ISLAMIST AND TURKIST CONCEPTUALIZATION OF NATION IN THE LATE
OTTOMAN PERIOD: A COMPARISON OF MEHMET AKİF ERSOY AND ZİYA
GÖKALP

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
ANKARA YILDIRIM BEYAZIT UNIVERSITY

BY

KEMAL UFUK

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

JUNE 2019

Approval of the Institute of Social Sciences:

_____

Doç. Dr. Seyfullah YILDIRIM
Manager of Institute

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Birol AKGÜN
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Bayram SİNKAYA
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Serdar PALABIYIK (TOBB ETU, PSIR)_____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Bayram SİNKAYA (AYBU, IR)   _____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Güliz DİNÇ (AYBU, PSPA)   _____

I hereby declare that all information in this thesis has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work; otherwise I accept all legal responsibility.

Name, Last name   : Kemal UFUK

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

ISLAMIST AND TURKIST CONCEPTUALIZATION OF NATION
IN THE LATE OTTOMAN PERIOD:
A COMPARISON OF MEHMET AKİF ERSOY AND ZİYA GÖKALP

UFUK, Kemal

M.A., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Bayram SİNKAYA

June 2019, 217 pages

This thesis analyzes the Islamist and Turkist conceptualization of nation during the Second Constitutional Era through the written works of Mehmet Akif Ersoy and Ziya Gökalp. In this sense, the articles, poems, letters, and books written by these two late Ottoman intellectuals as well as their recorded speeches reviewed chronologically in order to analyze the changes of their conceptualizations of nation. The understandings of nation of the selected intellectuals were compared through three constitutive elements gathered from various definitions of nation as the political community, the sovereignty, and the common values. The main argument of this thesis is both Akif's and Gökalp's understandings of nation had changed in time in parallel to the existing sociopolitical conditions of Turkey. Eventually, it can be said that both Akif and Gökalp had conceptualized nation through a sovereign entity based on certain common values.

Keywords: Nation, Islamism, Turkism, Mehmet Akif Ersoy, Ziya Gökalp.

ÖZ

GEÇ OSMANLI DÖNEMİNDE İSLAMCILARIN VE TÜRKÇÜLERİN MİLLET KAVRAMSALLAŞTIRMALARI:
MEHMET AKİF ERSOY VE ZİYA GÖKALP ÜZERİNE BİR KARŞILAŞTIRMA

UFUK, Kemal

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Ü. Bayram SİNKAYA

Haziran 2019, 217 sayfa

İşbu tez, İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi'nde İslamcıların ve Türkçülerin millet kavramsallaştırmalarını Mehmet Akif Ersoy ve Ziya Gökalp'in yazılı eserleri üzerinden analiz etmektedir. Bu kapsamda, zikredilen iki geç dönem Osmanlı aydınının makaleleri, şiirleri, kitapları, aynı zamanda kayıt altına alınmış söylevleri millet kavramsallaştırmalarındaki değişiklikleri açıklayabilmek için kronolojik olarak incelenmiştir. Mezkûr aydınların millet kavramından anladıkları siyasi topluluk, egemenlik ve ortak değerler olmak üzere çeşitli millet tanımlarından elde edilen üç temel unsur üzerinden karşılaştırılmıştır. Tezin esas iddiası, Akif ve Gökalp'in millet kavramlarının Türkiye'nin sosyopolitik şartlarındaki değişikliklere paralel olarak değişimlere uğradığıdır. Nihayetinde, hem Akif'in hem de Gökalp'in milleti belirli ortak değerler üzerinden egemen bir varlık olarak kavramsallaştırdıkları görülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Millet, İslamcılık, Türkçülük, Mehmet Akif Ersoy, Ziya Gökalp.

This work is dedicated to Mustafa Kemal Sağlam.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AUTHOR'S NOTE

Apart from the essential quest on seeking answers for the main research question and the sub-questions, the thesis intended to introduce both Akif and Gökalp to the audience in almost all the possible aspects as well as the general political and intellectual characteristics of the Second Constitutional Era in detail, that is to say, the chapters alone could be taken as independent works on their respective categories.

In his presumably the most famous book, *Ahlâk-ı Alâî* (High Morals), Kınalızâde Ali Efendi adviced two principles to lecturers and preachers: Not to bore the audience in detail and avoid self-humiliation through arrogance.[*] In the light of this precious advice, I have taken into consideration and also appreciated two humble principles in this work: Avoided bothering the audience and tried to mention any information retrieved about any particular issue related to the framework of the thesis. In order to accommodate myself between these two approaches, I have vastly benefited from the footnotes.

"Traduttore traditore", briefly means "translator is traitor" in Italian, and precisely and historically used to insult the translators according to my Aunt Zühre's husband (Abdurrahman İslam, formerly known as Giuseppe Seminara), who is coming from Italian descent, Sicily in particular. Although this idiom in Italian parlance was particularly used to insult the translators traditionally; contrary to this tradition, it was also used as a reference point to discharge, or in some cases aqcuit the translators 'by' translators. With this clarification, I assert the sole responsibility to bear the possible consequences that all the translations from Turkish to English in this work which were cited from the original works are mine, unless it was stated in the footnotes. In order to provide a cross-check, I also gave references to the original texts. The texts which were originally written in the Ottoman alphabet were transliterated and also simplified with the Latin alphabet by me.

