of the Pan-Turkist movement in the Republican era. When the discourse of Türkkan in this period is examined, it is noted that race and racism were the leading concepts that he emphasized persistently. First of all, Türkkan, who presented himself as a raciologue

²⁸⁸ Önen, p.320.

lived in Turkey, such as Armenians, Greeks and Jews, includes also those sub-groups that lived in Turkey that were Muslim but did not have Turkish blood, such as the Laz, Circassian and Kurds, into the concept of “foreigner.”²⁹⁶ As a result of this race theory, Türkkan defended eagerly xenophobic and eugenic applications to protect the purity of the Turk race. For instance, he defended the expulsion of all elements not having Turkish blood in Turkey, including all sub-groups, and if this could not be done, not giving place them in the governance of the state.²⁹⁷

On the other hand, he cursed hybridization, since it created dissolute and mentally anomalous generations.²⁹⁸ According to Türkkan, hybridization was the most important factor that caused the collapse of nations.²⁹⁹ Despite all his claims, however, Türkkan, who was conscious there could not be a pure race, accepted those whose ancestors were foreigners but had been Turkified by blood and feelings for four or five generations as Turks.³⁰⁰

²⁹⁶ He, hence, opposes the marriage with all sub groups, living in Turkey, too. Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, pp. 79-80.

²⁹⁷ Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, pp. 107-108.

²⁹⁸ Türkkan explains his claim in the following words: “We see that the biological compositions of our nation have been spoiled and our beautiful and powerful qualifications have been in danger of becoming indistinct because of blood mixture. Apart from that, because of the 50 % of the hybrid generations were born abnormal, we do not want our nation to contain insane people, prostitutes, epileptics and morphine addicts.” “*Kan karışmalarıyla milletimizin biyolojik terkinin gitgide bozulduğunu, güzel ve kuvvetli hususiyetlerimizin silikleşmek tehlikesine maruz kaldığını görüyoruz. Bundan başka, melez nesillerin yüzde ellisi anormal doğduğu için, milletimizi alabildiğine deli, fahişe, saralı ve morfinmanlarla doldurarak zarara sokmak istemeyiz.*” Reha Oğuz Türkkan, *Milliyetçilik Yolunda* (İstanbul: Müftüoğlu Yayınevi, 1944), p. 6. Emre Arslan, without showing any source, argues that Türkkan had proposed to prepare a law for protecting the Turkish race, advocating the execution of all hybrid children whose age was less than three years old in Turkey. Emre Arslan, “Türkiye’de Irkçılık” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), pp. 419-420. In fact, this accusation was, for the first time, put forward by Nihal Atsız in his booklet, *Hesap Böyle Verilir*, published in 1943. According to Atsız, Türkkan had made this offer in a speech between him and Türkkan. However, there is no evidence, confirming Atsız’s accusation in Türkkan’s works, published between 1938 and 1946.

²⁹⁹ Among the other factors that causes the collapse of nations, he enumerated the rule by those having foreign blood, the loss of the consciousness of race and nation, an extreme individualism, cosmopolitanism, pacifism, parliamentarism, political parties and the deterioration of family. Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, p. 206.

He rejected the accusation of imitating the German-Nazi racism because of his racial expression as other Pan-Turkist figures of the time did. For him, Turkish racism had a *sui generis* structure. In addition, according to Türkkan, racism did not result from Pan-Germanism, Nazism or Hitler. For him, the Turks had a consciousness of race at least 2,000 years ago and Mete Khan was the first Pan-Turkist as well as the first racist by uniting all Turks under one flag; eventually, the Turks were the creators of the first state based on race and racism and the first to put into practise this doctrine.³⁰¹

He believed that he diffused the arguments of Nazi racism with this theory. Thus, he thought of racism as an old Turkish tradition. In order to legitimize his own racism, Türkkan described Atatürk as a biological racist. For him, Atatürk had declared explicitly his racist tendencies by saying “*Türk genci! Muhtaç olduğun kudret damarlarındaki asil kanda mevcuttur.*” (The Turkish youth! The strength that you need exists in the noble blood in your veins.)³⁰² On the other hand, an anti-Islamic discourse is also complemented Türkkan’s racist expressions at the time. Since Türkkan was keenly aware that Turkey was an underdeveloped country when compared to the Western countries, he claimed that the basic reason for the underdevelopment of Turkey, consisting of the master race in the world was the rule by those who have foreign blood and the losing of race and nation consciousness. In this framework, as

³⁰⁰ Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, p. 109.

³⁰¹ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Türkler ve Panturanizm” *Ergenekon*, no. 3 (January 1939), pp. 23-24. Zeki Velidi Togan supports Türkkan’s claim that the Turks had had the consciousness of race since the pre-Islamic times. According to Togan, the old Turks had the consciousness of race and, for this reason, they were very careful not to marry to foreign people in order to protect the purity of their blood. However, they started to lose this feature after they adopted Islam. Zeki Velidi Togan, “Türklerde ‘Uruk’ (İrk) Bilgisi” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 5 (August 1940), pp. 110-11.

³⁰² Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, pp. 23-24. In fact, the only one in Pan-Turkist circles who claimed that Atatürk was racist was not Türkkan. For example, in 1951, Hocaoglu Selahattin Ertürk in the journal *Orhun* declared Atatürk a sincere racist, depending mainly on some of his words such as “the strength that you need exists in your noble word”, “one Turk is worth whole worth” etc. According to Ertürk, these expressions together with the Kemalist regime’s strong emphasis on the Turkish race during the period of Atatürk were evidence of his racism. Hocaoglu Selahattin Ertürk, “İrkçi-Turancı Atatürk” *Orkun*, no. 41 (13 July 1951), pp. 3-5. Another source that describes Atatürk as both racist and Pan-Turkist, see Hikmet Tanyu, *Atatürk ve Türk Milletçiliği* (Ankara: Orkun Yayınları, 1961).

Atatürk did in the book, *Vatandaş İçin Medeni Bilgiler* (Civic knowledge for the citizen), Türkkan indicated Islam as the main reason for the loss of race and nation consciousness among the Turks.³⁰³

As a result of this theory, Türkkan suggests purifying the Turkish language of Arabic and Persian origin words and later the Turkification of Islam to regain this consciousness.³⁰⁴ Türkkan, not content with that, defends the Turkification of art, architecture, literature, music, education, sports, and manner of dressing, briefly all of the concepts that shape the life of society.³⁰⁵ In this way, according to Türkkan, the Turks, who would gain the Turkishness consciousness again in a short time would

³⁰³ Türkkan describes how Islam eradicate the consciousness of race and nation among the Turks as follows:

“Islamic internationalism caused us to forget our race...I mean the Islam religion, which dressed in variety, put on various masks in the hands of fanatics, as soon as the prophet died. Our ancestors became Arabian snobs with these inspirations. Because of the Koran’s being written in Arabic (?), the usage of Iranian metrics in our poetry and of the use of Arabic in most religious phases our language has been invaded by foreign words. These ugly and arrogant words were placed first in poetry, then in prose, at least in language and ousted the real Turkish! The Ottoman, whose language was Arabic and Iranian, became Arabian and Iranian by cultural and then soul. The eastern laziness, this horrible poison that penetrated to our marrow and our soul and placed just near the peculiarity of our race is the heritage of the Arabians that entered first with their language!” “*İslam enternasyonalizmi, ırkımızı unutmamıza sebep oldu...Yalvaç ölür ölmez yobazların elinde bin bir kılığa giren, bin bir maske takan İslam dininden bahsediyorum. İşte bu telkinle atalarımız birer Arap züppesi oldular. Kuran’ın Arapça (?) yazılmış olması, şiirde Acem aruzunu kullanmamız ve bir çok dini tabirlerin Arapça oluşu, dilimize yabancı kelime akınına yol açtı! İlk şiirde, sonra nesirde, daha sonra da dilde, bu küstah ve çirkin kelimeler yer aldı, asıl Türkçe olanları kovdu! Dili Arap ve Acem olan Osmanlı, yavaş yavaş harsen de Arap, nihayet ruhça da Arap, Acem olmaya başladı: Hala kurtulamadığımız o meşhur Şark tembelliği, ruhumuza, ilkelimize kadar işleyen ve irki hususiyetlerimizin yanı başında yer alan bu korkunç zehir, ilkin dille giren Arapın yadigarıdır!*” Ergenekoncu, “Türk Tarihinde Dil Davası” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 1 (May 1939), p. 11. Türkkan, one of his articles at the same issue, emphasizes the negative effect of Arabs on Turkish race one more time: “We as the grandchildren of a superior race cannot be behind Europe! This apathy is the effect of the Semitic-Arabic theme! My race is the race which amazed the world with its dynamism in Central Asia! One thousand-fold dynamism is hidden in the Turkish blood! We can pass through the West by bringing this dynamism to light with a positive work!” “*Üstün bir ırkın torunları olan bizler, Avrupa’dan geri kalamayız! Şimdiki uyusukluk, Sami-Arap temasının tesiridir! Benim ırkım, Orta Asya’da dinamizmiyle dünyayı şaşırtan ırktır! Türkün kanında, bin misli daha fazla dinamizm gizlidir! Müspet bir çalışmayla biz, bu dinamizmi meydana çıkararak Batıyı da geçebiliriz!*” Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Hız”, *Bozkurt* 1, no. 1 (May 1939), p. 8.

³⁰⁴ Türkkan published some verses of the Koran such as “Fatiha”, “Hümeze” and “Ayet-el Kürsi”, which were translated by Besim Atalay, in purified Turkish (*Öz Türkçe*) in various issues of *Bozkurt* and the first issue of *Gök-Börü*. However, the language, which was used in the translations, was almost unspoken Turkish, in particular the verses in *Bozkurt*. For the verses, see *Bozkurt* 2, no. 2 (12 March 1942), p. 30; *Bozkurt* 2, no. 3 (19 March 1942), p. 51; *Bozkurt* 2, no. 4 (26 March 1942), p. 71 and *Gök-Börü* 1, no. 1 (5 November 1942), p. 8.

³⁰⁵ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Milliyetçiliğe Doğru!” *Gök-Börü* 1, no. 4 (1 January 1943), p. 6.

participate in the developed nations as old times through their superiority based on blood.³⁰⁶ This irrational and pseudo-scientific race theory, no doubt, was the principal factor that dominated Türkkan's discourse in the period between the late 1938 and 1944.

One of the issues that Türkkan emphasized at the time was Pan-Turkism. Türkkan, who defined the Turk as the name of the group that belongs to the Tur race, spoke Turkish, carried Turkish culture and was known as Turkish in history,³⁰⁷ continuously emphasized that Turkishness could not be confined by geographical or political borders. For him, every individual who had these qualifications was Turkish wherever he lived. According to Türkkan, the Turkish History Thesis, which showed Central Asia to the Turks of Turkey as the motherland, proved that the Turks did not live only in Turkey and that there were millions of Turks who remained outside the political borders of the Turkish Republic.³⁰⁸ Within this framework, Türkkan suggested that Pan-Turkism was a vital necessity for the continuation of the existence of Turkey and the Turkish world. He declares this necessity by saying, "Turkey, with the population of 20 million, cannot resist long the rising dynamic groups, consisting of

³⁰⁶ "The Turkish nation is also from a superior race naturally. The merits of being the most progressive nation are always included in its blood. We are always the most superior race. However, we are not the most progressive nation today. This does not indicate that we are not superior and makes us wrong to believe this superiority. As long as superiority is in our blood, we will tear out the bad fortune and negative conditions soon and will be the most progressive nation in civilization, in techniques, in politics and in culture... It is fate that the Turk race which is from most superior race will be the most progressive nation." *"Türk milleti de yaratılıştan en üstün bir soydandır. Kanında en ileri millet olma meziyetleri daima mevcuttur. Daima en üstün ırkız. Fakat bugün için en ileri millet değiliz. Bu, üstün olmayışımızı göstermez ve üstünlüğümüze inanmamızı haksız kılmaz. Üstünlük kanımızda olduktan sonra, ters talihi ve menfi şeraiti pek yakında paramparça edecek, tekrar, medeniyette, teknikte, siyasette ve kültürde de en ileri millet olacağız... En üstün ırktan olan Türk soyunun tekrar en ileri millet olması mukadderdir."* Reha Oğuz Türkkan, "İleri Millet Üstün Irk" *Gök-Börü* 1, no. 10 (8 April 1943), p. 3-4.

³⁰⁷ Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, p. 146.

³⁰⁸ Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, p. 70.

100 million, in the North and East. If Turkish world and Turkey want to survive, they must unite without loss of time and form a Turkish nation of sixty million.”³⁰⁹

Indeed, on Türkkan’s agenda, the main basis of Pan-Turkist unity that would be created in the future was Turkey, which was the only independent Turkish state in the world at the time. For him, a Pan-Turkist formation that was not based on Turkey could only be a toy in the hands of the foreign imperialist countries.³¹⁰ In other words, the first and most important phase of Pan-Turkist unity was the development of Turkey.³¹¹ At this point, Türkkan criticized the Anatolianists³¹² for neglecting the Turks abroad and Turanists³¹³ for being too hasty for Pan-Turkist unity without seeing Turkey’s vital problems. Türkkan, declared his criticism in the following words:

I accept as harmful to Turkism of the arranging of Turanist friends thinking firstly the ideal of Turkish Unity not considering Turkey as well as the opinions of Anatolianist friends who disregard the Turks abroad, retired in the boundaries of Turkey and believe the possibility of Unity Ideal can occur after one generation or century, although they accept the case theoretically. Anatolianist friends obviously do not know that Turkishness is exterminated and hybridized rapidly and tragically! How the Turanists did not recognize the delayed extraordinary cases of Turkey, which should be solved immediately, as well as Anatolianists did not recognize the danger of destroying the Turkishness in a half century.³¹⁴

³⁰⁹ “Türkiye, 20 milyonluk nüfusuyla, Şimalde ve Batıda tezekkül eden 100 milyonluk dinamik kütlelere uzun müddet karşı koyamayacaktır. Eğer Türklük ve Türkiye yaşamak istiyorsa, vakit kaybetmeden birleşmeli ve 60 milyonluk bir Türk milleti teşekkül etmelidir.”, Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, p. 116.

³¹⁰ Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, p. 113.

³¹¹ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Ülkü ve Hayat” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 4 (May-July 1940), p. 108.

³¹² Türkkan enumerates Remzi Oğuz Arık, Şevket Raşit Hatipoğlu, Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıkoğlu and Mükrem Halil Yinanç as Anatolianists in Turkey.

³¹³ Türkkan enumerates Hüseyin Hüsnü Emir Erkilet, Cafer Seydahmet Kırımer, Zeki Velidi Togan, Abdülkadir İnan, Mehmet Sadık Aran and Hüseyin Namık Orkun as Turanist. However, by saying Turan, he means only Turkic peoples and geography.

³¹⁴ “Türkiye’yi fazlaca ihmal edip ilkin ve acele olarak Türk Birliği Ülküsünü düşünen Turancı arkadaşların bu sıralarını Türklük için nasıl zararlı görüyorsam, dış Türkleri-davayı nazari olarak kabul etmekle beraber- fazla ihmal edip Türkiye sınırlarını içinde fazla kapanan, Birlik Ülküsünü ancak bir nesil veya bir asır sonra mümkün gören Anadolu cu arkadaşların görüşünü de Türklük için zararlı buluyorum...Anadolu cu arkadaşlar, Türklüğün süratle ve feci bir şekilde imha edildiğini ve melezleştirildiğini muhakkak ki bilmiyorlar! Turancılar Türkiye’nin müstecel muazzam davalarını nasıl

On the other hand, the influence of Türkkan's race theory can be seen in his ideas with respect to Pan-Turkism. For example, he did not include other Turanian peoples, such as the Finns, Hungarians, Mongols and Georgians in the Turkic unity, since they had mixed with other races and hence lost their original Tur blood. In other words, they do not have the principal racial and cultural features to join the Pan-Turkist Unity.³¹⁵ Consequently, the definition of Turanian geography directs Türkkan to the Soviet Union, in which many Turkic peoples live. The way that Türkkan suggested to found a Pan-Turkist unity is war. After the German attack on the Soviets, he clearly declared his desire to enter into the war. However, in contrast to many scholars like Hostler, Landau, Koçak and Özdoğan who claimed all Pan-Turkist were pro-German and wanted to enter into the war on the side of Germany during the Second World War, Türkkan considered Germany, which aimed to increase its economic and political hegemony over the world, as one of the greatest hindrances in front of the realization of Pan-Turkist unity. He, in 1940, explained the main reason that made him anti-German, as follows:

The German victory would be a tragic blow to Turkey, the Turkish world and Turkism. An active German hegemony on Europe would be very harmful and dangerous for my nation just in the era of development. However, the victory of Allied forces would be a salvation relatively, a free development. Only the victory of Allied forces would cause the success of revolutions that were necessary to strengthen, purify and grow Turkism. But, the victory of Italian and German mean the destruction of this hope, the surrounding of Turkey by all sides, the gathering of outside Turks by more merciless enemies and meant Turkey working hard for its independence and losing time, effort and blood. I wanted that the Allied forces would be the victors in the war and the Fascist (Italians and Germans) would be defeated just as it was appropriate for the benefits of Turkishness. I desired this with the whole intensity of my Turkist soul.³¹⁶

fark etmemişlerse, Anadolucular da Türklüğün yarım asır içerisinde yok olma tehlikesini farketmiyorlar!" Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, pp. 115-116.

³¹⁵ Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, pp. 108-112.

During the war, he reiterated his earlier claim that he had made in *Ergenekon* for the first time, that Germany and Italy had planned to obtain Turkey's lands. For this reason, he warned all Anatolianists and Turanists of the danger of Germany in the following words:

Yes, the Allied forces are defeated. But we should know that the German victory is the biggest danger for the Turkish world. Both Turanists and those who think of just Anatolia know that as well. The Germans are the biggest danger for our motherland, independence, the great Turkish world and the ideal of 'pure, great and strong Turkism' which we keep in our hearts. We should not be deceived by the promises of peace and friendship.³¹⁷

Consequently, he, by emphasizing the war, meant to occupy the Soviet lands in which Turkic peoples lived before the German invasion. However, in addition to being the principal way to create a Pan-Turkist unity, Türkkan also exalted the war as a sacred law of nature which differentiated the strong from the weak. For him, war regenerated the nation by creating a pure morality and increasing solidarity in society whereas peace caused terrible disasters by raising an extreme egoism and encouraging all kinds of immorality, bribery and societal disorders.³¹⁸ In fact, the influence of social Darwinism can be clearly seen in his thoughts related to the war.³¹⁹ First of all, Türkkan, opposed

³¹⁶ "Alman zaferi, Türkiye, Türklük ve Türkçülük için feci bir darbedir. Tam kalkınma çağımızda, Avrupa üzerinde fiili bir Alman hegemonyası, milletim için çok zararlı ve tehlikeli olacaktır. Halbuki Müttefiklerin zaferi, bir kurtuluş ve serbest inkişaf demektir. Ancak Müttefiklerin zaferi, Türklüğün kuvvetlenmesi, özleşmesi ve büyümesi için gereken inkılapların umduğumuz şekilde başarılmasını temin edebilirdi. Halbuki Alman ve İtalyan zaferi, bütün bu ümitlerin mahvolması, Türkiye'nin her taraftan çembere alınması, dış Türkelinin daha amansız düşmanların eline geçmesi ve Türkiye'nin sırf istiklali için didinmesi, vakit, emek ve kan kaybetmesi demektir. İşte, sırf Türklüğün menfaatine uyduğu için, Müttefiklerin savaştan galip çıkmalarını ve Faşistlerin (Almanların ve İtalyanların) yenilmelerini istiyordum. Bunu, Türkçü ruhumun bütün şiddetiyle istiyordum." Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, pp.225-226.

³¹⁷ "Evet, Müttefikler yeniliyor. Fakat şunu iyi bilelim ki Alman zaferi, Türklük için en büyük tehlikedir. Sırf Anadolu'yu düşünenler de bunu böyle bilsinler, Turancılar da. Almanlar, vatanımız için, istiklalimiz için, Büyük Türklük için ve gönüllerimiz de yaşattığımız 'Öz, büyük ve kuvvetli Türklük' ülküsü için en büyük tehlikedir. Sulh ve dostluk vaadleri bizi aldatmamalıdır." Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, p. 234.

³¹⁸ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, "Savaşçılık: Savaş Bir Felaket midir?" *Bozkurt* 1, no. 6 (September 1940), pp. 134-135.

Rousseau's concept of natural equality and criticized him, since he did not consider seriously nature which created every human being different from each other.³²⁰

According to Türkkan, there was no equality in the nature and the basic instrument that determined the strong, that is to say, the right was the war. He advocated this claim by saying:

War is a holy vehicle that manifested the real description of the right in an appropriate manner because it determines the victor of the struggle of two rights that is the most natural and efficient. The most genuine and natural right is the strong, that is to say, the efficient's right.³²¹

In addition, he claimed that war played a crucial role in the progress of civilization and states. For him, while Japan, Germany and England progressed through the wars, India, had been ruled by foreigners for ages, and Czechoslovakia, had been occupied by Germany, due to their pacifist policies.³²² On the basis of this theory, Türkkan wanted the Turkish nation, in particular the youth³²³, to be educated with

³¹⁹ For a short discussion of Social Darwinism in Turkey see, Hasan Ünder, "Türkiye'de Sosyal Darwinizm Düşüncesi" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), pp. 427-437.

³²⁰ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, *Dört İçtimai Mesele, Ahlak-Müsavat-Hak-Milli Menfaat* (İstanbul: Bozkurtçu Yayını, 1941), pp. 14-18.

³²¹ "Savaş, çarpışan iki haktan, en tabiisini ve en liyakatlisini muzaffer kıldığı için, hakkın hakiki tarifini en uygun bir şekilde tecelli ettiren mukaddes bir tabi vasıtaadır. En hakiki ve en tabii hak, kuvvetlinin- yani liyakatlinin- hakkıdır." Türkkan, *Dört İçtimai Mesele*, p. 29.

³²² Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, pp. 181-187.

³²³ Türkkan describes the Turkish youth, who would create the Turkic unity in the future as follows: "The Turkish youth of tomorrow is portly, well-built, healthy, vigorous and robust. He considers it a duty to exercise his body as well as his mind. He believes that his body's cleanliness and health is as important as his soul and moral health. All kinds of sports, movement and hard living conditions have made his blood loosened, made his body built, made his arm like iron, made his nerves like steel and made his lungs enlarged...This Turkish youth will be a fighter more horrible than his ancestors the Huns, greater than the Gök-Turks, more unbeatable than the soldiers of Ghengiz and more awesome than the Ottomans in tomorrow's blessed wars. Tomorrow's God of War is this Turkish youth!...There is no hardness and no enmity which this precipitous nature, this heroic soul and this steely grand Turkish body can not beat! You, Tomorrow's Turkish Youth, you will do all of these things!" "Yarının Türk Genci iri yapılı, geniş omuzlu, kanlı canlı, dinç ve gülbüz bir delikanlıdır. Vücudunu kafası kadar işletmeyi vazife bilir. Vücut temizliğini ve sıhhatini, ruh ve ahlak sıhhati kadar zaruri, aksini ayıp tanır. Her çeşit spor, hareket ve sert bir yaşayış tarzı, kanını bollaştırmış, vücudunu geliştirmiş, bazılarını demirleştirmiş, sinirlerini çelikleştirmiş ve ciğerlerini genişletmiştir...Bu Türk Genci, yarının kutlu savaşlarında, ataları Hunlardan daha korkunç, Gök-Türklerden daha müthiş, Cengizin askerlerinden daha yenilmez ve Osmanlılardan

warrior's soul and accused the intellectuals who promoted the peace of being defeatist and traitorous in the following words:

What is to be said to our intellectuals who teach Turks to hate the war with all aspects in spite of preparing them for this examination? Can we give them any name but defeatist and traitorous? Our each newspaper, journal, book conveys a too harmful idea, opposed to the war and tries to inculcate this idea with all its power! The Turk never relents! We can be sure that those defeatists who talk about the welfare of peace instead of the eternal character of Turks, bravery, warrior soul and die for an ideal are not included in us by race!³²⁴

As for his thoughts with respect to administration of the state, which was quite clearly stated in *Türkçülüğe Giriş* (An Introduction to Turkism), published in 1940,³²⁵ Türkkan proposed a political system he called “disciplined democracy” as the most appropriate system for Turkey. In disciplined democracy, because he believed that a nation could not develop unless it created a society freed from political parties and united around a national ideal, there was no room for political parties. For him, what political parties did was only to cause political polarization and ideological disintegration in society.³²⁶ Instead of political parties, the basic institution that represented the public opinion was the *Kurultay* (The General Assembly), consisting of the prominent personages in the country. The basic duty of the General Assembly was

daha heybetli bir savaşçıdır. Yarının savaş Tanrısı işte bu Türk gencidir!...Bu yalçın tabiat, bu kahraman ruh ve bu çelikten dev gibi Türk vücudunun kıramayacağı zor, ezemeyeceği azgınlık ve düşmanlık yoktur! Hepsini sen yapacaksın ey Yarının Türk Genci!” Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Yarının Genci” *Gök-Börü* 1, no. 6 (1 February 1943), pp. 3-4.

³²⁴ “Türkü bu imtahana hazırlayacağına, her vasıtayla ona savaştan nefret etmeyi öğreten münevverlerimize ne nedemeli? Hele böyle bir anda, bunlara ‘bozguncu’ ve ‘hain’ den başka bir sıfat verebilir miyiz? Her gazetemiz, her mecmuamız, her kitabımız, çok zararlı bir harp aleyhtarlığı fikri taşıyor ve bu fikri, bütün kuvvetiyle telkin etmeye çalışıyor!...Türk yumuşamamalıdır! Türkün ezeli seciyesini bozan, yiğitlik, savaşçılık ve ülkü uğrunda hayatını feda yerine sulhun refahından bahseden bu bozguncular, emin olalım ki çoğu kanca bizden olmayanlardır!” Reha Oğuz Türkkan, “Savaşçılık: Savaş Bir Felaket midir?” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 6 (September 1940), pp. 133-134.

³²⁵ Since the Soviet Ambassador applied to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to express his disturbance, resulted from the book, it was collected by the government in February 1941. Önen, p. 275.

³²⁶ According to Türkkan, the parliamentary democracy and political parties were the main reason of the defeat of France against the German armies. Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, p. 37.

to inspire and guide the chief, elected by the sublime figures of Turkishness as the most ascendant and capable Turkish men.³²⁷ In disciplined democracy, the members of the General Assembly take a decision not in the name of the peace, justice and humanity but only the benefits of Turkishness. But the final decision is not taken by the General Assembly but by the chief even though the decision is just on the contrary of the general assembly. After that decision, the sovereignty of the state begins and the duty of the individual is to obey this decision without any objection and hesitance.³²⁸ In other words, the main mission of the individual is to live for the state, which is represented by the chief. In fact, as noted by Özdoğan, the political system, which Türkkan envisaged was a “Chief system” that demonstrated his fascist tendencies obviously.

In this context, since Türkkan was keenly aware of the similarities between Fascism and disciplined democracy, he tried to show the differences between the two ideologies. According to him, in contrast to disciplined democracy, which had an institution, *Kurultay*, that guided the chief in the decision-making process; Fascism was only a dictatorship that accepted the infallibility of the chief. This claim, which reflected his irrationality clearly, was, no doubt, void, when the chief’s power over the General Assembly is considered. For him, another difference between Fascism and disciplined democracy was that while the main aim of former one was external, because of its being imperialist; the priority of the second one was internal, because of its being a development case.³²⁹ It is obvious that this claim was also void because the main aim of Türkkan was to create a Turkic unity based on Turkey even though he defended giving priority to Turkey. In other words, for him, the development of Turkey was only

³²⁷ Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, pp. 98-99.

³²⁸ Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, p. 117.

³²⁹ Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, pp. 31-35.

an instrument of Turkish imperialism that would establish the Pan-Turkist unity. In the final analysis, his rejection of Fascism did not result from Fascism's insufficiency as an ideology, but from Germany and Italy's imperialist tendencies, which he considered as one of the greatest barriers to the Pan-Turkist unity.

Another dimension of Türkkan's discourse in this period is anti-Communism. As mentioned above, Türkkan, first of all, perceived Communism as an instrument of Russian imperialism, which persecuted the Turkic peoples and was controlled by the Bolshevik regime. In addition, Türkkan, who defined Communism as equality in production, consumption, property, money, family and women,³³⁰ departing from his Social Darwinist approach, considered it as an ideology that was totally against the laws of nature. For him, it was a vain attempt to try to put Communist ideology into practice, despite the nature, which was established on the basis of inequality. Depending on this theory, he described Communism as an ideology that obstructed the development of societies and that was appropriate for only primitive and barbaric societies:

Communism is an obstacle to the development of society because of it not being natural, not rewarding the hard worker and not punishing the lazy. Communism is impossible in civilized societies, in other words, societies in which the division of labor rules. Communism is appropriate only for barbaric societies that know only game flesh as food, sharpened rocks as gun, eating, drinking and sleeping as unique desires.³³¹

In fact, although the influence of Fascism can be seen obviously on his thoughts and he declared his respect for the Italian and German regimes to some extent, Türkkan opposed all foreign ideologies, since they were not suitable for the psychology of the

³³⁰ Türkkan, *Dört İctimai Mesele*, p. 18.

³³¹ “Komünizm, tabii olmadığı, çalışkanı mükafatlandırmadığı ve tembeli cezalandırmadığı için cemiyetin tekamülüne engeldir. Medeni, yani iş bölümünün hüküm sürdüğü cemiyetlerde, komünizm imkansızdır...Komünizm, yegane gıda olarak av etini, yegane silah olarak yontulmuş taş ve yegane istek olarak yiyip, içip uyumayı bilen vahşi cemiyetler içindir.” Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, pp. 27-28.

Turkish race and the historical conditions of the Turkish nation.³³² For him, in the period between 1938 and 1944, there could be only an ideology for the whole Turkish world. It was Turkism, consisting of an extreme racism based on Turkish blood, xenophobia and irredentism.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE DEATH OF THE GREY WOLF: THE CASE OF RACISM -TURANISM

³³² Türkkan, *Türkçülüğe Giriş*, p. 40.

The case of racism-Turanism, which took approximately three years, was undoubtedly one of the turning points for the Pan-Turkist movement in the Republican era. Indeed, although it was officially started with a government decree, which was announced to the public opinion on 18 May 1944, the case did not begin at once. In other words, the case had a historical process. In this process, the open letters written by Nihal Atsız to Prime Minister Şükrü Saraçoğlu, the defamation case between Nihal Atsız and Sabahhattin Ali, and the demonstrations that were held in Ankara on 3 May 1944 were the three important phases.

The Open Letters by Nihal Atsız

Nihal Atsız, who was a teacher of Turkish literature at the private Bosphorus High School (*Boğaziçi Lisesi*), from May 1939, after a nine-year-interval, started to publish his previous journal, *Orhun*, again in October 1943. In the journal, Atsız's main target seemed to be Communism rather than disseminating Pan-Turkist ideology as it had been beforehand. He, in particular in his two open letters addressed to Prime Minister Şükrü Saraçoğlu, tried to attract the attention of Turkish public opinion to the increasing danger of Communism.³³³ In the first letter, which was published in March 1944, Atsız indicated that he had selected Saraçoğlu because he was both a Turkist and a Prime Minister and he emphasized the significance of Saracoğlu's speech, made in the Parliament on 5 August 1942. However, he complained that neither the government nor the RPP had taken steps, which were in harmony with Saraçoğlu's speech:

³³³ In fact, that was not Atsız's first attack on the leftist personages in Turkey. For example, in addition to his articles in the journal *Orhun*, published between 1933 and 1934, in a pamphlet he published in 1935, he had described Nazım Hikmet as "communist Don Quixote" and "proletarian bourgeois." For more detailed information on the pamphlet, see Nihal Atsız, *Komunist Don Kişotu Proleter Burjuva Nazım Hikmetof Yoldaşa* (İstanbul: Arkadaş Basımevi, 1935).

Mr. Prime Minister,

You, in a speech made in Parliament on 5 August 1942, said, “We are Turkist, Turkish and always will remain Turkist. For us, Turkism as much as an issue of blood as that of conscience of culture.” As an intellectual who has engaged in Turkish history, I can say that the Turkish nationalism has never been expressed with such definite words by an official authority in the history of either our race or our state. There is no need to explain the enthusiasm these words aroused among the Turkist circles. Although one and half year passed, however, we are in straits, seeing nothing has been done to put into Turkism practice. The thoughts are meaningful when they are put into practice. We call it ideal. The thoughts that will not be put into practice are nothing but raw dreams...I had to regretfully express that while Turkism goes on remaining in the theoretical field, the leftist ideas, which are the enemy of this nation and country, are progressing, growing sometimes stealthily sometimes explicitly, and are continually propagandized. Whereas, since you are a Turkist and one of the six arrows of your party is nationalism, this case should not be like that.³³⁴

Besides, he, having stated many examples of Communist propaganda in Turkey,³³⁵ criticized the government for being indifferent to communist agitation as follows:

Mr. Turkist Prime Minister!