---

[*] Kınalızâde Ali Efendi, *Ahlâk-ı Alâî*, Hüseyin Algül (Ed.), Tercüman 1001 Temel Eser, No. 30, Kervan Kitapçılık, pp. 246-251, and also Kınalızâde Ali Efendi, *Devlet ve Aile Ahlâkı*, Ahmet Kahraman (Ed.), Tercüman 1001 Temel Eser, No. 69, Kervan Kitapçılık, pp. 76-77.

INTRODUCTION

By taking a brief look at various theses, one can simply witness that it is about to or has already become a tradition to begin the introduction chapter with a 'striking' sentence or a quote to influence the audience. However, this thesis will not represent this 'tradition'. Instead, it will be plainly and simply suggested that this thesis problematizes Mehmet Akif Ersoy and Ziya Gökalp had changed their conceptualizations of nation in parallel to the sociopolitical changes in Turkey in the late Ottoman times. In order to find a 'remedy' to this problem, the Islamist and Turkist understandings of nation with the help of these two late Ottoman intellectuals, as one of the most famous figures in their particular intellectual trends during the Second Constitutional Era (1908-1918), were analyzed through their accounts and studies.

The main research question of this thesis is "Did Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp change their conceptualizations of nation during the Second Constitutional Era?". Although the main question seems simple at first glance, the question brought several other questions with it, equivalently crucial and essential, which can be labelled 'the sub-questions'; these are: "If their understandings of nation had changed in time, which situations had an impact on these changes?", "How many times did they change?", "Did their understandings change completely each time or can some residues of earlier versions be tracked?", "Did their conceptualizations meet at some similar points or draw completely apart?", "Did their conceptualizations of nation influence their fellow followers of the particular intellectual movement they represented?", "What was the impact of Turkist and Islamist conceptualizations of nation in the late Ottoman politics?", and finally "Can their nation understandings be evaluated with the constitutive elements of the contemporary definitions of nation?".

With the help of these questions, it can be said that the thesis has two hypotheses and both were substantially originated from a comparison of Akif and Gökalp. First, the thesis

presents a chronological comparison of Akif's and Gökalp's conceptualizations of nation. With this comparison, it is expected to reveal and review the changes in their both understandings and also conceptualizations of nation. Second, a conceptual comparison of Akif and Gökalp will be presented. The main agenda of this second comparison is comparing Akif's and Gökalp's understandings and conceptualizations of nation through the contemporary meaning of nation. Through these two comparisons, by introducing Akif's and Gökalp's understandings of nation extensively, the thesis aims to find answers to the mentioned research questions completely.

1. Rationale of the Thesis

In the beginning, it was clear that the research would be about Mehmet Akif. This clarity arose from a passage about Akif in one of İsmail Kara's books, *Din ile Modernleşme Arasında Çağdaş Türk Düşüncesinin Meseleleri* (The Problems of Contemporary Turkish Thoughts between the Religion and Modernization). In this book, Kara argued that although Akif was considered an important figure in Turkish intellectual life as a representative of the Islamist modernization trend, the literature did not have any monography written for Akif in details. Kara claimed that Akif's thoughts were taken as templates instead of their 'genuine' meanings underlying beneath them by the contemporary scholars, and the Turkish intellectual history in general was mostly reviewed by these scholars in a very 'delicate' way in order to avoid a possible censorship. His example on this issue was, even the famous Turkish sociologist Hilmi Ziya Ülken did not reserve a place for Akif in his famous book titled *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (Contemporary Intellectual History in Turkey) in none of its editions which was first published in 1966.[1] At this point, although the ultimate agenda of the thesis was and is not writing a monography on Akif which would be out of its league, the decided action was to review Mehmet Akif's works, understand what he offered, and contribute to literature about Akif. Additionally, while reading Akif's life through the pen of his close friend Mithat Cemal, an unexpected claim appeared. He claimed that during Sultan Abdul Hamid II's reign, Mehmet Akif had once praised Abdullah Cevdet's poems; additionally, Akif had also once acclaimed that there was noone in the Empire that was able to understand

---

[1] İsmail Kara, *Din ile Modernleşme Arasında Çağdaş Türk Düşüncesinin* Meseleleri, 6th Edition, Dergâh, İstanbul, 2018, p. 193-194.

philosophy better than Ziya Gökalp.[2] This statement presented a clue that these three late Ottoman intellectuals who represented different intellectual trends had indeed met with each other; either face to face or through the publications.