Leftism is progressing stealthily by benefiting from indifference and the tolerance exhibited towards it. Their journals are being published in every size. In these journals, the morality, the sense of motherland and honor, and the truth of nation are attacked through the same old stories. It is made fun of the holy values by pretending to struggle with fanaticism. When one of

³³⁴ “Sayın Başvekil... Millet Meclisinde, 5 Ağustos 1942 günü verdiğiniz nutukta ‘Biz Türküz, Türkçüyüz ve daima Türkçü kalacağız. Bizim için Türkçülük bir kan meselesi olduğu kadar ve laakal o kadar bir vicdan ve kültür meselesidir.’ demiştiniz. Türk tarihiyle uğraşmış bir münevver olarak söyleyebilirim ki ne ırkımızın, ne de devletimizin tarihinde, Türk milliyetçiliği resmi bir ağızdan, bu kadar kesin sözlerle hiçbir zaman açığa vurulmamıştı. Bu sözlerin Türkçü çevrelerde nasıl sevinçle karşılandığını anlatmaya gerek yoktur. Fakat aradan bir buçuk yılı aşan bir zaman geçtiği halde biz bu Türkçülüğün iş alanına geçmediğini görmekten doğan bir sıkıntı içindeyiz. Fikirler iş alanına geldiği zaman manalanır. Buna ülkü deriz. İş haline gelmeyecek fikirler ise ham hayalden başka bir şey değildir... Esefle söylemeye mecburum ki Türkçülük nazariyat sahasında kalmaya devam ederken, bu milletin ve bu ülkenin düşmanı olan solcu fikirler bazen sinsi, bazen açık yürümekte, büyümekte, propagandasını yapmakta devam ediyor. Halbuki, sizin Türkçü ve partinizin altı okundan birinin de milliyetçilik olmasına göre, bunun böyle olmaması icap ederdi.” Nihal Atsız, “Başvekil Saraçoğlu Şükrü’ye Açık Mektup” *Orhun*, no. 15 (1 March 1944), p. 1.

³³⁵ The main example Atsız cited was an event that occurred at a conference on nationalism given by İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu at the Istanbul Eminönü People’s House in February 1944. At the conference, a group of leftist students had protested Baltacıoğlu and, according to Atsız, it was a Communist attack on Turkish nationalism. He also claimed that similar incidents recurred at various schools, including the university, in Istanbul.

these journals is closed, another appears with the same signatures. How do these idle vagrants find money? How do their journals, which are not sold, but distributed free of charge, survive? But, what's most interesting, how can you close your eyes to these? How can you allow this hostile idea that is articulated in the journals even in the daily newspapers to poison the Turkish nation under the mask of statism, patriotism, humanism, being scientific? Why do you give the top positions to those who grudged the independence to this country, and who wanted it to be the slave of others.³³⁶

One month later, Atsız published another open letter in *Orhun*, which was more detailed and outspoken about Communism and Communist personages in Turkey. In the introductory paragraphs of the letter, Atsız stated that he had received from every part of the country many telegrams, which were the translation of the feelings of the public opinion, due to his first open letter. After that, he attacked Communism immediately:

Mr. Prime Minister!

According to our constitution, Communism is prohibited in Turkey and our state is a nationalist state. Those who try to bring Communism, which is contrary to the peculiar structure, moral and national tendencies of Turkish race, to Turkey are both ignoble and despicable with respect to nation and traitors in terms of the law. No nation allows the ideas, which it considers as hostile for its own structure, to live in its country. Even in England, which is the motherland of freedom and democracy, the Fascist Party was abolished and its members were sent to prison. Turkey is the unique state that tolerates the enemies of motherland and even gives them high ranks and responsibility in the whole world. This tolerance may originate from the strength of the state and its self-confidence. But, when the destructive results of the great and glorious Fatih's tolerance in an age in which Turkey had the strongest position is considered, it is immediately understood the great danger of tolerance to the enemies of motherland and nation. What destroys the most robust bodies is that a few tiny microbes form a bridgehead in that

³³⁶ "Sayın Türkçü başvekil!.. Solculuk gördüğü müsamaha ve kayıtsızlıktan faydalanarak sinsi sinsi ilerliyor...Boy boy dergileri çıkıyor. Bu dergilerde hep aynı teranelerle ahlaka, vatan ve şeref duygusuna, millet hakikatine saldırılıyor. Taasubla mücadele ediliyormuş gibi gözüükerek mukaddesatla eğleniliyor. Bu dergilerden biri kapatılınca aynı imzalarla bir başkası çıkıyor. Bu işsiz güçsüz serseriler bu parayı nereden buluyor? Satılmayan, bedava dağıtılan dergileri nasıl yaşıyor? Fakat en zorlusu, siz bunlara nasıl göz yumuyorsunuz? Dergilerle ve hatta gündelik gazetelerle işlenen bu vatan düşmanı fikrin bazen devletçi, bazen vatancı, bazen insanı, bazen ilimci kılıklarla Türk milletini zehirlemesine niçin müsaade ediyorsunuz? Niçin bu memlekete istiklali çok görmüş, onu başkalarına köle etmek istemiş olanlara yüksek makamlarda yer veriyorsunuz?" Nihal Atsız, "Başvekil Sarçoğlu Şükrü'ye Açık Mektup" *Orhun*, no. 15 (1 March 1944), pp. 3-4.

body. In case they are not cleaned immediately, they destroy a vital part of organs by proliferating in time. Then comes destruction and death. Some may ask whether there are Communists in Turkey or not. This should be not forgotten that Communists never explicitly show themselves as Communist. They show themselves as if they were populist patriots by using one of the six arrows of the RPP, populism, which are too flexible. However, there is no need to be a genius in order to understand their real identity. Enmity against race and family, opposition to religion and war, undermining the nation under the disguise of attacking against fascism, over-love towards the minorities in our country and assessing everything in economic terms are the main marks that make them become evident. They attack the nationalists, who are the greatest enemy of them, with respect to racism, because they are well aware of the fact that racism is the fundamental in nationalism.³³⁷

Succeeding this introduction, Atsız directed his attention to more specific and concrete figures and described Sabahattin Ali, a teacher at the Ankara State Conservatory;³³⁸ Pertev Naili Borotav, an associated professor of folklore at the Faculty of Language History and Geography in Ankara;³³⁹ Prof. Sadrettin Celal Antel, the

³³⁷ “Sayın başvekil! Bizim anayasamıza göre komünizm Türkiye’de yasaktır ve devletimiz milliyetçi bir devlettir. Türk ırkının hususi yapısına, ahlaki ve milli temayüllerine aykırı olan komünizmi Türkiye’ye sokmak isteyenler millet bakımından soysuz ve namert oldukları gibi kanun nazarında da haindirler. Hiçbir millet kendi milli yapısına düşman saydığı fikirleri kendi ülkesinde yaşatmaz. Hürriyetin ve demokrasinin anayurdu olan İngiltere’de bile, savaş başlar başlamaz faşist fırkası lağvedilip, azaları hapse atıldı. Bütün dünyada, yurt düşmanlarına müsamaha gösteren, hatta onlara mevki ve salâhiyet veren tek devlet Türkiye’dir. Bu müsamaha devletin kuvvetinden, kendisine güveninden de doğabilir. Fakat, Türkiye’nin en kuvvetli olduğu bir çağda, büyük ve şanlı Fatih’in yaptığı müsamahanın ne belalar getirdiği düşünülürse, yurt ve millet düşmanlarına müsamaha göstermekteki büyük tehlike derhal anlaşılır. En sağlam gövdeleri yere vuran şey de küçücük birkaç mikrobun o gövdede bir köprübaşı kurmasıdır. Derhal temizlenmezlerse zamanla çoğalıp uzviyetin can alıcı bir noktasını tahrip ederler. Sonrası yıkım ve ölümdür. Türkiye’de komünistler var mıdır sorusu bir takımları tarafından sorulabilir. Şunu unutmamalı ki komünistler hiçbir zaman biz komünistiz diye açıkça kendilerini ortaya vermezler. Onlar Halk Partisi’nin çok elastiki olan altı okundan halkçılığı alarak kendilerini halkçı yurtseverler gibi ortaya atarlar. Fakat onların hakiki benliğini anlamak için dahi olmaya lüzum yoktur. İrk ve aile düşmanlığı, din ve savaş aleyhtarlığı, faşistliğe hücum perdesi altında milliyeti baltalama, yurdumuzdaki azlıklara aşırı sevgi, her şeyi iktisadi gözle görüş onları açığa vuran damgalardır. En büyük düşmanları olan milliyetçilere ırkçılık noktasından saldırımları, milliyetçilikte ırkçılığın temel olduğunu bilmelerinden dolayıdır.” Nihal Atsız, “Başbakan Saraçoğlu Şükrü’ye İkinci Açık Mektup” *Orhun*, no. 16 (April 1944), pp. 1-2.

³³⁸ Sabahattin Ali was a close friend of Nihal Atsız at *Darülfunun*. According to Atsız, Sabahattin Ali was a dedicated Turkish nationalist who visited the Turkish Hearths regularly when he was a student at the *Yüksek Muallim Mektebi*. For him, Sabahattin Ali had become Communist after he met with leftist circles, in particular with Nazım Hikmet. Nihal Atsız, *İçimizdeki Şeytanlar* (İstanbul: Arkadaş Basımevi, 1940), pp. 1-9. Indeed, there are some indications that confirm Atsız’s claim. For example, Sabahattin Ali was among the contributors of *Atsız Mecmua*, published by Atsız in İstanbul between 1931 and 1932, and one of his poems in the journal, *Nefes* (The breath), published in the third issue, appeared 15 July 1931, had been dedicated to Ziya Gökalp.

president of Institute of Pedagogical Studies at the University of Istanbul,³⁴⁰ Ahmet Cevat Emre, a former deputy and a member of Turkish Language Institution, as the prominent promoters of communism in Turkey and as traitor. In the letter, another target of Atsız was the Ministry of Education, ruled by Hasan Ali Yücel. According to Atsız, the Ministry of Education had a great responsibility in this situation, since many communists had high ranks positions in the Ministry, and it had to solve the problem by following his proposal as follows:

In the face of these incidents, the Ministry of Education has a great duty. Its duty is a more important and sublime mission than the translation of classical works, Latin and Greek courses lectured in some high schools as if the education of foreign language and even that of Turkish are all right, and these courses are essential. This mission is to clean the Turkish education system from all Communists, be it teachers and students.³⁴¹

At the end of the letter, Atsız, having criticized Hasan Ali Yücel for condoning the Communist agitation in the Ministry, sent a clear message to him, saying, “the resignation of the Ministry Education would be a patriotic gesture.” After the second open letter, the reaction of the government to Atsız was very hard and destructive. First, he was dismissed from his post at the Bosphorus High School and then his journal,

³³⁹ Pertev Naili Boratav was a classmate of Nihal Atsız at the Institute of Turcology and he also contributed to *Atsız Mecmua*. In addition to contribute to Atsız’s journal, Boratav also had declared that he was proud of being a student of Zeki Velidi Togan by signing the telegram that Atsız sent to Reşit Galip in order to support Zeki Velidi Togan. Orhangazi Ertekin, “Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkçülüğün Çatallanan Yolları” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), pp. 357-358. According to Atsız, Boratav had also become a Communist in Germany, where he went to continue his education in 1936. Nihal Atsız, “Başbakan Saraçoğlu Şükrü’ye İkinci Açık Mektup”, pp. 2-3.

³⁴⁰ Nihal Atsız was among the students of Sadrettin Celal Antel at *Darülfünun*. Berkes, pp. 173-174.

³⁴¹ “Bu olaylar karşısında Maarif Vekaletine de büyük bir vazife düşüyor. Bu vazife klasiklerin tercümesinden, sanki yabancı dil ve hatta Türkçe öğretimi pek yolunda gidiyormuş da sıra kendisine gelmiş gibi bazı liselere konulan Latince ve Yunanca derslerinden daha ileri ve üstün bir vazifedir. Bu vazife Türk maarifini, öğretmen olsun öğrenci olsun, bütün komünistlerden temizlemek vazifesidir.” Nihal Atsız, “Başvekil Saraçoğlu Şükrü’ye İkinci Açık Mektup”, *Orhun*, no: 16, April 1944, p. 6.

Orhun, was closed down. In addition, Sabahattin Ali brought a suit of defamation against Atsız.³⁴²

The Defamation Case between Sabahattin Ali and Nihal Atsız

Sabahattin Ali, who was accused of being a traitor by Atsız in his second open letter, was the only person, who brought an action for defamation against Atsız. The other people accused by Atsız did not start judicial processes against him.³⁴³ The first hearing of the case was held at the Ankara Criminal Court of First Instance on 26 April 1944.³⁴⁴ In the court, Sabahattin Ali stated that Atsız had insulted him by emphasizing an event, which had occurred fifteen years ago and he had accounted for,³⁴⁵ and demanded that Atsız should be punished and pay compensation, consisting of ten

³⁴² Mahmut Goloğlu, *Milli Şef Dönemi, 1939-1945* (Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi, 1974), p. 247.

³⁴³ At this point, some Turkist personages such as İlhan Darendelioğlu and Mustafa Müftüoğlu, both of whom had participated in the demonstrations, occurred in Ankara on 3 May 1944 in order to support Atsız, claimed that the main figures who had encouraged Sabahattin Ali to launch a judicial process against Atsız were Hasan Ali Yücel and Falih Rıfkı Atay, the editor of *Ulus*. İlhan Darendelioğlu, *Türkiye’de Milliyetçilik Hareketleri* (İstanbul: Toker Yayınları, 1968), pp. 115-116; Mustafa Müftüoğlu, *Çankaya’da Kabus: 3 Mayıs 1944* (İstanbul: Yağmur Yayınevi, 1974), pp. 42-43. In addition, the prominent Pan-Turkists of the time like Alparslan Türkeş and Reha Oğuz Türkkan also support that claim. Alparslan Türkeş, *1944 Milliyetçilik Olayı* (İstanbul: Arkın Kitabevi, 1938), pp. 27-32; Reha Oğuz Türkkan, interview by Murat Kaya, tape recording, Istanbul, Turkey, 10 June 2005. On the other hand, the advocate of Sabahattin Ali in the court was the judicial adviser of the *Ulus* newspaper. Baskın Oran, “İç ve Dış Politika İlişkisi Açısından İkinci Dünya Savaşı’nda Türkiye’de Siyasal Hayat ve Sağ-Sol Akımlar” *A.Ü.S.B.F. Dergisi*, 24 (1969), p. 254.

³⁴⁴ Atsız, who had come to Ankara on 24 April 1944, was welcomed at the train station by a group of university students, demonstrating in his favor. Those people also came to the court in order to support Atsız against Sabahattin Ali. However, when the hearing started, the windowpanes and doors were broken due to the disorder among the supporters of Atsız and, therefore, the hearing was postponed to afternoon by the court in order to increase security measures. Müftüoğlu, pp. 43-44.

³⁴⁵ In his second letter, Atsız reminded that Sabahattin Ali had been sentenced to fourteen months in prison in 1931 in Konya due to one of his poems in which he had insulted prominent political figures of the time such as İsmet İnönü and Ali Çetinkaya. Sabahattin Ali was imprisoned for a while in Konya and Sinop in 1932 because of his poem.

thousand TL to him.³⁴⁶ As for Atsız, he claimed that Sabahattin Ali was not the specific target of his letters in which he had meant a larger group:

I, as a patriot, see that Turkey is at the edge of a cliff. These kinds of personages take possession of higher offices in the country by supporting each other. Whereas, these personages try to deal a blow to those who love Turkey. I wrote the mentioned open letter to the prime minister in order to prevent that situation.³⁴⁷

Following these mutual accusations, at the end of the hearing, the lawyer of Atsız, Hamit Şevket İnce,³⁴⁸ turned the case into a more ideological one by saying:

This case is the case of the conflict of two beliefs. This case is a case of the conflict between nationalism and Communism. The origins of this case are in consciences and minds. We shall present this in our defense. The claimant has the fire of Communism in his mind. My client has lunged in order to extinguish that fire.³⁴⁹

After that, the hearing was adjourned to 3 May 1944. However, the tension between the two sides increased gradually³⁵⁰ and Hamit Şevket İnce was continuously trying to turn the case into a war between Communism and Turkish nationalism. For

³⁴⁶ *Tasvir-i Efkar*, 27 April 1944, pp. 1-3.

³⁴⁷ *Ben bir vatansever sıfatı ile Türkiye'nin bir uçuruma sürüklendiğini görmekteyim. Bu kabil kimseler birbirlerine dayanarak memleketin yüksek makamlarına turmanıyorlar. Halbuki bunlar Türkiye'yi sevenlere darbe vurmağa çalışıyorlar. Ben bu vaziyetin önlenmesi için Başvekile malum olan açık maktubu yazdım. Tasvir-i Efkar*, 27 April 1944, pp. 1-3. For the full text of Nihal Atsız's defense in the court, see Osman F. Sertkaya, "Hüseyin Nihal Atsız" in *Atsız Armağanı*, ed. Erol Güngör, M. N. Hacıeminoğlu, Osman F. Sertkaya, Mustafa Kafalı (İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 1976), pp. XLIII-XLVIII.

³⁴⁸ In the court, in addition to Hamit Şevket İnce, Atsız had two more lawyers, Ferruh Agan and Rasih Yeğengil. Müftüoğlu, p. 43.

³⁴⁹ *Bu dava, iki imanın çarpışması davasıdır. Bu dava, milliyetçilikle komünizmin çarpışması davasıdır. Bu davanın kökleri, vicdanlarda ve kafalardadır. Bunu müdafamızda arz edeceğiz. Davacının kafasında komünizm ateşi vardır. Müvekkilim bu ateşi söndürmek için hamle yapmaktadır. Tasvir-i Efkar*, 27 April 1944, pp. 1-3.