With the end of Sultan Abdul Hamid II's 'actual' reign, that is the 1908 Revolution,[3] Abdullah Cevdet was considered an important figure among the Westernists whereas Ziya Gökalp was a famous Turkist intellectual in the same time. Hence, considering the fact that Akif was representing the Islamists during the Second Constitutional Era, the former praises of Akif had a chance to be altered after the 1908 Revolution, at the times when the 'actual' intellectual pen-fights began; and also it could be a vantage point to grasp. At this point, the 'shape' of the thesis was getting clearer; it was constitutively going to be a comparison between Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp or Abdullah Cevdet during the Second Constitutional Era; yet, the issue which was going to be compared was ambiguous. Weird but true that the problematization mentioned above did not emerge in time; contrary to this, it showed up instantly. Reviewing the works of some researchers on Akif, an academician showed himself: Mehmet Emin Erişirgil. He had written two books on Mehmet Akif[4] and Ziya Gökalp;[5] additionally, he got in contact with them, befriended with them, and he managed to analyze and review their daily lives and intellectual thoughts with the help of his own memories in his books. In one of these books, he stated as follows:

> […] For Akif, it had to be an ideal to awaken all the Muslims and change the ones that remained outside the Ottoman society into sovereign Muslim states and bond them with immaterialistic links. According to Ziya Gökalp however, this kind of thinking was a utopia, means a desire which is impossible to become real. […] The nation was [sole] Islam for the former; the nation was a community of a cultural unity for the latter; […] the religion could not create a nation alone […] For Akif, the nation and ummah had the same meaning; all the Muslims belonged to the same nation […] For Ziya Gökalp, the nation concept had gained a specific meaning in the

---

[2] Mithat Cemal, *Mehmet Akif Ersoy*, Türkiye İş Bankası, Ankara, 1986, p. 62.

[3] It is important to take into consideration that Sultan Abdul Hamid II was indeed the "official" ruler of the Ottoman Empire for several months after the 1908 Revolution until Sultan Mehmed V *(Reşad)* ascended the throne on 27 April 1909.

[4] Mehmet Emin Erişirgil, *İslamcı Bir Şairin Romanı Mehmet Akif*, 3rd Edition, Aykut Kazancıgil & Cem Alpar (Ed.), Nobel, Ankara, 2006.

[5] Mehmet Emin Erişirgil, *Bir Fikir Adamının Romanı Ziya Gökalp*, 2nd Edition, Aykut Kazancıgil & Cem Alpar (Ed.), Remzi, İstanbul, 1984.

3

19th century; thus, the nation word became something else than the ummah word alone.[6]

This passage alone had directed the research towards the change of the nation concept in the late Ottoman times. At this point, with the introduction of İsmail Kara's article in the *Dergâh* journal which was analyzing the semantic shifts in the conceptualizations of nation from the Young Ottomans onwards,[7] the thesis left Abdullah Cevdet aside, limited the main problem with Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp's understandings of nation, and scanned through their original accounts. In order to explain their conceptualizations of nation chronologically, the thesis intended to follow a step-by-step approach while reviewing the main question; it was planned as to mount every chapter to another, without leaving any gaps between the chapters as well as sub-chapters.

Since the thesis deals with the concept of nation particularly, it would make easier to understand the following chapters with the earlier information given about "What is nation?".

2. Conceptual Framework of the Thesis

Before reviewing Akif's and Gökalp's approaches to the concept of nation, it would be helpful to recall the theoretical studies on nation, nationality, and nationalism. Umut Özkırımlı claims that there are three approaches towards the origins of the concepts of nation and nationalism. First, the primordialist approach claims that the nations and nationalities are 'natural' parts of the human beings, similar to speech, sight, smell, etc. and the concept of nation was as old as the time.[8] Second, as a reaction to the primordialist approach, the modernist approach claims that the concepts of nation and nationalism are not natural elements of the ancient societies; instead, they are the products of the last two centuries or so with the sociopolitical awakening of the 1789 French Revolution.

---

[6] *"[...]Âkif için, bütün müslümanları uyandırarak Osmanlı Camiâsına giremeyecek olanları müstakil İslâm Devletleri haline getirmek, sonra onları mânevi bağlarla birbirine bağlamak bir ideal olmalıydı. Ziya Gökalp'e göre ise böyle düşünme bir ütopya işi, yani gerçekleşmesine imkân olmayan bir istekti. [...] Birine göre Millet İslâmdı, ötekine göre Millet kültür birliğinin doğurduğu bir topluluktu. [...] yalnız başına Din bir millet yaratamazdı [...] Âkif'e göre 'Millet ve Ümmet' aynı mânaya gelen kelimelerdi, Müslüman olanların hepsi aynı millettendi [...] Ziya Gökalp'e göre ise millet kavramı ondokuzuncu yüzyılda hususî bir mâna aldı, böylece Millet sözü, Ümmet kelimesinden ayrı bir mânaya geldi."* Erişirgil, *İslamcı...* p. 181.

[7] İsmail Kara, "Kimin Milletindensin? İstiklal Marşı'ndaki 'Millet' Üzerine Bir Deneme", *Dergâh*, Vol. 21, No. 251, January 2011, 16-19 (The mentioned introducer was Mustafa Kemal Sağlam; appreciated his contribution to this research).

[8] Umut Özkırımlı, *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction (Foreword by Fred Halliday)*, Macmillan, 2000, pp. 64-66.