³⁵⁰ One day after that hearing, a conflict broke out between Sabahattin Ali and a group of university students and it suddenly was transformed into a quarrel in which Osman Yüksel Serdengeçti, who was a student at the department of philosophy at the University of Ankara at the time, physically attacked Sabahattin Ali. The quarrel came to the court at the same day. According to the court's decision, while Sabahattin Ali was fined 12.5 TL, Serdengeçti was fined 12.5 TL and sentenced to three days imprisonment. *Tasvir-i Efkar*, 28 April 1944, p. 1.

example, in an interview, he made with the correspondent of *Tasvir-Efkar* on 28 April 1944 in Ankara, described the case as follows:

I am a Turkish. I am a Turk, who has been affiliated with the Turkish Hearths in the past. Consequently, I am Turkist. For this reason, I esteemed the writing of Nihal Atsız as mine and decided to advocate his case just as mine. I cannot defend a communist man. I have never followed a policy that does not correspond to my principles and I will not. During the hearing, Sabahattin Ali declared that this case should be considered as an ordinary defamation case, which has not a political aspect, and if Nihal Atsız tried to make the case seem so, this would not have a positive result for both himself and the country. In return to this, I stated that it is not possible to evaluate the event within a narrow cadre as they said, on the contrary, we have to examine the past and origins of the matter and, since the two believes and ideals conflicts, we have to express the impressions that has been created and will be created in the social milieu.³⁵¹

The tension reached its peak on 3 May 1944, which was the date of the second hearing of the case. On 3 May, although the majority of the crowd remained outside, a crowded group of people, consisting mainly of university students, came to the Court House in order to watch the hearing. During the hearing, they supported Atsız by clasping him and shouting slogans against Sabahattin Ali. After the hearing was closed,³⁵² the attendants of the hearing joined the big crowd, waiting outside and they started to walk towards Ulus Square, shouting slogans such as “damned Communists!”, “damned servers of Moscow!”, “long live Atatürk!” and “long live nationalist Turkey!”. After that, the crowd turned towards the prime ministerial residence of Saraçoğlu, and on the way they burned Sabahattin Ali’s books. The demonstration was suppressed by

³⁵¹ Ben Türküm. Eski Ocakçı bir Türküm. Binaenaleyh Türkçüyüm. Bu itibarlardır ki, Nihal Atsız’ın yazısını kendi yazım addettim ve davasını kendi davam gibi müdafaa etmek kararını aldım. Ben komünist bir adamın müdafiliğini yapamam. Akideme uygun olmayan bir siyaseti bugüne kadar takip etmedim, bundan sonra da edemem. Duruşma esnasında, Sabahattin Ali, açtığı davanın alelade bir hakaret meselesi telakki edilmesini, bunda siyasi bir mahiyet görülmemesini, şayet Nihal Atsız bu davaya öyle bir renk verirse, bu hem kendisine ve hem de memleket için iyi bir netice vermeyeceğini söylemiştir. Buna karşı ben, hadiseyi dedikleri gibi dar bir kadro içinde temaşa etmeğe imkan bulunmadığını, bilakis meselenin köklerine kadar inmeğe mecbur olduğumuzu, iki imanın, iki idealin çarpıştığını ve bu müsaraaanın içtimai muhitte yarattığı ve yaratacağı intibaları belirtmek mevkiinde bulunduğumuzu...dedim. *Tasvir-i Efkar*, 29 April 1944, pp. 1-3. 46.

³⁵² The hearing had been adjourned to 9 May 1944 for the final decision.

the police and some protestors were detained.³⁵³ After this event, the case between Nihal Atsız and Sabahattin Ali ended in the final hearing, which was held on 9 May 1944.³⁵⁴

In the case, Atsız was found guilty of defamation and sentenced to imprisonments for four months and fine sixty-six TL. Although his imprisonment was postponed by the court, on the same day, Atsız was arrested while he was about to return to Istanbul. His arrest was followed by the arrest of many others, including all of the prominent Pan-Turkists of the time. In a short time, the total number of the people who were arrested or detained by the government reached forty-seven.³⁵⁵ These people were: 1. Nihal Atsız, 2. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, 3. Zeki Velidi Togan, 4. Abdülkadir İnan, 5. Hüseyin Namık Orkun, 6. Akdes Nimet Kurat, 7. Muharrem Fevzi Togay, 8. Cafer Seydahmet Kırimer, 9. Remzi Oğuz Arık, 10. Mükremin Halil Yinanç, 11. Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıkoğlu, 12. Orhan Şaik Gökyay, 13. Peyami Safa, 14. Fethi Tevetoğlu, 15. Samet Ağaoğlu, 16. Osman Turan, 17. Nihat Sami Banarlı, 18. Hüseyin Hüsni Emir

³⁵³ Müftüoğlu, pp. 49-50; Darendelioğlu, pp. 117-118; Türkeş, p. 31. The incidents on 3 May 1944 in Ankara did not remain an ordinary demonstration to support Nihal Atsız and the date “3 May 1944” was accepted as “the date of national resurgence” by the following generations of Turkists. For example, according to Altan Deliorman, one of the students of Nihal Atsız from the Haydarpaşa High School, during the 1950s and 1960s, many special organizations were arranged by the Turkists in order keep the spirit of May the third vivid. Altan Deliorman, *Tanıdığım Atsız* (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 1978), pp. 134-152. The importance of May the third can be also seen in the works of Turkist of the time such as Türkeş and Müftüoğlu. See Türkeş, pp. 20-36; Müftüoğlu, pp. 49-53; Today, the third May is still celebrated as “Turkists’ Day” among the Turkist circles.

³⁵⁴ Before the final hearing, one of advocates of Nihal Atsız, Hamit Şevket İnce, who had described himself as a sincere Turkist, announced that he had left defending Atsız in the case. According to İnce’s declaration, published in *Ulus* on 8 May 1944 in order to explain the reasons of his resignation, he, having read Atsız’s novel “The Nights of the Toadies,” had found out that Atsız was a person who was opposed to the revolutions of Atatürk. *Ulus*, 8 May 1944, p. 3.

³⁵⁵ Samet Ağaoğlu, who also was detained at the time, argues that Memduh Şevket Esandal, the Secretary General of the RPP of the time, had strongly objected to the government which aimed to arrest a larger group of people by saying “I am also a nationalist, if that is your verdict, then arrest me first.” Samet Ağaoğlu, *Babamın Arkadaşları* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998), p. 137. On the other hand, the people to be arrested and detained were determined by a committee, ruled by Hasan Ali Yücel. Özdoğan, “Turan”dan “Bozkurt”a, p. 105; Goloğlu, p. 249. However, Mustafa Müftüoğlu, who was also among the detainees, claims that the list of the names to be arrested was prepared by a committee, consisting of Hasan Ali Yücel, Falih Rıfkı Atay and Nevzat Tandoğan, the governor of Anakara at the time. Müftüoğlu, p. 58.

Erkilet, 19. Ali Dursun Tibet Tevetoğlu, 20. Nurullah Barıman, 21. Hamza Sadi Özbek, 22. Ahmet Çaferoğlu, 23. Nebil Buharalı, 24. Mehmet Halil Bayrı, 25. Mustafa Hakkı Akansel, 26. Bedriye Atsız, 27. Mustafa Müftüoğlu, 28. M. Zeki Sofuoğlu (Özgür), 29. Gülcan Tevetoğlu, 30. Uluğ Turanlıoğlu, 31. Ali Haydar Yeşilyurt, 31. İzzettin Şadan, 32. Tahir Akın Karaoğuz, 33. İ. Hakkı Yılanlıoğlu, 34. Kadircan Kaflı, 35. Tesbihçioğlu (*sic.*), 36. Azeri Mehmet Altunbay (*sic.*), 37. Sanan Azer, 38. M. Şakir Ülkütaşır, 39. Yusuf Kadıgil, 40. Sepicioğlu (*sic.*), 41. Hüseyin Avni Göktürk, 42. Necdet Sancar, 43. Cemal Oğuz Öcal, 44. Elmas Yıldırım, 45. Sanan Azer, 46. İsmet Rasin Tümtürk, 47. Ali Genceli.³⁵⁶

Towards the Case of Racism-Turanism

The official decree for the arrest of suspects was expressed by the government in a declaration, published on 18 May 1944 as follows:

Upon the suspicion due to the documents on some people for whom the necessity to detain aroused as a result of the impetuosity in favor of Nihal Atsız, the owner of the journal *Orhun*, which recently was closed down by the government, and his case with Sabahattin Ali, a teacher of the conservatory, in Ankara, the houses of Nihal Atsız, Reha Oğuz Türkkan, Zeki Velidi and Dr. Hasan Ferit Cansever in Istanbul and some of their close friends' houses had been searched by the Istanbul Martial Law Commandership and the document obtained had been examined. According to conviction and result resulting from the examination of these documents, these personages, who pursue racist and Turanist ideas that were against the principles our constitution, have increased their actions recently, made preparations to these aims and signed agreements have ideas opposing to our

³⁵⁶ Tekin Erer, *Basında Kavgalar* (İstanbul, Yeni Matbaa, 1965), pp. 116-119; Goloğlu, p. 249. However, according to Müftüoğlu, who was also among the 47 people mentioned above, Osman Yüksel Serdengeçti, Ali Çankaya and İlhan E. Darendelioğlu were also detained by the government. Müftüoğlu, pp. 64-65. Another person whose name was not seen in the list of the detainees was the retired General Ali İhsan Sabis. Sabis, who had assumed the editorship of the *Türkische Post*, which was published as daily in Istanbul in German, wrote many pro-German articles with respect to war in *Tasvir-i Efkar*. He was also arrested in May 1944, since he sent unsigned letters criticizing the foreign policy of the government to official and military circles. Sabis was tried separately and sentenced to imprisonment for two years and eight months in July 1944. Cemil Koçak, *Türkiye'de Milli Şef Dönemi (1938-1945)*, vol. 2 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996), p. 228.

current regime and the actual nationalistic sentiments of the citizens, the principles of which are determined by the constitution, and clandestine associations, action programs, organization and have propaganda organs and even codes and paroles to hide their communications. These personages, by exploiting the pure nationalism and patriotism sentiments of innocent youth in various places in the country, in particular in various education institutions, try to find supporters and reach their aims using this method continuously and systematically, and strive to actualize their harmful ideology. Since this kind of activity is contrary to our constitution and has been regarded as crime according to Turkish Penal Code, the authorized judicial authorities started the legal prosecutions against the perpetrators.³⁵⁷

Following the declaration of the government, President İsmet İnönü, in a public speech he made in Ankara for the commemoration of the national day of May the 19, in contrast to İncedayı and Menemencioğlu, who had explained that there was neither a Pan-Turkist nor a racist movement in Turkey in the parliament in July 1943, not only accepted the existence of racism and Pan-Turkism, but also described them as ideologies, contradicting the basic principles of the Turkish Republic. In his speech, İnönü, first, stated that Turkish Republic was a state, which was nationalist but opposed racism by emphasizing equality among the all citizens in the country as follows:

Nationalist Turkey has given all facilities to the Turkish citizen defined by the constitution of being a patriotic Turkish nationalist. Our state is a national state. It is a foundation which has the will to have good and sincere links with

³⁵⁷ “Son günlerde hükümetçe kapatılan Orhun mecmuası sahibi Nihal Atsız ile Konservetuar öğretmenlerinden Sabahattin Ali’nin Ankara’da görülen muhakemesi sırasında Nihal Atsız lehine yapılan taşkınlıklar dolayısıyla nezaret altına alınmaları zarureti hasıl olan bazı kimseler nezdinde çıkan evrakın verdiği şüphe üzerine Nihal Atsız, Reha Oğuz Türkkan, Zeki Velidi ile doktor Hasan Ferit Cansever’in İstanbul’da bulunan evlerinde ve daha bazı yakın arkadaşları nezdinde İstanbul Örfi İdare Komutanlığınca aramalar yapılmış ve elde edilen vesikalar tetkik edilmiştir. Bu vesikaların tetkikinden elde edilen netice ve kanaate göre Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunumuzun tespit ettiği esaslara aykırı olarak ırkçılık ve Turancılık gayeleri güden ve son zamanlarda faaliyetlerini arttırdıkları, bu yolda tertipler aldıkları ve anlaşmalar imzaladıkları bilhassa görülen bu kimselerin Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunu ile müesses bugünkü rejimimize ve vatandaşların hakiki milliyetçilik telakkilerine aykırı umdeleri ve bu umdelere varmak için gizli cemiyetleri, faaliyet programları, teşkilat ve propaganda organları, hatta muharebelerini gizli tutmağa matuf şifreleri ve parolaları vardır. Bunlar memleketin muhtelif muntıkalarında ve bilhassa her çeşit terbiye müesseselerini masum gençlerin temiz milliyetçilik ve vatanseverlik duygularını istismar ederek genç nesil arasında kendilerine taraftar toplamak ve bu suretle hedeflerine ulaşmak için devamlı ve sistemli bir faaliyet sarf etmekte ve memlekete zararlı ideolojilerini tahakkuk ettirmek yolunda çalışmaktadırlar. Bu mahiyetteki faaliyet, Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunumuza aykırı ve Türk Ceza Kanunumuza göre suç vasıflarına haiz olduğundan failleri hakkında salahiyyetli adli merciler tarafından kanuni takibat yapılmak üzere işe el konulmuştur. “İrkçılık ve Turancılık Tahrikatı Yapanlar Hakkında Hükümetin Tebliği”, *Ayın Tarihi*, May 1944, p. 21.

all nations, and which is based on national interests and national ideals. It is a mentality which is positive in itself, conciliatory, connective and unites all citizens having good will. The citizens known to be minority have all the citizenship rights and full support of laws like every Turkish citizen has. Besides, for every citizen who is brought up in Turkish culture and who wants to be a Turkish nationalist, there are means of access. We are Turkish nationalist, but the enemy of the principle of racism in our country.³⁵⁸

İnönü, having said these, gave a strong message to all neighbors of Turkey, in particular the Soviet Union, which had been the main target of the Pan-Turkists in the country, since the outbreak of World War II, by declaring that the government would not tolerate Pan-Turkism and the subversive activities of Pan-Turkists in the country in the following words:

The idea of Turanism is a manifestation of recent times that is harmful and sick. From this point of view, we need to understand the Republic very well. On the day national independence came to an end, our only companion was the Soviet Union and all of our neighbors kept the memory of their old hostility in their minds alive. Every one of them thought that if only we gained some power, we would again impose an aggressive and adventurous policy. The republic has considered one of the basic conditions of powerful civilized living to let exist a secure atmosphere among the nations family. It has deemed necessary the existence of good and close relationships with its neighbors that had recently separated from the Empire for the happiness of the nation. It is obvious that our national policy is totally different from the mentality of looking for adventures abroad. The most significant aspect of this approach is that it has resulted from the necessities, but from an understanding and conviction...Turanists have found the means to make all of its neighbors hostile to Turkey again in an irrevocable way. In order not to yield the collective destiny of the nation to those unconscious and conscienceless conspirators' misdemeanors, we shall surely impose all measures of the Republic...The racists and Turanists have applied to conspiracies and secret formations. Why? Is it possible that their ideas find a place in this country by secret conspiracies among their cognates? Is it possible that the countries from east to west would be seized by a secret Turan society? These are ideas that can be realized only after the laws and basic organization of it are violated...In today's world conditions, those who claim that Turkey has to

³⁵⁸ “*Milliyetçi Türkiye; anayasanın tarif ettiği Türk vatandaşına, vatansever bir Türk milliyetçisi olmanın bütün imkanlarını vermiştir. Devletimiz, milli bir devlettir. Bütün milletlerle iyi ve samimi münasebetler beslemek isteyen, milli menfaatler ve milli ülküler üzerinde kurulmuş bir müessesedir. Kendi içinde yapıcı, iyi niyet sahibi bütün vatandaşları birleştirici, uzlaştırıcı ve kaynaştırıcı bir zihniyettir. Azlık diye tanınmış olan vatandaşlar, her Türk vatandaşı gibi, kanunun bütün himayesini ve bütün vatandaş haklarına sahiptirler. Bundan başka, Türk kültürü içinde yetişerek Türk milliyetçisi olmak isteyen her vatandaş için imkan kapıları açıktır...Türk milliyetçisiyiz, fakat memleketimizde ırkçılık prensibinin düşmanıyız.*” Milli Şef İnönü’nün 19 Mayıs Gençlik Bayramı Münasebetiyle Gençliğe Hitaben Söylediği Nutuk”, *Ayın Tarihi*, May 1944, pp. 26-27.

become racist and Turanist are useful for which persons and nation's benefits? That those who want to execute these ideas, which bring only trouble and calamity to the Turkish nation, shall not to serve the Turkish nation is undoubted.³⁵⁹

Parallel to İnönü's speech,³⁶⁰ the Turkish press started a hard campaign against racism and especially Turanism, which lasted approximately two weeks.³⁶¹ In this process, numerous editorials and articles, which supported İnönü's messages and denounced racism and Turanism very harshly, appeared in the newspapers.³⁶² In fact, as emphasized by Weisband and Hostler, the attitude of the Turkish press with respect to Pan-Turkism and the great publicity the press gave the arrests was a message, which sent to the Soviet Union, which was about to enter into the Balkans,³⁶³ since Turkey's

³⁵⁹ "Turancılık fikri, yine son zamanların zararlı ve hastalıklı gösterisidir. Bu bakımdan Cumhuriyeti iyi anlamak lazımdır. Milli kurtuluş sona erdiği gün yalnız Sovyetlerle dostluk ve bütün komşularımız eski düşmanlarının bütün hatıralarının bütün hatıralarını canlı olarak zihinlerinde tutuyorlardı. Herkesin kafasında, biraz derman bulursak sergüzeştçi, saldırgan bir siyasete kendimizi kaptıracağımız fikri yaşıyordu. Cumhuriyet, kuvvetli bir medeniyet yaşayışının şartlarından bir esaslısını, milletler ailesi içinde bir emniyet havasının mevcut olmasında görmüştür. İmparatorluktan son zamanlarda ayrılmış olan komşuları ile de iyi ve samimi komşuluk şartlarının temin edilmiş olmasını, milletin saadeti için lüzumlu saymıştır. Görülüyor ki milli politikamız memleket dışında sergüzeşt aramak zihniyetinden tamamen uzaktır; asıl mühim olan da bunun bir zaruret politikası değil, bir anlayış ve inanış politikası olmasıdır...Turancılar, Türk milletini bütün komşularıyla onulmaz bir surette derhal düşman yapmak için birebir tilsimi bulmuşlardır. Bu kadar şuuruz ve vicdansız fesatçıların tezvirlerine Türk milletinin mukadderatını kaptırmamak için elbette Cumhuriyetin, bütün tedbirlerini kullanacağız...İrkçılar ve Turancılar gizli tertiplere ve teşkillere başvurmuşlardır. Niçin? Kandaşları arasında gizli fesat tertipleriyle fikirleri memlekette yürür mü? Hele, doğudan batıdan ülkeler, gizli Turan cemiyetiyle zapt olunur mu? Bunlar öyle şeylerdir ki ancak devletin kanunları ve esas teşkilatı ayak altına alındıktan sonra başlanabilir...Dünya olaylarının bugünkü durumunda Türkiye'nin ırkçı ve Turancı olması lazım geldiğini iddia edenler, hangi millete faydalı kimlerin maksadına yaralıdırlar? Türk milletine yalnız bela ve felaket getirecek olan bu fikirleri yürütmek isteyenlerin Türk milletini hiçbir hizmeti olmayacağı muhakkaktır." Ibid., pp. 27-29.