Additionally, this approach argues that the nations do not make nationalism but the states make nations and nationalism.[9] Third, the ethno-symbolist approach which can be taken as a 'midway' that seeks to accommodate the primordialist and modernist approaches. This approach constitutes a more homogenous entity while categorizing nation. According to this, nations are more of an ethnic entity than anything else, and the formations of nations should be reviewed within a long timeline *(longue durée)* through the earlier ethnic forebears.[10]

In dictionaries, the nation word is described as "a community of people of mainly common descent, history, language, etc., forming a unified government or inhabiting a territory".[11] This definition might be taken as a complete definition at first glance; yet, there had to be also another hidden element lying beneath which urged the human communities to gather around and form this kind of community. The members of such 'community' had to choose to live together by their own wills at some point, or there had to be a strong link that was able to bind all these human groups into one, like common social values. However, Ernest Gellner argued that describing nations as a large group of people who chose to exist as a community with their own wills or grounding these groups on their social union upon a common culture alone required much more data; therefore the ultimate definition would eventually miss the authentic definition of the concept of nation. In his argument, the definition of the nation term needed another element to be added into the equation, which was "the age of nationalism".[12] In order to explain this 'age of nationalism' approach, Gellner argued that the agrarian societies evolved into industrial societies and left all their values behind during this transition. Furthermore, the industrial society brought its own values including cumulative scientific and technological advances along with the requirement of definitive national borders. Thus, these new values shifted the industrial age to the age of nationalism at the political level, which could not be applied to agrarian societies earlier.[13] Although Gellner's approach seems very convincing in the first glance, Benedict Anderson had another approach on nation. According to him, the nation was an imaginary concept from the beginning to the end. It was imagined to be homogenous, limited with its kind only, presented as absolutely sovereign within its

---

[9] *Ibid.* pp. 85-86.
[10] *Ibid.* pp. 167-169.
[11] *Oxford American Dictionary of Current English*, Oxford University Press, Oxford & New York, 1999, p. 525.
[12] Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, Cornell University, New York, 1983, pp. 53-55.
[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.

borders, and presented as a community which was nourished by "a deep and horizontal comradeship". Thus, the nations were nothing but imagined communities.[14]

It seems nation –whether it was genuine or imaginary– was a social and therefore a sociological concept. The words of famous sociologist Max Weber could be helpful to expand the description. According to Weber, the concept of nation could not be formed by the concrete elements such as common language, religion, race, or blood. It was rather a product of prestige idea, and the concept of nation belonged to the political field.[15] Since Weber defined the nation as a non-materialistic entity, another description made by Mümtaz'er Türköne could vary the concept. He defined the nation as a complicated fact; it was shaped by an amalgamation of cultural, political, and psychological factors.[16] The debates above offer an origin to distinguish which mandatory elements have to be within the definition of nation. In this regard, a nation had to include a community, needed to be formed after the industrial age, should carry sovereign characteristics, had to share a common culture, and eventually had to represent itself within the political field which will be incredibly helpful to get successfully through reviewing the selected concept that will be discussed in the final chapter.

With the common elements mentioned above, after putting Ernest Gellner's 'age of nationalism' approach aside since both Akif and Gökalp were already 'the sons' of that age; it can be said that a nation definition shall carry three common elements within: Political community, sovereignty, and common values (culture). Therefore, it would be beneficial to review these three constitutive elements of nation this thesis picked. Since all these definitions above had constituted themselves upon the 'political' word, and also the intimacy of nation and politics will be briefly mentioned while reviewing the sovereignty and common values in the following pages, it would be repetitive action to go further in the value of political community element within the conceptualization of nation. However, reviewing the sovereignty and common values elements could be helpful to understand the framework of the definition of nation.

---

[14] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Revised Edition, Verso, London & New York, 1991, pp. 5-7.
[15] Max Weber, "Millet", Ebru Çerezcioğlu (Trans.), *Doğu Batı*, No. 39, November, December, January 2006-2007, pp. 181-188. The original text was in: Max Weber, *Essays in Sociology*, H. H. Gerth (Trans.) & C. W. Mills (Ed.), Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1948, Ch. 3, pp. 171-179.
[16] Mümtaz'er Türköne, *Siyaset*, Lotus, İstanbul, 2003, p. 633.

Sovereignty element had occupied a vast amount of space in the nation definitions made by various scholars. However, the approaches towards the sovereignty within nation were not homogenous mostly; these were either focusing on 'pure and precise' national sovereignty, or they were based on sharing the national sovereignty. In any case, both approaches were addressing the national sovereignty with a legitimate power, the state. The sovereignty and the state relationship can be explained through Weber's definition. According to him, the sovereignty means the possibility of existence of 'some' group of people who were present to submit 'some' orders given by higher authorities.[17] With the help of this perspective, scholars preferred to embody the obeyers and givers of these 'orders' into one entity: The nation-state. For instance, Anderson asserted that the nation was 'imagined' to be sovereign from the beginning. Because, according to him, the concept was born in an era in which it was believed the sovereignty rights were granted to the dynasties by the religions. Therefore, since it was granted by the religion, instead of positioning the dynasties between the God and the nation as a 'middleman', it was preferred to embody the national sovereignty within the nation-state.[18] In another approach, in his quest to find out "What is nation?", Elie Kedourie claimed that the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen mentioned "the principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation". From the sovereignty perspective, he claimed the nation was and had to be 'more' than the king and the aristocracy. Therefore, he asserted that "a number of individuals, living under certain government, decide that they no longer wish to continue under it; since the sovereignty is theirs, they may now form a new government and constitute a nation on their own".[19] Although he had many other references to the sovereignty within the nation concept, this quote above could be sufficient to understand that Kedourie had also reserved a special place to the sovereignty in his definition of nation.