³⁶⁰ After İnönü's speech, Hasan Ali Yücel, the Minister of Education of the time, who had been accused by Atsız of condoning the Communist agitation in the Ministry, made the speech a compulsory subject in the all schools, including universities, in the country by publishing a decree. In other words, all students had to learn İnönü's speech. *İrkçılık-Turancılık* (Ankara: Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1944), pp. 21-24.

³⁶¹ According to Metin Toker, who was a young journalist working at *Cumhuriyet* newspaper at the time, the campaign against racism and Turanism in the Turkish press started with the signal of the government. Metin Toker, *Tek Partiden Çok Partiye* (İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1970), p. 35.

³⁶² Some of these articles were also compiled into a book under the name of *İrkçılık-Turancılık* (Racism-Turanism), which was published with the support of the Ministry of Education within the same year.

³⁶³ Edward Weisband, *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1943-1945* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1973), 246. Hostler, "Trends in Pan-Turanism", p. 10.

relations with the Soviet Union were seriously strained during the war.³⁶⁴ In other words, the anti-Pan-Türkist campaign in the Turkish press together with İnönü's speech, which clearly condemned Pan-Turkist ideology, was one of the attempts of the Turkish government aiming to normalize the relationship between Turkey and the Soviets.³⁶⁵ As a result, the political atmosphere and the public opinion in Turkey before the case started were totally against the defendants.

The Case of Racism-Turanism

³⁶⁴ The amicable relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union, which had advanced since the beginning of the Turkish War of Independence, could not survive under the new conditions created by the war. Reciprocal perception of threat and mistrust on both sides were the most important reasons of this deterioration. At this point, Germany played a crucial role in increasing the tension between two countries. For example, Germany, after the collapse of France in 1940, published a "White Book," revealing that at time of the Soviet-Finnish war in 1939-1940, France had planned, with Turkish approval, to use Turkish bases to bombard the Soviet petrol sources in Baku in the event of war. Although numerous denials were subsequently made by the Turkish government, that event increased the tension between Turkey and the Soviets. In June 1941, just after the attack on the Soviets, Germany this time tried to increase anti-Soviet sentiments in Turkey, where a pro-German sympathy was quite widespread, and, for this reason, Hitler himself declared some Soviet plans related to the future of the Straits, which were allegedly expressed by Molotov, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, to Hitler and Ribbentrop in November 1940 in Berlin, in 23 June 1941. Even though the Soviets declared that they had no intention on the Straits, Hitler's declaration was also a factor that intensified the mistrust of Turkey against the Soviets. On the other hand, succeeding the Soviet victory against the German army, the Soviets desired Turkey's entry into the war on the Allied side. However, Turkey rejected the Soviets by emphasizing the argument of neutrality and this attitude was severely criticized by the Soviets, which accused Turkey of prolonging the war in September 1943. Finally, the increase of Pan-Turkist sentiments, which targeted directly the Turkic peoples living in the Soviet Union, in Turkey was another factor, increased the friction between the two countries. George Lenczowski, *The Middle East in the World Affairs* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1952), p. 145; Özdoğan, "Turan"dan "Bozkurt"a, pp. 150-175.

³⁶⁵ Turkey maintained its efforts in order to normalize its relations with the Soviets. For instance, Turkey cut off diplomatic relations with Germany in August 1944 and in January 1945; Turkey agreed to open the Straits for the flow of supplies to the Soviet Union. Moreover, on 23 February 1945, became an ally of the Soviet Union by declaring war against Germany and Japan. Lenczowski, *ibid.* p. 146. In addition, Turkey accepted to deliver one hundred and ninety-five Turkic refugees, who had escaped from the Soviet Union to Turkey during the war, to the Soviets in August 1945 and also refused to admit into its borders Crimean Tartars, who had found refuge in Rumania in the same year. Karpas, *Turkey's Politics*, pp. 267-268.

After a long investigation process that took approximately four months,³⁶⁶ the case of racism-Turanism started in Istanbul Martial Law Court No. 1 with the great interest of the press on 7 September 1944.³⁶⁷ In the case, twenty-three defendants, Zeki Velidi Togan, Reha Oğuz Türkkan, Nihal Atsız, Hüseyin Namık Orkun, Orhan Şaik Gökyay, Fethi Tevetoğlu, Alparslan Türkeş, Hasan Ferit Cansever, Hikmet Tanyu, Hamza Sadi Özbek, Cihat Savaş Fer, Zeki Sofuoğlu (Özgür), Nurullah Barıman, Fehiman Altan, Necdet Sancar, Cebbar Şenel, Said Bilgiç, Cemal Oğuz Öcal, Yusuf Kadıgil, Fazıl Hisarcıklı, İsmet Rasin Tümtürk, Muzaffer Eriş and Saim Bayrak, were charged with establishing secret organizations in order to overthrow the government, making propaganda of racist³⁶⁸ and Turanist ideologies, opposing the constitution, humiliating the spiritual personality of the Grand National Assembly and the government and counteracting national interests.³⁶⁹ In the case, establishing secret organizations in order to overthrow the government was an accusation that was particularly made for Togan and Türkkan. According to the Final Investigation Decision, the official report, which was presented to the court by the prosecutor, Kazım Alöç, in the first hearing of the case, Togan had set up a secret organization after the outbreak of the war between Germany and the Soviet Union in order to overthrow the

³⁶⁶ According to the claims of the defendants who were under arrest at time, they subjected to torture during the investigation process. According to the claims, the most applied kinds of torture were: locating detainees in coffin-size cells called “tabutluk”, not giving food and water, beating, bastinado, and making them watch other prisoners, being beaten. For the claims of torture, see Hikmet Tanyu, *Türkçülük Davası ve Türkiye’de İşkenceler* (Kayseri: Erciyes Matbaası, 1950), pp. 7-9, Türkkan, *Tabutluktan Gurbete*, pp. 50-67, Müftüoğlu, *ibid.*, 74-78, 82-89. Hikmet Tanyu, in 1949, tried to bring the tortures to the court by appealing the Council of State for the punishment of policemen who were on duty at the time. However, the Council of State rejected his application. See Tanyu, *Türkçülük Davası*, pp. 15-24.

³⁶⁷ Although the demonstrations were held in Ankara, the defendants were tried Istanbul where Martial Law had been in effect since the outbreak of the war.

³⁶⁸ Although he was charged with making propaganda of racism, the journals, edited by Türkkan were never suspended by the government because of racism.

³⁶⁹ “Son Tahkikat Kararı”, pp. 28-56.

government, whose policy of neutrality in the war he saw as a barrier for the foundation of the great Turkic unity. For the prosecutor, Togan, who desired Turkey to enter on the side of Germany against the Soviet Union, and the members of the organization, Reha Oğuz Türkkan, Cihat Savaş Fer, Nurullah Barıman, Hamza Sadi Özbek, Nuriman and Ahmet Karadağlı and Heybetullah İdil,³⁷⁰ had taken an oath on the flags of Turkestan and Turkey, the Koran and the gun to strive to realize that aim.³⁷¹

As for Türkkan, in addition to striving to overthrow the government, he was accused of founding another secret organization under the name of *GÜREM*,³⁷² aiming to disseminate racist and Turanist ideas in the country through publishing activities and to create a Turanian state, consisting of those who had racially pure Turkish origin.³⁷³ Nihal Atsız was charged with trying to disseminate racist and Turanist ideas among the Turkish youth, insulting the Grand National Assembly and the government in his writings and planning the demonstrations on 3 May 1944 in Ankara.³⁷⁴ Finally, Necdet Sancar, Hüseyin Namık Orkun, Orhan Şaik Gökyay, Hasan Ferid Cansever, Fethi Tevetoğlu and Alparslan Türkeş were accused of making propaganda of racism-Turanism.³⁷⁵

³⁷⁰ Since Nuriman and Ahmet Karadağlı, a couple originally from Eastern Turkestan, were in Germany at the time of the trials, and the residence of Heybetullah İdil whose could not be traced by the court, their names were not in the list of the defendants. However, they were included to the case in the second phase of the trials, started on 26 August 1946. In other words, the total numbers of the defendants who were trailed in the case of racism-Turanism was twenty-six.

³⁷¹ “Son Tahkikat Kararı”, pp. 34-36.

³⁷² According to the Final Investigation Decision, the members of the *GÜREM* were Cihat Savaş Fer, Hikmet Tanyu, Muzaffer Eriş, Fehiman Altan, Hamza Sadi Özbek, Yusuf Kadıgil, Nurullah Barıman, İsmet RasinTümtürk and Zeki Sofuoğlu (Özgür). For the accusation on the members of the *GÜREM* see, “Son Tahkikat Kararı”, pp. 36-42.

³⁷³ “Son Tahkikat Kararı”, pp. 42-46.

³⁷⁴ “Son Tahkikat Kararı”, pp. 36-41, 55-56. In addition to Nihal Atsız, Cebbar Şenel, Sait Bilgiç, Saim Bayrak, Fazıl Hisarcıklı and Cemal Oğuz Öcal were the other defendants who were accused of arranging the demonstrations of May the third.

During the case process, in addition to stressing remarkably that he had never had an intention of coup d'état and refusing such claims, what Türkkan continuously tried to do was to show the common racist discourse between the official position and his nationalism. In this framework, in order to prove racism of the regime, in the court, he emphasized some applications of the regime such as the necessity of being a member of the Turkish race for registration to military schools and the Institute of Mineral Research and Exploration, the speech of the Prime Minister Şükrü Saraçoğlu on 5 August 1942 in the Parliament and the racist implications of *Atatürk İhtilali* by Mahmut Esat Bozkurt. He, having made a reference to Bozkurt's words like "the Turkish Revolution must remain unconditionally in the hands of genuine Turks" and "the state affairs of the new Turkish republic must be governed absolutely by Turks. We will not trust anyone but Turks" in *Atatürk İhtilali*, said:

These had been said for years by Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, who was charged and appointed by Atatürk, personally, in the chair of Revolution History in state universities. Ten thousands of juveniles including me heard these words. We were inspired by them. We believed that Atatürkism, Kemalism, was that. We could only pass the class by answering in this way in exams. These lessons were published by the state, later on. The same words were said by the same professor in the chair of Constitution in the School of Political Sciences. The meaning of the constitution had been told to us like that. It is weirdness to tell the ones who learned Kemalism, the system and the Constitution like that through the Ministry of National Education that "You are the enemy of Kemalism, the system, you believe things against the Constitution, and you are traitor" today. ³⁷⁶

³⁷⁵ Since Tevettoğlu, physician first lieutenant, and Türkeş, infantry first lieutenant, were officers in the army at the time, they were also charged with opposing the decree, forbidding political activity in the army.

³⁷⁶ *Bunlar, yıllarca, Atatürk tarafından bizzat tayin ve tadviz edilen Mahmut Esat Bozkurt tarafından devletin üniversitelerinde, İnkılap Tarihi kürsüsünden söylenmiştir. On binlerce genç ve içlerinde de ben, bu sözleri duyduk. Bu telkinler altında kaldık. Atatürkçülüğün, Kemalizmin bu olduğuna inandık. İmtihanlarda ancak bu surette cevap vererek sınıf geçebildik. Bu dersler, bilahare devlet tarafından yayınlanmıştır... Aynı sözler, aynı profesör tarafından, Siyasal Bilgiler Okulunda; Teşkilat-ı Esasiye kürsüsünden de söylenmiştir. Anayasamızın manası bize böyle anlatılmıştı. Kemalizmi, Rejimi ve Anayasayı bu şekilde belleyen ve Maarif vasıtası ile bu şekilde öğrenen kimselere bu gün "Kemalizm'in, rejimin düşmanısın, Anayasaya aykırı şeylere inanıyorsun, hainsin" demek, tarihin hayretle üzerinde duracağı bir acayıplıktır."* Türkkan, *Tabutluktan Gurbete*, pp. 427-428.

As for Pan-Turkism, he accepted that he had made propaganda of Pan-Turkism in his journals. However, he claimed that the regime itself, which held history congresses, emphasizing Central Asia and showed it as the real motherland of the Turks in history and geography textbooks, was also Pan-Turkist, since it made propaganda of Pan-Turkism.³⁷⁷ Therefore, for Türkkan, his ideas were in a great harmony with the attitude of the regime.

After a long trial process in which sixty-six hearings were held, the court declared the decision on 29 March 1945. According to the decision of the court, while thirteen defendants were acquitted,³⁷⁸ a group of ten people was sentenced to various punishments. Zeki Velidi Togan, the only one, who was found guilty of conspiring to overthrow the government among the all defendants, was sentenced to heavy imprisonment for ten years and to reside in Adapazarı for four years under general society supervision. Reha Oğuz Türkkan, was sentenced to heavy imprisonment for five years and ten months and reside in Diyarbakır for two years under general society supervision, since he had founded a secret organization. Nurallah Barıman and Cihat Savaş Fer, members of the same secret organization, also was sentenced to four years imprisonment and to reside in Kırşehir and Uşak under general society supervision for one and half year.³⁷⁹ The court decided that Togan, Türkkan, Barıman and Fer be deprived of all public services for their lifetimes. As for Nihal Atsız, he was sentenced to heavy imprisonment for four years, thirty months and fifteen days and to reside in

³⁷⁷ Türkkan, *Tabutluktan Gurbete*, pp. 432-441. Parallel to Türkkan's claim, Nihal Atsız, in his defense, claimed that the Turkish government was also Pan-Turkist to some extent, since it had annexed Hatay in 1939. Sertkaya, *Atsız Armağanı*, pp. XLIX-LX.

³⁷⁸ The people who were acquitted in the case were Hasan Ferit Cansever, Hüseyin Namık Orkun, Orhan Şaik Gökyay, Hikmet Tanyu, Fehiman Altan, Muzaffer Eriş, Said Bilgiç, Yusuf Kadıgil, Fazıl Hisarcıklı, İsmet Rasin Tümtürk, Hamza Sadi Özbek, Saim Bayrak and Zeki Sofuoğlu. *Ulus*, 30 March 1945, pp. 1-3.

³⁷⁹ Since there was evidence that proved that the organization had been dissolved prior to Türkkan and his friends' arrest, they were not sentenced for conspiring to overthrow the government by the court.

Adana under general society supervision for insulting the spiritual personality of the Grand National Assembly and the government and organizing the demonstrations of May the third in Ankara.³⁸⁰

Other people who were sentenced to imprisonment were Necdet Sancar (one year and one month), Alparslan Türkeş (nine months and ten days), Fethi Tevetoğlu (eleven months and twenty days), Cebbar Şenel (eleven months) and Cemal Oğuz Öcal (eleven months)³⁸¹ However, the decision, which was taken by the Istanbul Martial Law Court No. 1 on 29 March 1945 was appealed by the defendants, who applied to the higher court. The Military Supreme Court, on 25 October 1945, quashed the decree of the Istanbul Martial Law No. 1 and decided that the defendants who had been found guilty in the first trial should be retried at the Istanbul Martial Court No. 2 and that the defendants be released from the prison, since neither the evidence nor the investigation in the first trial was sufficient.³⁸²

In contrast to the very wide publicity given the first trial, the re-trial, which had started on 26 August 1946, was sparsely reported in the Turkish press and it was finally concluded on 31 March 1947, with a decision of acquittal for all the defendants. In contrast to former verdict of the Istanbul Martial Law Court No. 1 on 29 March 1945, according to the final decision of the court, racism was not an act contrary to the

³⁸⁰ *Ulus*, 30 March 1945, pp. 1-3.

³⁸¹ While Şenel and Öcal were sentenced for only their roles in the demonstrations of May the third, Sancar and Türkeş were sentenced for disseminating subversive ideas. As to Tevetoğlu, he was sentenced for writing political articles, although he was an officer in the army. *Ulus*, 30 March 1945, p. 3.

³⁸² In fact, the General Board Military Supreme Court, consisting of seven members, had been split into two for the reversal decision. For example, while four members, major general H. Alpagut and judicial members H. Aydemir, Ş. Örs and K. Alkan insisted that the decision of the Istanbul Martial Law Court No. 1 should be quashed, the other three military members, full general Ali Fuat Erden, the president of the court, major general R. Süalp and major general C. Yalım opposed to the decision of quashing. Orhangazi Ertekin, "A Turning Point of Turkist Movement: 1944 Trials" (Master's thesis, Ortadoğu Teknik University, 1999), p. 137. However, although they were close friends, according to Ali Fuat Erden, who had opposed to the decision of quashing, President İsmet İnönü was personally disturbed by the decision of the court. Ali Fuat Erden, *İsmet İnönü* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1999), p.240-242.

constitution. For the court, although making racial discrimination within the Turkish nation could be considered as violation of the Constitution, which defined Turkishness in terms of citizenship, there was no article that specified this act as crime in the Turkish Penal Code.³⁸³ As to the accusation of conspiring to turn the government down, the decision of the court was that there was no valid evidence against Togan, Türkkan and the others. According to the court, the oaths taken by Togan, Türkkan and their associations aimed to help the Turkestanians who had been captured by the Germans, to struggle for the local improvement of Turkic peoples, which would obtain their independence, like Hatay, if Russia collapsed and to go those places and work for the cause of their coming to an understanding without falling into discord, instead of overthrowing the government. For this reason, they only struggled for a national aim.³⁸⁴ On the other hand, the final decision, having emphasized strongly that the demonstration, which was held on 3 May 1944 in Ankara, which constituted the basis of the case, emerged out of the national feelings of the Turkish youth, because the Communists had increased their activities in the country at the time, stated that the young people had been moved by their feelings and wanted to express their hatred against Communists. In other words, according to the court, “that demonstration was nothing than an expression of a national ideology against a non-national one”³⁸⁵

In fact, the final decision of the court, in particular its emphasis on Communism, which was described as a non-national ideology, obviously reflected the change, thorough the period between May 1944 and to March 1947, in the public opinion of the country. First of all, although Turkey had made some attempts in order to normalize its

³⁸³ *Tavsir-i Efkar*, 1 April 1947, p. 3.

³⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³⁸⁵ *Tasvir-i Efkar*, 1 April 1947, p. 3.

relations with the Soviet Union, these steps did not assuage the Soviets and the tension in the Turk-Soviet relations increasingly continued. In March 1945, Molotov, the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs, handed Selim Sarper, the Turkish Ambassador in Moscow, a note, stating that the Turk-Soviet Treaty of Neutrality and Friendship, which had been signed in 1925, would not be renewed. According to the Soviet note, the Treaty no longer corresponds to actual conditions nor for the changes brought about by the war and thus requires fundamental alterations”³⁸⁶ Moreover, in June 1945, the Soviet government put forward a number of conditions which Turkey had to meet in order to sign a new friendship treaty. These conditions included the return to the Soviet Union of Kars and Ardahan and the revision of the Montreux Straits Convention that would gave the rights of joint defense to the Soviet Union on the Straits.³⁸⁷ The conditions were rejected by Turkey in July 1945. However, these demands created a strong anti-Soviet wave, which shifted the Turkish public opinion in favor of all movements opposed to Communism. In this atmosphere, the official attitude of the government towards the Pan-Turkists, who described themselves as sincere Turkish nationalists fighting against Communism, started to change and in October 1945, just four months after the Soviet demands, the Military Supreme Court repealed the verdict of the Istanbul Martial Law Court No. 1 and all defendants in the case were released.

Parallel to this, another indication that displayed the change in the attitude of government was the “incident of *Tan*,” which occurred in Istanbul just one month after the release of the defendants of the case of racism-Turanism. *Tan*, edited by Zekeriya and Sabiha Sertel, who had been accused by Türkkan of being agents of Russia in 1943, had been, in general, accepted as a pro-Soviet and leftist journal in the Turkish press at

³⁸⁶ Weisband, p. 305.

³⁸⁷ *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1995)*, ed. Mehmet Gönlübol (Ankara: 1995, Siyasal Kitabevi), p. 185; Deringil, pp. 179-180.

the time.³⁸⁸ On 4 December 1945, an anti-Soviet demonstration, made by a group of university students turned into an attack against *Tan* and, in the meantime, its publishing house together with some bookstores, which sold leftist publications, were destroyed.³⁸⁹ Although Martial Law was still in effect in Istanbul, the government, headed by Recep Peker remained indifferent to the attack and did nothing to stop the crowd.³⁹⁰ The repetition of the Soviet demands for the revision of the Montreux Straits Convention and recognition of the Soviet control on the Straits in 7 August 1946, just three weeks before the beginning of the Pan-Turkists' re-trial, intensified anti-Soviet sentiments in Turkish public opinion one more time. As result of this process, in 1947, the Turk-Soviet relations had nearly reached an all-time low and the decision of the court was in a great harmony with this situation. For instance, in the final verdict of the court, the main emphasis was totally on Communism once again instead of racism or Turanism, which were the basic charges in the case, and the court itself stated that all Pan-Turkists had acted out of "nationalist" sentiments in order to oppose a "non-nationalist" ideology.

Consequently, thanks to the new conditions originated basically from the tension in the Turk-Soviet relations, the case of racism-Turanism ended with a great victory for not only the Pan-Turkist ideology, but also the defendants of the case, who were described by the court as sincere Turkish nationalists, fighting against Communism.

Reha Oğuz Türkkân after the Case of Racism-Turanism

³⁸⁸ Oran, "İç ve Dış Politika", p. 260.

³⁸⁹ Özdoğan, "Turan"dan "Bozkurt"a, p. 116.

³⁹⁰ According to Sabiha Sertel, although they had informed Fahrettin Kerim Gökay, the governor of Istanbul of the time, about the attack beforehand, he did not take any measures to prevent the attack. Sabiha Sertel, *Roman Gibi* (İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1987), pp. 314-316.

After the first phase of the case, which ended with the decision of the Military Supreme Court, and the transition to multi-party system in Turkey, Türkkan, in 1946, publishes *İleri Türkçülük ve Partiler* (The Advanced Turkism and the Parties) in which he tried to form an ideological framework for a Turkist party which could be established in the future. In his book, since he was aware that authoritarian-totalitarian regimes weakened after World War II, Türkkan noticeably modified the racist-militarist discourse that he had used between 1938 and 1944, in accordance with the political atmosphere in the world at the time. First of all, he criticized the chief system, since it created totalitarian regimes, and supported the parliamentary system and the existence of the political parties, which he blamed for the collapse of nations.³⁹¹ In addition, Türkkan, who gave up the idea of "absolute state," emphasized the idea that "the people were not created for the government, but the government was created for the people."³⁹² Another change is noticed in the case of minorities, even if he still made a distinction between the Turks and them. Türkkan, who had demanded that all of the foreign elements should be deported and not be given any responsibility in state affairs before, declared in his book that he was against the xenophobic nationalism and that the minorities could be civil servants after Turks.³⁹³ However, the most radical change in the ideas of Türkkan after the case was in the subject of war and war adherence.

³⁹¹ Reha Oğuz Türkkan, *İleri Türkçülük ve Partiler* (İstanbul: Sinan Matbaası, 1946), pp. 80-81, 102-103. Türkkan also expressed that he changed some of his ideas when he was in prison.

³⁹² However, he exposed his anti-democratic manner by being against the idea of equal vote for everybody. In his book, Türkkan proposes an election system based on the educational level of the voters. In this system, the value of every vote changes according to the educational level of the voters. For example, while the value of the vote of the primary school graduates was two, that of university graduates was ten. The value of the votes rose as well as the educational level of the voter rose. Türkkan, defended this election system, which he described as the most equitable system for Turkey, by making a reference to Schiller's words: "The votes should not be calculated but weighted." Türkkan, *İleri Türkçülük*, pp. 99-102.

³⁹³ Türkkan, *İleri Türkçülük*, pp. 103-104.

Contrary to his attitude during World War II, he condemned harshly war that he described as a terrible disaster because of its damage to humanity and he supported the United Nations, which he considered an institution with the ability to prevent war. Türkkan, who accepted his mistake in the issue of the war, explained the change of his opinions as follow:

Before, I believed the absolute utility of war. After the foundation of Turkish Unity, I thought that it was very right and necessary that the Turks deal with the conquests in Asia and Europe and like our old ancestors. I wrote that it would be futile to prevent imperialist wars because the stronger state would try to invade and it was the right of that nation. But, after going behind bars, seeing the people in pain like me and feeling the pains of others just in my flesh and in my nerves, it was impossible not to understand the mistakes and deficiencies of my old beliefs.³⁹⁴

As for Pan-Turkism, although he made certain changes in his discourse, Türkkan shows that he kept his Pan-Turkist beliefs by describing the Turks as a nation of sixty million and not restricting Turkishness within political boundaries. For him, the realization of Pan-Turkist unity was still among the duties of a Turkish nationalist.³⁹⁵

After his acquittal, in 1947, Türkkan went to the USA, where he would live until 1974,³⁹⁶ in order continue his medical treatment.³⁹⁷ In the meantime, he completed his Ph.D. program at the University of Columbia where he taught psychology during the

³⁹⁴ “Evvelce savaşın mutlak faydasına inanıyordum... Türk birliği kurulduktan sonra, kuvvetli iseler, Türklerin Asya ve Avrupa’da, eski atalarımız gibi, cihangirliğe girişmelerini haklı ve lüzumlu buluyor, emperyalist harpleri önlemenin boş olduğunu, kuvvetli olan devletin istilaya kalkışacağını ve bu hareketinde o milletin haksız sayılamayacağını yazıyordum... Fakat hapse girip, orada eziyetler içinde, benim gibi, kıvrananları, acı çeken insanları gördükten, başkasının acı duyuşunu ta etimde ve sinirimde hissettikten sonra... eski inançlarımdaki hata ve eksikliği anlamama imkan yoktu.” Besides, Türkkan described protecting Turkey from the wars as a necessity of nationalism, since many dreadful destructive weapons like atom bomb that could cause annihilation of Turkish nation have been invented. Türkkan, *İleri Türkçülük*, pp. 81-83.

³⁹⁵ Türkkan, *İleri Türkçülük*, p. 95.

³⁹⁶ In the period between 1947 and 1974, Türkkan visited Turkey, for the first time, in 1972 after a 25-year-interval.

³⁹⁷ Since he was subjected to torture when he was in prison, Türkkan was injured seriously in his eye.

1950s and 1960s.³⁹⁸ In 1974, he returned to Turkey and a year later, in 1975, he published his memoirs in which he allotted a considerable place to the case of racism-Turanism under the name of *Tabutluktan Gurbete* (From the cell to foreign land). In his book, Türkkan, although he stated that he still believed that the races had distinctive spiritual and material qualifications, abandoned totally his former racist discourse by declaring “I don’t favor the claim that the Turk race is superior to the other races like waving a flag. I have given up the differentiation of superiority-inferiority.” The change in the ideas of Türkkan is seen in the case of minorities. Türkkan, having emphasized that he completely gave up the idea of discrimination to all minorities in Turkey, explained the reason that caused this change as follows:

If we discriminate racially saying ‘this is Kurd, this is Albanian’, we whip up feelings of separation of these elements which are about to be absorbed in Turkish society, and one day the external enemies of Turks will whip up this feelings much more and attempt to disorder our country. Also, the race discrimination may not stay in the field of reason and law, it bears grudge and causes inhuman injustices when the direction slips to the sensation. In addition, I gave up the idea of discrimination because of an emotional reason: In my imprisonment days, two young men, one of whom was Abkhasian, the other was hybrid of Albanian and Kurdish, behaved so courageously and bravely and they proved how they embraced the ideas of Turkism, even the Turk racism by heart, the feelings of love and embracement arose inside me. Who knows how many citizens that we call “pseudo-Turk” we have like them? How can we accept to exclude them and say that they are not from us?³⁹⁹

³⁹⁸ Türkkan was a Ph.D. student both at the Departments of Law and Psychology of Istanbul University, when he was arrested in May 1944.

³⁹⁹ “Bu Kürt, şu Arnavut diye ayırıcılık yaparsak, Türk toplumu içinde erimeğe yüz tutmuş unsurların ayrılık hislerini kamçılamaş olacağız, bir gün gelecek Türk’ün dış düşmanları bu hisleri daha da kışkırtıp ülkemizi karıştırmaya kalkışacaklar. Hem sonra, ırk ayrımı akıl ve hukuk sahasında kalmayabilir, kin de doğurur ve iş his tarafına kayınca, insanlık dışı haksızlıklara yol açabilir...Bir de hissi sebepten bu uygulama düşüncemi terk ettim: Tutuklama günlerimde, aramızda bulunan biri Abaza, diğeri de Arnavut ve Kürt karışımı olan iki genç, öyle cesur ve mertçe davrandılar, Türkçü hatta Türk ırkçısı fikirlerine ne kadar candan sarıldıklarını öylesine ispat ettiler ki, içimde hem sevgi hem de utanma hissi uyandı. Buna benzer kim bilir ne kadar “gayrı Türk” dediğimiz vatandaşımız vardı. Bunları itmeğe, sen bizden değilsin demeğe gönlümüz nasıl razı olabilirdi?” Türkkan, *Tabutluktan Gurbete*, pp. 403-404.

After returning to Turkey, Türkkan focused on education, futurology and techniques of fast reading rather than the Turkist or Pan-Turkist movement. In this period, in addition to establishing the “Türk 2000 Vakfı” (Turk 2000 Foundation) in 1987, aiming to make futurology research on the Turkic world,⁴⁰⁰ the most interesting claim of Türkkan was that the American Indians racially are from Turanian, that is to say, one of Turkish origin.⁴⁰¹ However, although he was one of the most active Pan-Turkist during the Second World War, in contrast to Nihal Atsız, who, in general, is described as the greatest Turkist of the twentieth century after Ziya Gökalp by Turkist circles,⁴⁰² Türkkan has been almost totally forgotten among the new generations of Turkist movement due to mainly his absence from Turkey between 1947 and 1974.

CHAPTER FIVE

⁴⁰⁰ Nizam Önen, “Reha Oğuz Türkkan” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tabıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), p. 368.

⁴⁰¹ For Türkkan’s claim on the American Indians, see Reha Oğuz Türkkan, *Kızılderililer ve Türkler* (İstanbul: E Yayınları, 1999)

⁴⁰² Cenk Sarçoğlu, “Ülkücü Hareketin Bilinaçlı Olarak Nihal Atsız” *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 100 (Spring 2004), pp. 104-105.

CONCLUSION

This thesis examined the ideas and life of Reha Oğuz Türkkan on the basis of Pan-Turkist movement in the Second World War, which is considered the golden age of Pan-Turkism in Turkey in the Republican era. Pan-Turkism, which can be briefly defined as either a geographical or a political unification of all Turkic peoples from the Balkans to Central Asia under a single state, emerged among the Turkic intellectuals such as İsmail Gasprinsky, Hüseyinzade Ali Turan, Ahmet Ağaoğlu and Yusuf Akçura living in Russia as a means of self-defense against the Russian Empire's Russification and Christianization policies. Among these intellectuals, Yusuf Akçura, was the first who proposed Pan-Turkism as a serious alternative to Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism, which had been adopted by the Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals as the main ideologies that could save the Empire from collapse. Although Akçura's ideas, in general, were evaluated as a "romantic", "strange" and "extreme" vision by the Ottoman-Turkish intelligentsia and their effect remained limited on the ruling elites when *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* was published in 1904, as mentioned above, the Pan-Turkist ideology, in a short time, was adopted by many of the prominent intellectuals and ruling elites of the time as the basic ideology that would create a strong and modern state through the contribution of Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals, in particular Ziya Gökalp who spread Pan-Turkist ideology to the mass of people, the alienation between the Turks and non-Turkish subjects of the Empire and the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan War. However, the enthusiasm for the realization of Pan-Turkist unity among the Pan-Turkists during the First World War, which reached its peak after the Bolshevik Revolution in the late 1917, ended with the Armistice of Mudros, which paved way for the occupation

of the Empire, including capital Istanbul. Within this framework, as a result of real politics, the people who dedicated themselves to the realization of Pan-Turkist unity, in general, supported the Kemalist movement, trying to save the Empire from the occupation instead of striving for Pan-Turkism.