On the other hand, in modern times, the sovereignty element within the nation was mostly reviewed through the division of sovereignty or granting a share of sovereignty to a higher authority. For instance, Özkırımlı argued that the globalization had an enormous impact on the 'traditional' sovereignty understandings. According to him, in a global world, when the state matters, it is about how the states could preserve their sovereignties. However, when the nation matters, it is about what kind of alternative allegiance models the globalization

---

[17] Max Weber, *Toplumsal ve Ekonomik Örgütlenme Kuramı*, 2nd Edition, Özer Ozankaya (Trans.), Cem, İstanbul, 2014, pp. 96-97, 321-322.

[18] Anderson, *Imagined Communities…* p. 7.

[19] Elie Kedourie, *Nationalism*, Revised Edition, Hutchinson University, London, 1961, pp. 12-15.

offers. In a dilemma like this, several ideas had emerged like establishing a new type of post-sovereign governance or abandoning the traditional concept of sovereignty completely. In any case, with the emergence of new actors in the global politics, the nation-states were not the sole actors anymore; he asserted that, from this time on, the national sovereignty had to comply itself "with a range of transnational regulatory regimes" the globalization introduced.[20] With the help of these approaches, it can be said that the sovereignty was an important constitutive element within the definition of nation.

The common values element within the concept of nation can be tracked in various definitions made by several scholars. For instance, even he had precisely distinguished the nation and nationalism explanations with agrarian societies and industrial societies, Gellner had put a special emphasis on the common values, or culture with his preferred word. According to him, in the agrarian societies, there was a 'boom' in the culture types; almost every tribe, community, or society, whether it was a large or a small one, had its own culture along with some specific cultures the high-ranking officers carried within like priests, government officers, and scholars.[21] Additionally, he claimed that during the industrial age, these various culture types 'had to' reconcile, merge, and be accepted as a 'new type' of culture, a national culture, which the industrial society put it inside its nationalism formulation.[22] Hence, it is safe to say that both the agrarian societies and the nations of the industial age had included common values in their presences from the perspective of Gellner, regardless of the homogeneity of these communities.

Moreover, although he had named the nations 'imagined communities', Anderson had also put the common values in his descriptions of nation and nationality. According to him, in the period earlier than the 18th century, the common values were mostly based on religion. With the Enlightenment, that particular date became "not only the dawn of the age of nationalism but the dusk of religious modes of thought". This is why in the newly emerged nationalism ideas, the role of the religion within the community as the common values had replaced itself with national culture. Therefore, he claimed that "nationalism has to be understood by aligning it, not with self-consciously held political ideologies, but with the large cultural systems that preceded it, out of which −as well as against which− it came into

---

[20] Umut Özkırımlı, *Contemporary Debates on Nationalism: A Critical Engagement*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, pp. 131-135.
[21] Gellner, *Nations…* pp. 8-13.
[22] *Ibid.* pp. 39-40.

being".[23] Last but not least, Özkırımlı claimed that although the nation, nationality, and nationalism concepts were mostly accepted as parts of politics by a great percentage of scholars, it had also some deep relationships with the culture. His claim on this issue was the nations, or ethnic nations, which claimed no political power ultimately, were also named 'nations' in the literature just because they constituted themselves upon common values within their communities. Therefore, in a debate whether the nations were political communities or cultural ones, he claimed it was neither on one hand and both on another. He stated "it involves the 'culturalization' of politics and the 'politicization' of culture".[24] From these perspectives, although the examples could be varied, these three approaches made by three scholars could reflect the constitutive role of common values within the definitions and descriptions of nation; which played a significant role in conceptualization of nation.

Fred Halliday claimed that the language and also its usages within a country was a prerequisite to comprehend the concepts belong to that particular society completely like nation, state, and tradition.[25] If this statement can be taken as an advice, it can be asserted that in order to analyze the nation concept in the teachings of Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp, it is important to know the Turkish equals of the nation word, which are *millet* and *ulus*. However, the *ulus* word was not invented during the late Ottoman times;[26] therefore, it would not be rational to scan this word in the reviewed works. Additionally, although there was a single word in the Ottoman-Turkish language to address the nation concept, *millet*, there were three different meanings of the *millet* word during the last century –with a relatively broader timeline– of the Ottoman Empire. First, the ancient *millet* concept in the classical times of the Empire was used for centuries to indicate the non-Muslim elements of the Ottoman society. The main factor in this variation was the religion, and the society was divided into two groups as Muslims and non-Muslims; the non-Muslim part was divided into several smaller groups based on their religious orders, and every single group was named *millet* depending on their religious paths: *Ermeni milleti* (Armenian

---

[23] Anderson, *Imagined Communities…* pp. 9-12.

[24] Özkırımlı, *Contemporary Debates…* pp. 20-22.

[25] Fred Halliday, *The Middle East in International Relations: Power, Politics and Ideology*, Cambridge University, 2005, p. 4.