After the National Struggle, which culminated in the founding a new state and a republican regime under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal, the Pan-Turkist ideology faced serious obstacles. First of all, the main priority of the Kemalist regime was to reconstruct the country, infrastructure of which had been ravaged by the many destructive wars, and to create an independent nation-state within the new borders. This meant that Turkic peoples outside the new borders were not on the agenda of the new regime. In addition, due to the amicable relations between the Kemalist regime and the Soviet Union that had started to advance during the National Struggle, the Kemalist regime and Mustafa Kemal himself had totally a negative attitude towards Pan-Turkism, which had the potential to jeopardize the Turk-Soviet relations. In this framework, the leading Pan-Turkists of the Ottoman period such as Akçura, Ağaoğlu and Kohen, joined the ranks of the Kemalist regime by revising their old Pan-Turkist discourses. In addition, since the Kemalist regime took all political activities and organizations, including cultural ones, under its own control during the 1930s, the Pan-Turkists were also deprived of cultural and political organizations like Turkish Hearths, which could have facilitated the dissemination of their own ideology. Under these negative conditions, Pan-Turkism lost considerable momentum during the first decade of the Republican era. In this period, in addition to the Turkic emigrants such as Ahmet Caferoğlu, Mehmet Emin Resulzade and Zeki Velidi Togan, who published some journals and numerous articles, supporting a cultural unity among the all Turkic peoples, as emphasized above, the main figure, trying to keep Pan-Turkist ideology alive was

Nihal Atsız, who published two journals, *Atsız Mecmua* and *Orhun* having clear Pan-Turkist tendencies. In addition, since he established his own Pan-Turkist discourse primarily on the concepts of race and blood, Atsız added new features like racism and xenophobia to Pan-Turkist movement.

Pan-Turkism, starting from the late 1938, began to gain a new impetus, which intensified during the Second World War. In this time, the main figures who tried to revive and disseminate Pan-Turkist ideas were the members of younger generation, who had been educated by the Kemalist regime. Of course, the Second World War, especially the battle between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, was a serious factor that resuscitated Pan-Turkist desires in the country, since it could cause the collapse of the Soviet Union, where millions of Turkic people lived. The Kemalist regime, which had officially rejected Pan-Turkism, paradoxically, played a crucial role in the revival of Pan-Turkism among the young generation. First of all, the pseudo-scientific theories such as the Turkish History Thesis and its complement the Sun-Language Theory, which were used by the Kemalist regime in order to create a new national consciousness and Turkish identity based on secular values and to prove that Anatolia had been a Turkish homeland from the earliest times served Pan-Turkism to a great extent by describing Central Asia as the real motherland of the Turks. Moreover, the textbooks of the time, in particular history and biology textbooks, which exalted the Turks as a superior race together with the racist implications of the regime that crystallized in the works of the leading Kemalist figures like Recep Peker and Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, and some applications of the regime, such as the necessity of being a Turk to be a civil servant and to register in the military schools, contributed to the creation of a youth, that was open to racist ideologies. In other words, the Pan-Turkist and racist tendencies

among the young generation were unintentionally nourished by the Kemalist regime itself.

Reha Oğuz Türkkan, no doubt, was the most active Pan-Turkist of the young generation due to his publication activities between 1938 and 1944. Indeed, the discourse Türkkan used was not a new one. For example, some tenets of his discourse like “the necessity of Pan-Turkist unity for the continuation of existence of Turkey”, “the destructive results of the rule by those who have foreign blood” and “the Turks have had the consciousness of race from the earliest times in history “ had been already expressed by Nihal Atsız in the early years of the thirties. However, since he was the member of a younger generation, educated by the Kemalist regime, he was also affected by the Kemalist leadership. For instance, in contrast to the leading Pan-Turkist figures of the period, such as Nihal Atsız and Zeki Velidi Togan, Türkkan not only supported, but also benefited from the Turkish History Thesis in order to emphasize the glorious history of the Turks. Moreover, his attempt to purge the Turkish language from Arabic and Persian words and his anti-Islamic discourse were in great harmony with the Kemalist reforms. On the other hand, although he persistently denied, Türkkan also was influenced by the authoritarian-totalitarian regimes of the interwar period, like Nazism and, in particular, Fascism, which had also affected the Kemalist regime and intellectuals to some extent. In other words, while Nazism fed his racist tendencies, the effects of Fascism on Türkkan became evident in the political system he proposed for Turkey under the name of “disciplined democracy”, advocating, roughly, “one race” (the Turkish race), “one doctrine” (Pan-Turkism and racism under the name of Turkism), “one party” (Kurultay) and “one leader” (the chief) in the country. However, because he did not have a systematic and coherent ideology, the main factors that determined Türkkan’s current discourse was the political climate in the world and

Turkey. For example, although he had persistently advocated the great Turkish unity of 65 million, which would be realized through the war between 1940 and 1942, after the Soviets' success in the war against Germany, Türkkan by establishing his discourse on the basis of anti-Communism. In addition, he, parallel to the radical changes in favor of liberal-democratic regimes in the world after the Second World War, immediately modified his racist, militarist and fascist discourse by condemning xenophobic nationalism and wars and accepting the necessity of parliamentary system and political parties.

In the last analysis, this thesis asserts that the Kemalist regime played an important role in the ideological formation of Reha Oğuz Türkkan, the principal representative of the Pan-Turkist ideology among the young generation, as well as the new political climate created by the Second World War and the authoritarian-totalitarian regimes that came into existence in Europe in the inter-war period. In other words, although it rejected Pan-Turkism officially, the Kemalist regime, paradoxically, facilitated the resuscitation of the Pan-Turkist ideology, which had a clear racist dimension, during the Second World War in Turkey, in particular among the younger generation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Articles

Ağaoğlu, Samet. *Babamın Arkadaşları* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998)

Ağaoğulları, Mehmet Ali. “The Ultrationalist Right” in *Turkey in Transition: New Perspectives*, ed. Irvin C. Schick and Ertuğrul Ahmet Tonak (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987)

Ahmad, Feroz. “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Sonu” in *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Sonu ve Büyük Güçler*, ed. Marian Kent, trans. Ahmet Fethi (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999)

Ahmad, Feroz. *The Young Turks: the Committee of Union and Progress in Turkish Politics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)

Akçura, Yusuf. *Türkçülüğün Tarihi* (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 1998)

Akçura, Yusuf. *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1998)

Akşin, Sina. *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1998)

Aktar, Ayhan. *Varlık Vergisi ve Türkleştirme Politikaları* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001)

Alemdaroğlu, Ayça. “Öjeni Düşüncesi” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002)

Alman Dış İşleri Dairesi Belgeleri, Türkiye’deki Alman Politikaları (1941-1943), trans. Levent Konyar (İstanbul: Havass, 1977)

Alpkaya, Faruk. “Rıza Nur” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002)

Altun, Fahrettin. “M. Şemseddin Günaltay” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 6, *İslamcılık*, ed. Yasin Aktay (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004)

Arai, Masami. *Jön Türk Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliği*, trans. Tansel Demirel (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2000)

Arslan, Emre. “Türkiye’de Irkçılık” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002)

Atatürk, Mustafa Kemal. *Nutuk* (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1991)

Atatürk’ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, IV (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1991)

Atsız, Nihal. “Türkler Hangi Irktandır” *Atsız Mecmua*, no. 1 (15 May 1931)

Atsız, Nihal. “Milli Mefkure” *Atsız Mecmua*, no. 14 (15 June 1932)

Atsız, Nihal. “Kurtulmamış Türkeli” *Atsız Mecmua*, no. 17 (September 1932)

Atsız, Nihal. “Çokayoğlu Mustafa Beye Son Cevap” *Atsız Mecmua*, no. 17 (September 1932)

Atsız, Nihal. “Darlfününün Kara, Daha Doğru Bir Tabirle, Yüz Kızartacak Listesi” *Atsız Mecmua*, no. 17 (September 1932)

Atsız, Nihal. “Şarki Türkistan” *Orhun*, no. 4 (20 February 1934)

Atsız, Nihal. “Komünist, Yahudi ve Dalkavuk” *Orhun*, no. 5 (21 March 1934)

Atsız, Nihal. “Yirminci Asırda Türk Meselesi II Türk Irkı=Türk Milleti” *Orhun*, no. 9 (16 July 1934)

Atsız, Nihal. “İki Yıl Dönümü” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 9 (December 1940)

Atsız, Nihal. “Türkçülükte Ahlak” *Bozkurt* 2, no. 5 (11 June 1942)

Atsız, Nihal. “Başvekil Saraçoğlu Şükrü’ye Açık Mektup” *Orhun*, no. 15 (1 March 1944)

Atsız, Nihal. “Başbakan Saraçoğlu Şükrü’ye İkinci Açık Mektup” *Orhun*, no. 16 (April 1944)

Atsız, Nihal. *Türk Tarihi Üzerinde Toplamalar* (İstanbul: Arkadaş Basımevi, 1935)

Atsız, Nihal. *Komunist Don Kişotu Proleter Burjuva Nazım Hikmetof Yoldaşa* (İstanbul: Arkadaş Basımevi, 1935)

Atsız, Nihal. *İçimizdeki Şeytanlar* (İstanbul: Arkadaş Basımevi, 1940)

Atsız, Nihal. *Dalkavuklar Gecesi* (İstanbul: Arkadaş Matbaası, 1941)

Atsız, Nihal. *En Sinsi Tehlike* (İstanbul: Aylı Kurt Yayınları, 1943)

Atsız, Nihal. Hamza Sadi Özbek, *Hesap Böyle Verilir* (İstanbul: Aylı Kurt Yayınları, 1943)

Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya. *Suyu Arayan Adam* (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2004)

Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya. *Makedonya’dan Orta Asya’ya Enver Paşa*, vol. 3 (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1998)

Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya. *İkinci Adam (1884-1938)*, vol. 1 (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2000)

Aydın, Suavi, “Cumhuriyet’in İdeolojik Şekillenmesinde Antropolijinin Rolü: Irkçı Paradigmanın Yükselişi ve Düşüşü” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 2, *Kemalizm*, ed. Ahmet İnsel (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001)

Barutçu, Faik Ahmet. *Siyasi Hatıralar*, vol. 1, *Milli Mücadeleden Demokrasiye* (Ankara: 21. Yüzyıl Yayınları, 2001)

Başar, Ahmet Hamdi. *Atatürk'le Üç Ay ve 1930'dan Sonra Türkiye* (İstanbul: Tan Matbaası, 1945)

Baykara, Tuncer. *Zeki Velidi Togan* (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1989)

Berkes, Niyazi. *Unutulan Yıllar* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1997)

Beyatlı, Yahya Kemal. *Siyasi ve Edebi Portreler* (İstanbul: Fetih Cemiyeti Yayınları, 1986)

Bezanis, Lowell. "Soviet Muslim émigrés in the Republic of Turkey", in *Central Asian Survey* 13, no. 1, 1994.

Bilsel, Cemil. *Lozan*, vol. 1 (İstanbul: Sosyal Yayınları, 1998)

Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi, Konferanslar, Münakaşalar (Ankara: T.C. Maarif Vekaleti, 1932)

"Birkaç Söz", *Türk Amacı*, no. 1 (July 1942)

Bora, Tanıl. "Cumhuriyetin İlk Dönemlerinde Milli Kimlik" in *Cumhuriyet, Demokrasi ve Kimlik*, ed. Nuri Bilgin (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 1997)

Boratav, Korkut. "Kemalist Economic Policies and Etatism" in *Atatürk, Founder of a Modern State*, ed. Aykut Kazancıgil and Ergun Özbudun (London: C. Hurst, 1981)

Bozkurt, Mahmut Esat. *Atatürk İhtilali* (İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi, 1967)

Bozkurt, Mahmut Esat. "Milliyetçilerin Cevabı!" *Gök-Börü* 1, no. 4 (1 January 1943)

Léon Cahun, *Gök Bayrak*, trans. Galip Bahtiyar (İstanbul: Hilmi Kitaphanesi, 1933)

CHF Nizamnamesi ve Programı (1931) (Ankara: TBMM Matbaası, 1931)

Copeaux, Etienne. *Tarih Ders Kitaplarında (1931-1993) Türk Tarih Tezinden Türk-İslam Sentezine*, trans. Ali Berktaş (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000)

Danişmend, İsmail Hami. *Türklük Meseleleri* (İstanbul: İstanbul Kitapçılık, 1966)

Darendelioğlu, İlhan. *Türkiye'de Milliyetçilik Hareketleri* (İstanbul: Toker Yayınları, 1968)

Deliorman, Altan. *Tanıdığım Atsız* (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 1978)

Demirkan, Tarık. *Macar Turancıları* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000)

Deringil, Selim. *Turkish Foreign Policy During the Second World War: An Active Neutrality* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

Derviş, Suat, Erkman, Faris. *Kırklı Yıllar-1 En Büyük Tehlike, Niçin Sovyet Birliğinin Dostuyum* (İstanbul: Türkiye Sosyal Tarih Arştırma Vakfı, 2002)

Erden, Ali Fuat. *İsmet İnönü* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınları, 1994)

Erer, Tekin. *Basında Kavgalar* (İstanbul, Yeni Matbaa, 1965)

“Ergenekondan Çıkan Bozkurt” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 3, (May 1939)

Ergenekon Köylüsü, “En Büyük Dava: Türk Köylüsü” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 2 (June 1939)

Erkman, Faris. *En Büyük Tehlike* (İstanbul: Ak-Ün Matbaası, 1943)

Ersanlı, Büşra. *İktidar ve Tarih Türkiye’de “Resmi Tarih Tezi”nin Oluşumu (1929-1937)* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003)

Ertekin, Orhangazi. “Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkçülüğün Çatallanan Yolları” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002)

Ertekin, Orhangazi. “A Turning Point of Turkist Movement: 1944 Trials” (Master’s thesis, Ortadoğu Teknik University, 1999)

Ertürk, Hocaoglu Selahattin. “İrkçi-Turancı Atatürk’ *Orkun*, no. 41 (13 July 1951)

Fer, Cihat Savaş. “Hesap Veriyoruz” *Gökbörü* 1, no. 1 (5 November 1942)

Georgeon, François. *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935)*, trans. Alev Er (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999)

Glasneck, Johannes. *Türkiye’de Faşist Alman Propagandası*, trans. Arif Gelen (Ankara: Onur Yayınları, n.d.)

Goloğlu, Mahmut. *Milli Şef Dönemi, 1939-1945* (Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi, 1974)

“Gök-Börü Tabiri ve Anlamları” *Gök-Börü* 1, no. 1 (5 November 1942)

Gökalp, Ziya. *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1996)

Gökay, Bülent. *Bolşevizm ile Emperyalizm Arasında Türkiye (1918-1923)* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1997)

Gökay, Fahrettin Kerim. *İrk Hıfzısıhhasında İrsiyetin Rolü ve Nesli Tereddiden Koruma Çareleri* (Ankara: CHP Konferanslar Serisi, Kitap 12, 1940)

Gulis, Berthe Geoges. *La nouvelle Turquie*, 1924

Gümüőoğlu, Firdevs. “Türk Yurdu” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002)

Günaltay, Şemseddin.Hasan Reşit Tankut, *Dil ve Tarih Tezlerimiz Üzerine Gerekli Bazı İzahlar* (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1938)

Günaltay, Şemseddin. *Maziden Atıye* (İstanbul: Marifet Yayınları, 1998)

Güvenir, Murat. *Siyasal İktidarın Basını Denetlemesi ve Yönlendirmesi: 2. Dünya Savaşında Türk Basını* (İstanbul: Türkiye Gazeticiler Cemiyeti Yayınları, 1991)

Hanioglu, Şükrü. “Türkçülük” in *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 5 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1985)

Heyd, Uriel. *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism, The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp* (London: Luzac & Company Ltd and The Harvill Press Ltd, 1950)

Hobsbawm, Eric. *Age of Extremes: the short twentieth century, 1914-1991* (London: Abacus, 1995)

Hostler, Charles. *Turkism and the Soviets: the Turks of the World and Their Political Objectives* (London: G.Allen & Unwin; New York: F. A. Praeger, 1957.)

Hostler, Charles. "Trends in Pan-Turanism" in *Middle Eastern Affairs* 3, no. 1 (January 1952)

İrkçılık-Turancılık (Ankara: Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1944)

İrkçılık ve Turancılık Tahrikatı Yapanlar Hakkında Hükümetin Tebliği” *Ayın Tarihi* (May 1944)

İğdemir, Uluğ. *Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında Türk Tarih Kurumu* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1973)

İnan, Afet. *Medeni Bilgiler ve M. Kemal Atatürk’ün El Yazıları* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1969)

İnan, Afet. *Türkiye Halkının Antropolojik Karakterleri ve Türkiye Tarihi: Türk Irkının Vatanı Anadolu (64.000 kişi üzerinde anket)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1947)

Karabekir, Kazım. *Birinci Cihan Harbine Nasıl Girdik*, vol. 2, (İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 1994)

Karaosmanoğlu, Yakup Kadri. *Politikada 45 Yıl* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002)

Karaömerlioğlu, Asım. “Tek Parti Döneminde Halk Evleri ve Halkçılık” in *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 88 (Spring 2001)

Karaömerlioğlu, Asım. “The Village Institutes Experience in Turkey”, in *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 25, no. 1 (May 1998)

Karpat, Kemal H. *Ottoman Population (1830-1914): Demographic and Social Characteristics* (Madison, Wis.: University of Madison Press, 1985)

Karpat, Kemal H. “Tarihsel Süreklilik, Kimlik Değişimi ya da Yenilikçi, Müslüman, Osmanlı ve Türk Olmak” in *Osmanlı Geçmişi ve Bugünün Türkiye’si*, ed. Kemal H. Karpat (İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004)

Karpat, Kemal H. *Turkey’s Politics: The Transition to a Multi-Party System* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1959)

Kevles, Daniel J. *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Hereditary* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1985)

Keyder, Çağlar. *State and Class in Turkey: A Study in Capitalist Development Study* (London; New York: Verso, 1987)

Keyder, Çağlar. “The Political Economy of Turkish Democracy” in *Turkey Transition: New Perspectives*, ed. Irvin C. Schick and Ertuğrul Ahmet Tonak (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987)

Kırimer, Cafer Seydahmet. *Gaspıralı İsmail Bey: Dilde, Fikirde, İşte Birlik* (İstanbul: Matabacılık ve Neşriyat Anonim Şirketi, 1934)

Kırımlı, Hakan. *Kırım Tatarlarında Milli Kimlik ve Milli Hareketler (1905-1916)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1996)

“Kitapsevenler Kurumu” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 4 (May-June 1940)

Koçak, Cemil. *Türkiye’de Milli Şef Dönemi (1938-1945)*, vol.1 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996)

Koçak, Cemil. *Türkiye’de Milli Şef Dönemi (1938-1945)*, vol. 2, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996)

Koloğlu, Orhan. *Bir Zamanlar Bab-ı Ali* (İstanbul: Türkiye Gazeteciler Cemiyeti Yayınları, 1998)

Koroğlu, Erol. *Türk Edebiyatı ve Birinci Dünya Savaşı (1914-1918): Propagandadan Milli Kimlik İnşasına* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004)

Köymen, Nusret. “Köycülük Ülküsü Türkçülük Ülküsüdür” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 3 (May 1940)

Kurtuluş, Reha. “Hala Akıllanmamış” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 11 (July 1941)

Kurtuluş, Reha. “Türkler ve Panturanizm” *Ergenekon*, no. 3 (January 1939)

Kushner, David. *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu (1876-1908)*, trans. Şevket Serdar Türet, Rekin Ertem, Fahri Erdem. (İstanbul: Kervan Yayınları, 1979)

Kut, Halil. *İttihat ve Terkki'den Cumhuriyet'e Bitmeyen Savaş*, ed. Taylan Sorgun (İstanbul: Kamer Yayınları, 1997)

Landau, Jacob M. *Pan-Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation* (London: C. Hurst & Company, 1995)

Landau, Jacob M. *Tekinalp Bir Türk Yurtseveri (1883-1961)* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996)

Landau, Jacob M. *The Politics of Pan-Islam: Ideology and Organization* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1990)

Lenczowski, George. *The Middle East in the World Affairs* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1952)

Lewis, Bernard. "History-writing and National Revival in Turkey" in *Middle Eastern Affairs* 4 (June-July 1953)

Maksudyan, Nazan. *Türklüğü Ölçmek Bilimkurgusal Antropoloji ve Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Irkçı Çehresi 1925-1939* (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2005)

Menteşe, Halil. *Osmanlı Mebusan Meclisi Reisi Halil Mentese'nin Anıları* (İstanbul: Hürriyet Vakfı Yayınları, 1986)

Meram, Ali Kemal. *Türkçülük ve Türkçülük Mücadeleleri Tarihi* (İstanbul: Kültür Kitabevi, 1969)

Milli Şef İnönü'nün 19 Mayıs Gençlik Bayramı Münasebetiyle Gençliğe Hitaben Söylediği Nutuk" *Ayın Tarihi* (May 1944)

Müftüoğlu, Mustafa. *Çankaya'da Kabus: 3 Mayıs 1944* (İstanbul: Yağmur Yayınevi, 1974)

Nur, Rıza. "Türk Nasyonalizmi" *Tanrıdağ*, no. 1 (8 May 1942)

Okutan, M. Çağatay. *Bozkurt'tan Kur'an'a Milli Türk Talebe Birliği (1916-1980)* (İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004)

Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası Kurtuluş Savaşından Bugüne Olgular, Belgeler, Yorumlar, ed. Baskın Oran (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001)

Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1995), ed. Mehmet Gönübol (Ankara: 1995, Siyasal Kitabevi)

Oran, Baskın. *Atatürk Milliyetçiliği Resmi İdeoloji Dışı Bir İnceleme* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1999)

Oran, Baskın. “İç ve Dış Politika İlişkisi Açısından İkinci Dünya Savaşı’nda Türkiye’de Siyasal Hayat ve Sağ-Sol Akımlar” *A.Ü.S.B.F. Dergisi*, 24 (1969)

“Orhun” *Orhun*, no. 1 (5 November 1933)

Orkun, Hüseyin Namık. *Türkçülüğün Tarihi* (Ankara: Kömen Yayınları, 1977)

OrtaMektep İçin Tarih I, (Ankara: Marif Vekaleti, 1936)

Ortaç, Yusuf Ziya. “Biz Türküz! Türkçüyüz!” *Çınaraltı*, no. 46 (8 August 1942)

Ortaylı, İlber. *Ottoman Studies* (İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004)

Owen, Roger & Pamuk, Şevket. *A History of Middle East Economies in the Twentieth Century*, (London: I.B. Tauris, 1998)

Ölçer, Cüneyt. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Kağıt Paraları: 1923-1983* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1983)

Ömer Seyfettin. “Büyük Türklüğü Parçalayan Kimlerdir?” *Kırım Mecmuası*, no. 1 (30 April 1918) in *Türklük Üzerine Yazılar* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1993)

Ömer Seyfettin. “Yarınki Turan Devleti” in *Türklük Üzerine Yazılar* (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1993)

Önen, Nizam. *İki Turan Macaristan ve Türkiye’de Turancılık* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2005)

Önen, Nizam. “Reha Oğuz Türkkan” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tabıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002)

Önen, Nizam. “Turan’a İki Farklı Yol: Macar ve Türk Turancıları” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002)

Öner, Sakin. *Nihal Atsız* (İstanbul: Toker Yayınları, 1977)

Özbek, Nadir. “Zeki Velidi Togan ve Türk Tarih Tezi” *Toplumsal Tarih* 8, no. 45 (September 1997)

Özbudun, Ergun. “Milli Mücadele ve Cumhuriyetin Resmi Belgelerinde Yurttaşlık Sorunu” in *Cumhuriyet, Demokrasi ve Kimlik*, ed. Nuri Bilgin (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, 1997)

Özdoğan, Günay Göksu. “II. Dünya Savaşı Yıllarındaki Türk-Alman İlişkilerinde İç ve Dış Politika Aracı Olarak Pan-Türkizm” in *Türk Dış Politikasının Analizi*, ed. Faruk Sönmezoglu (İstanbul: Der Yayınları, 2001)

Özdoğan, Günay Göksu. “Dünyada ve Türkiye’de Turancılık” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasal Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001)

Özdoğan, Günay Göksu. “Turan”dan “Bozkurt”a Tek Parti Döneminde Türkçülük (1931-1946) (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001)

Özdoğan, Günay Göksu. “Türk Ulusçuluğunda İrkçı Temalar: 1930 ve 1940’ların Türkçü Akımı” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 29 (May 1996)

Parla, Taha. *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp* (1876-1924) (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985)

Parla, Taha. *Türkiye’de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları*, vol. 3, *Kemalist Tek-Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP’nin Altı Ok’u* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1995)

Peker, Recep. *İnkılap Dersleri* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1984)

Poulton, Hugh. *Top Hat, Grey Wolf and the Crescent: Turkish Nationalism and the Turkish Republic* (New York, New York University Press, 1997)

“Prof. Şevket Aziz Kansu’dan Bir Rica” *Ergenekon*, no. 2 (December 1938)

Sarçoğlu, Cenk. “Ülkücü Hareketin Bilinaçlı Olarak Nihal Atsız” *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 100 (Spring 2004)

Sarınay, Yusuf. *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Tarihi Gelişimi ve Türk Ocakları, 1923-1931* (İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 1994)

Sertkaya, Osman Fikri. *Hüseyin Nihal Atsız* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1987)

Sertkaya, Osman F. “Hüseyin Nihal Atsız” in *Atsız Armağanı*, ed. Erol Güngör, M. N. Hacıeminoğlu, Osman F. Sertkaya, Mustafa Kafalı (İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 1976)

Sertel, Sabiha. *Roman Gibi* (İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1987)

Sevenlerinin Kalemile Rıza Nur, ed. Ziya Yücel İlhan (İstanbul: B. Kervan Matbaası, 1970)

Shorter, Frederic C. “The Population of Turkey After the War of Independence” *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 17 (1985)

Somel, Selçuk Akşin. “Osmanlı Reform Çağında Osmanlılık Düşüncesi (1839-1913)” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 1, *Cumhuriyet’e Devreden Düşünce Mirası, Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet’in Birikimi*, ed. Mehmet Ö. Alkan (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001)

“Son Tahkikat Kararı” *Ayın Tarihi* (September 1944)

“Son Vaziyet Kaşısında Türkçüler” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 7 (October 1940)

Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi, vol. 6 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1988)

Soysal, Ayşe Gün. “Rusya Kökenli Aydınların Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliği’nin İnşasına Katkısı” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002)

Soysal, Ayşe Gün “Zeki Velidi Togan” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002)

Tachau, Frank. “The Search for National Identity among the Turks” *Die Welt des Islams*, vol. 8, no. 3 (1963)

Tansel, Fevziye Abdullah. *Mehmet Emin Yurdakul’un Eserleri-1. Şiirler* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1969)

Tansel, Fevziye Abdullah. *Ziya Gökalp Külliyyatı-1, Şiirler ve Halk Masalları* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1952)

Tanyu, Hikmet. *Atatürk ve Türk Milliyetçiliği* (Ankara: Orkun Yayınları, 1961)

Tekeli, İlhan; İlkin, Selim. *Bir Cumhuriyet Öyküsü: Kadrocuları ve Kadroyu Anlamak* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2003)

Tekin, Alp. *Kemalizm* (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Gazete ve Matbaası, 1936)

Tezel, Yahya S. *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000)

Timur, Taner. “Batı ideolojisi, Irkçılık ve Ulusal Kimlik Sorunumuz” in *Osmanlı Kimliği* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1998)

Togan, Zeki Velidi. *Hatıralar, Türkistan ve Diğer Müslüman Doğu Türklerinin Milli Varlık ve Kültür Mücadeleleri* (İstanbul: Hikmet Gazetecilik Ltd. Sti., 1969)

Togan, Zeki Velidi. *On Yedi Kumaltı Şehri ve Sadri Maksudi Bey* (İstanbul: Bürhaneddin Matbaası)

Togan, Zeki Velidi. “Türklerde ‘Uruk’ (İrk) Bilgisi” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 5 (August 1940)

Toker, Metin. *Tek Partiden Çok Partiye* (İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1970)

Toprak, Zafer. “II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde Paramiliter Gençlik Örgütleri” in *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2. (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1985)

Toprak, Zafer “Cihan Harbi’nin Provası Balkan Harbi” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 104 (August 2002)

Toprak, Zafer “Türk Bilgi Derneği (1914) ve Bilgi Mecmuası” in *Osmanlı İlmî ve Meslekî Cemiyetleri: Birinci Milli Türk Bilim Tarihi Sempozyumu*, ed. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1987)

Toprak, Zafer. *Türkiye’de Milli İktisat (1908-1918)* (Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 1982)

Tunaya, Tarık Zafer. *Türkiye’de Siyasal Partiler*, vol. 1, *İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi, 1908-1918* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998)

Tunaya, Tarık Zafer. *Türkiye’de Siyasal Partiler*, vol. 3, *İttihat ve Terakki, Bir Çağın, Bir Kuşağın, Bir Partinin Tarihi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998)

Tunçay, Mete. Haldun Özen. “1933 Darülfünun Tasfiyesi veya Bir Tek-Parti Politikacısının Önlenemez Yükselişi ve Düşüşü” *Tarih ve Toplum* 2, no. 10 (October 1984)

Tunçay, Mete. *Türkiye’de Tek-Parti Yönetimi’nin Kurulması (1923-1931)* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999)

Türk Tarihinin Anahatları: Medhal Kısmı (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1931)

“Türk Tarihinde Dil Davası” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 1 (May 1939)

“Türkçülerin Şimdiki Baş Vazifesi: 5. Kola Dikkat” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 4 (May-July 1940)

Türkeş, Alparslan. *1944 Milliyetçilik Olayı* (İstanbul: Arkın Kitabevi, 1938)

Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. “Ülkü ve Hayat (Türk Gençliğine)” *Filiz*, no. 1 (January 1938)

Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. “Ruh mu Bilgi mi?” *Filiz*, no. 4 (April 1938)

Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. “Faşizm Tehlikelidir” *Ergenekon*, no. 2 (December 1938)

Türkkan Reha Oğuz. “Kandaşlarım” *Ergenekon*, no. 2 (December 1938)

Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. “Atatürk’ü Niçin En Büyük Dahi Tanırız” *Ergenekon*, no. 2 (December 1938)

Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. “Atatürk ve Panturanizm” *Ergenekon*, no. 4 (February 1939)

Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. “Faşizm Tehlikelidir Yazısı Etrafında” *Ergenekon*, no. 3 (January 1939)

Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. “Hız” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 1 (May 1939)

Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. “Gürcülerin Irkı Hakkında II” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 6 (September 1940)

Türkkan, Reha Oğuz, “Gürcülerin Irkı Hakkında” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 5 (August 1940)

- Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. *Irka Dair Münakaşalar* (İstanbul: Bozkurtçu Yayını, 1943)
- Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. *Solcular ve Kızilllar* (İstanbul: Bozkurtçu Yayını, 1943)
- Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. *Kızıl Faaliyet* (İstanbul: Bozkurtçu Yayını, 1943)
- Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. *Kuyruk Acısı* (İstanbul: Stad Matbaası, 1943)
- Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. *İleri Türkçülük ve Partiler* (İstanbul: Sinan Matbaası, 1946)
- Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. *Tabutluktan Gurbete*, (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 1975)
- Türkkan, Reha Oğuz. *Kızılderililer ve Türkler* (İstanbul: E Yayınları, 1999)
- “Türklük Haberleri” *Türk Yurdu*, no. 1 (1 September 1942)
- “Türklük Bekliyor” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 11 (July 1941)
- Türköne, Mümtaz’er. *Siyasi İdeoloji Olarak İslamcılığın Doğuşu* (Ankara: Lotus Yayınları, 2003)
- Uzman, Mazhar Osman. *Öjenik* (Ankara: CHP Konferanslar Serisi, Kitap: 2, 1939)
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya. *Türkiye’de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları, 1998)
- Ünal, Tahsin. *Türklüğün Sembolü Bozkurt* (Konya: Milli Ülkü Yayınları, 1976)
- Ünder, Hasan. “Türkiye’de Sosyal Darwinizm Düşüncesi” in *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasal Düşünce*, vol. 4, *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002)
- Ünver, Cennet “Images and Perceptions of Fascism among the Mainstream Kemalist Elite, 1931-1934” (Master’s thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2001)
- Üstel, Fusun. *İmparatorluktan Ulus-Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği: Türk Ocakları (1912-1931)* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1997)
- “Üzerindeki Şüpheyi Dağıtmak İçin Beşinci Koldan Bahsedenler!” *Bozkurt* 1, no. 7 (October 1940)
- Yerasimos, Stefanos. *Türk- Sovyet İlişkileri: Ekim Devriminden Milli Mücadeleye* (İstanbul: Gözlem Yayınları, 1979)
- Yetkin, Çetin. *Türkiye’de Tek Parti Yönetimi 1930-1945* (İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi, 1983)
- Yıldız, Ahmet. “Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyebilene” *Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin Etno-Seküler Sınırları (1919-1938)* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004)

Weisband, Edward *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1943-1945* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1973)

Yücel, Hasan Ali. “Ülkü ve Hayat” *Ulus*, 5 March 1938

Zenkovsky, Serge A. *Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960)

Zürcher, Erik Jan. *Turkey: A Modern History* (London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 1993)