[26] Although Ziya Gökalp had proposed the *ulus* word to cover the nation word first in 1911 (*see.* Gökalp, "Altun Destan ve Açıklaması" in Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler II*, Süleyman Hayri Bolay (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1982, pp. 51-59) along with other 'archaic' Turkish words to fill some concepts in his Turkish nationalism proposals; yet, these concepts were merely belonged to himself alone and eventually these words had also changed in parallel to the changes of his *Turan* ideal in time which will be widely discussed later.

community), *Yahudi milleti* (Jewish community), *Rum milleti* (Greek community), etc.[27] Second, all of the subjects of the Empire were called *millet*, regardless of the ethnicity or religion. This was a relatively late usage in the Empire, and it was used after the Empire started to lose vast territories as a result of the ethnic nationalist movements that emerged within the Empire. Thus, the Empire's lands shrank to the Anatolia and Thrace more or less, and the Empire used *millet* word to define its subjects as a whole in correspondence to remind the previous state ideology, Ottomanism.[28] In this regard, the previous *millet* concept, which was used to define the non-Muslim elements alone, enlarged itself to define all the subjects of the Empire in order to address the unity. Lastly, with the introduction of the nation and also nationalism concepts after the 1789 French Revolution –ethnic identities in large territories mostly, and with the emergence of the national consciousness, the nationalist movements in both inside and outside of the Empire had caused the *millet* concept to evolve into its final meaning, which had the exact similar meaning in today's world. Although the Committee of Union and Progress[29] (henceforth CUP) was promoting an Ottomanist state policy in its early times; after the Balkan Wars and especially and intensively during WWI times, it started to promote a nationalist approach in the political field. Additionally, the Turkism movement was blossoming accross the different parts of the Empire and its former subjects were seeking to claim their independent 'national' entities by revolting against it. As a result of these events within the Empire, the third usage of the *millet* word to cover the contemporary 'nation' concept had emerged.

---

[27] According to İlber Ortaylı, the *millet* word should not be used to correspond to 'nation'; the *ulus* word will cover the meaning neatly. Instead, *millet* should remain as a historical concept to define the unique Ottoman policy which was used to categorize the society through their particular religious orders. According to him, the language, ethnicity, or race was not taken as characteristics to categorize the society in the classical times of the Empire. For instance, the Pomaks, who were speaking in Bulgarian were also categorized within the Muslim community due to their religion. Similarly, the Armenians were speaking their own language; yet, the Armenian society was divided as Catholics, Gregorian, and in the 19th century as Protestants. İlber Ortaylı, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Millet" in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Collective, Vol. 4, İletişim, İstanbul, 1985, pp. 996-1001.

[28] Ottomanism was an ideology which aimed to unite the ethnic and religious elements of the Empire around the 'imperial ideal' of the Ottoman Empire. The ideology was presented by claiming all the subjects of the Empire, regardless of their ethnicity or religion, as sole members of the 'Ottoman nation'. Ottomanism ideology was valid between 1839 and 1913, and it can be reviewed under four periods: (1) From 1830s to 1875, when the Sublime Porte was following a centralist state policy via Ottomanism, (2) 1868-1878, when the Young Ottoman opposition was active and a pragmatic Ottomanism idea was presented via constitutional monarchy, (3) the Ottomanism idea championed within the Young Turk opposition against the absolute monarchy of Sultan Abdul Hamid II, (4) and the relatively weak Ottomanism during the Second Constitutional Era. Selçuk Akşin Somel, "Osmanlı Reform Çağında Osmanlıcılık Düşüncesi (1839-1913)" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce – Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası: Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi*, 8th Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2009, pp. 88-116.

[29] *İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti*: The political organization in the late Ottoman times which seize the power via a sociopolitical revolution in 1908. The following chapters will review its impact to the late Ottoman politics in detail.

On the other hand, originally the *millet* word was carrying neither of these meanings within. As some enlightening information on the origins of the *millet* word, İsmail Kara's analysis could be a reference point to mention. According to Kara, until the second half of the 19th century, the *millet* (nation), *kavim* (ethnie), *cins* (race), and *ümmet* (ummah) words were four different concepts in the Empire which were 'strictly and exactly' different from each other in their ultimate meanings. In the famous dictionary of Şemseddin Sami named *Kamus-i Türkî* (Turkish Dictionary) which was first published in 1899 and also the first Turkish to Turkish dictionary; the *millet* word was defined within the religious periphery as [1] religion, sect and [2] a community within a religion or a sect. On the other hand, the *ümmet* (ummah) word was defined as [1] the sum of all the people with the same language and [2] the community which a prophet was assigned to invite to a religion. Additionally, the *kavim* word was defined as [1] a group of people with some relations among each other, little ummah and [2] the community which a prophet was sent. Moreover, the *cins* word was defined within the race concept as [1] root, essential and [2] vein [3] generation, family, offspring, lineage. Therefore, as Kara stated, before the *"iddia-yı kavmiyet ve cinsiyet"* (ethnicism and racism claims) movements in the late Ottoman times that emerged during the Second Constitutional Era, the *millet* and the *ümmet* words had the exact opposite meanings of each other. Hence, the concepts had witnessed a semantic shift between each other during the last decade of the Empire. The meaning of *millet* shifted towards the concept of 'nation' under the meaning of *kavim*, and the meaning of *ümmet* slided through the original meaning of the *millet* word.[30]

At this point, from Kara's perspective, it would be helpful to apply the same method to Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp's works to analyze the changes and track the interchangeable usages of the same word, or in some cases, words. Speaking of the interchangeable usages of the same words, tracking the origins of the *millet* word to see when it was started to be used as covering the nation concept could be essential to shed a light on this matter. The Western authors who translated Quran into Western languages had witnessed three different words which were used interchangeably while addressing the ancient nations in the narratives of Quran: *millet*, *kavim*, and *ümmet*. Instead of using different words in their translations, they preferred a single word to correspond all these three concepts: Nation. Thus, depending on from which side the origin of this

---

[30] Kara, "Kimin Milletindensin…"

mistranslation problem among these concepts was observed, either the translators suffered the pain during the translation processes and introduced the concept of nation to the religious literature, or they built the problem by binding three different concepts into one word.[31] This comment of Kara can indeed be justified from the perspective of Quran. For instance, in the verse 5:48 of Quran (Surah al-Ma'idah), the God claimed he created the mankind as different societies and he could have created it as a single entity if he desired to do so. That single entity notion was called *ümmet* in the original verse. The Turkish translations name this entity ummah[32] whereas the English translations use the 'nation' word.[33] Additionally, in Quran, the *millet* and *kavim* words were used very differently. The *kavim* word used to address the 'ethnie' whereas the *millet* word was used to address the 'religion' of any particular *kavim*. As a good example, in the verse 12:37 of Quran (Surah Yusuf), Prophet Joseph stated he had abandoned the *"millet-e kavmin"* (مِلَّةَ قَوْمٍ). This *millet-e kavmin* addressing had two parts: The *kavim* word which used as 'ethnic people', and the *millet* word which was used to describe the 'religion'. In the contemporary Turkish translations of Quran this description was translated *"gürûhun dini"* (religion of the people)[34] and *"milletin dini"* (religion of the nation).[35] In Spanish translation, it was translated 'the religion of people' *(la religión de gente)*[36] and in German translation 'the religion of those people' *(die Religion jener Leute)*.[37] Therefore, although the Western translators were able to use the *kavim* word close to its original meaning, it seems even in the contemporary times, these terms cause some confusion among the Turkish translators that the *kavim* and *millet* words, which are fundamentally in different meanings, were used interchangeably.

---

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] *"[...] Eğer Allah dileseydi, elbette sizi tek bir ümmet yapardı [...]"* in Halil Altuntaş & Muzaffer Şahin (Ed.), *Kur'an-ı Kerim Meali*, 12th Edition, Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı, Ankara, 2011, p. 126 and *"[...] Allah isteseydi hepinizi bir tek ümmet yapardı [...]"* in R. İhsan Eliaçık, *Nuzül Sırasına Göre Yaşayan Kur'an Türkçe Meal/Tefsir*, 5th Edition, İnşa, İstanbul, 2014, pp. 1038-1039.

[33] "[...] had God pleased, he could have made you one nation [...]" in Oliver Leaman (Ed.), *The Qur'an: An Encyclopedia*, Routledge, London & New York, 2006, p. 655. Additionally, apart from the Western translators, even the Arab translators preferred to use 'nation' word on this issue: "[...] If Allah had willed, He would have made you one nation [...]" in Muhammad Taqî-ud-Dîn al-Hilâlî & Muhammad Muhsin Khân, *Translation of the Meanings of The Noble Qur'ân in the English Language*, King Fahd Glorious Qur'ân Printing Complex, Madinah, p. 151 and "[...] Had God willed, he could have made you a single nation [...]" in Talal Itani, *The Quran in English*, ClearQuran, Dallas-Beirut, p. 47.

[34] Eliaçık, *Nuzül Sırasına...* p. 506.

[35] Altuntaş & Şahin, p. 258.

[36] Guillermo B. Brown (Ed.), *El Quran Santo (Koran) Interpretación Española de Los Significados*, p.107.

[37] William B. Brown (Ed.), *Heiliges Quran (Koran) Deutsche Deutung der Bedeutungen*, p. 121. In the English translations of the Arab translators on the other hand, it was translated as "religion of people" (al-Hilâlî and Khân, p. 307) and "tradition of people". Itani, p. 99.

In the light of the discussion above,[38] it can be said that the *millet* concept which was covering a religious meaning had switched into a political one in time. Indeed, the share of corresponding the *millet* word and nation in the modern sense for the first time in the Empire belonged to Şinasi, the famous Young Ottoman. According to Şinasi, *millet* was a political community who lived within the borders of a country with equal rights. Although the *Tanzimat* (Reorganization) Edict introduced equal rights to all the subjects of the Empire, the citizenship pattern Şinasi tried to introduce by defining the *millet* word in the meaning of contemporary concept of nation would not emerge within the Turkish lands until the establishment of the Turkish Republic.[39]

Additionally, the *millet* concept that the Young Ottomans introduced was trying to bind all the subjects of the Empire under a *millet* identity to secure the unity. Moreover, Sultan Abdul Hamid II had also embraced this type of *millet* definition and championed it as a

---

[38] Since the discussion above rotating around the Arabic terms, at this point, the comments of Bernard Lewis could enrich the argument about the nation and ummah concepts in the Arab tradition. According to him, "the Arabs may be a nation but they are not a nationality in the legal sense". Because, although several states like Yemen, Iraq, Syria, Jordan, etc. identify themselves as Arab, their citizens are not designated as Arabs. This situation was based on their own historical backgrounds. The spread of Islam through conquests after the Prophet Mohammad's time caused the Arabic language to spread. And after 10th century, when the Turks became the ruling people in the same area, more or less, the provinces of the west of Iran lost their old native languages and the Arabic became the dominant language. At this point, with the Turkish impact to the Near East, "various minority faiths were organized as religio-political communities, each under its own leaders and laws". However, "the majority belonged to the *Ummat al-Islam*, the community or nation of Islam". Hence, the members of the society built their identities with Islam, more than anything. However, "the rapid growth of European activity and the influence to these lands brought with it the European idea of the nation as a group of people with a common homeland, language, character, and aspiration". According to him, the national idea caused the first Arab revival and national movements with the 16th century. Bernard Lewis, *The Arabs in History*, Oxford University, 6th Edition/Reissued, 2002, pp. 1-10. This ummah-*millet* similarity will be widely discussed from the eyes of Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp in the following chapters. However, before concluding this debate, Adeed Dawisha's approach could be also beneficial to review. According to him, Arabness is emphasizing a historical bond which addresses the early Islamic rule, and the Arabic language had an enormous impact on building an Arab nationality. In the beginning of the 16th century, the Rome papacy had decided to train priests for the eastern churches. Eventually, in the 19th century, this training became intense in the Levant and through their own printing presses, the Arabic literary revived, "which was to become the basis for the early national stirrings in the Arabic-speaking provinces of the Ottoman Empire". Additionally, he claimed that from the eyes of Arabs, Jamal al-Din al-Afghani and Muhammad Abduh were considered the 'great contributors to the Arab nationalism'. With this perspective, al-Afghani was taking ummah as "constituted all Muslims, regardless of their countries, nationalities, and languages" whereas Abdu "always spoke of and to the *Ummah* in the traditional sense of the community of all Muslims". Adeed Dawisha, *Arab Nationalism in the Twentieth Century: From Triumph to Despair*, Princeton University, Princeton & Oxford, 2003, pp. 14-20. Apart from their contributions to this particular issue, and also the impact of language in the roots of the nationalism ideas, these two approaches above provide two specific contributions to the general problem of the thesis. First, it seems, the genesis of the nationalism claims was grounded on the crack in the identity by holding the religion separate from the identity, which can be taken as the earlier phase of secularism. Second, it seems, al-Afghani and Abduh, who were considered to be the fathers of Islamism movement in Turkey were taken as the fathers of nationalism by Arabs.

[39] Mustafa Kemal Sağlam, "Osmanlı Modernleşmesinde Entelijansiyanın İcadı: Şinasi" in Aytaç Yıldız (Ed.), *Türkiye'den Aydın Portreleri – I: Kurtuluş Kayalı*, Doğu Batı, Ankara, 2017, pp. 278-293.

state policy. By this, it seems the confusion between the different definitions of the *millet* word in the last century of the Empire had finally switched its meaning from a religious one to a political concept. For instance, in the first draft of the 1876 Constitution *(Kanun-i Esasi)* the *millet* concept was not used. Instead, the Ottoman society was named *tebaa-i Osmaniye* (Ottoman subjects) and *efrad-ı Osmaniye* (Ottoman individuals) while defining the identity of the society (without referring any words to *millet* or *kavim*) as Ottomans regardless of their religion in the 8th article.[40] However, in the first amendment on 22 August 1909, the 3rd article, which was defining the rightful ruler of the Empire, was changed,[41] and a sentence was added where the sultan had to swear an oath in the parliament upon the *millet* and the fatherland before ascending to the throne. This was the first and the only usage of the *millet* word in the Ottoman Constitution.[42]

While reviewing Mehmet Akif's and Ziya Gökalp's writings along with other Islamist and Turkist intellectuals in the late Ottoman period, the thesis came across two enormous changes in Islamist and Turkist discourses in time: First, the early Turkists had paid the utmost respect to Islam and formulated their discourses by adding Islam in it. In time, the place reserved for Islam in the Turkist discourses did not lost its position completely but it had started to be positioned in lower ranks. Second, the Islamists were in complete denial in the nationalism idea in their early accounts. However, that 'denial' gave its place to an 'acceptance' in time, and the Islamists softened their voices towards nationalism idea while proposing some Islamic nationalism versions. The closings of both trends caused some confusions and it was needed to review whether the Turkism and Islamism movements articulated themselves with each other during Second Constitutional Era, even mildly. At this point, through two articles written by Birol Akgün and Şaban H. Çalış,[43] and Gökhan

---

[40] A. Şeref Gözübüyük & Suna Kili, *Türk Anayasa Metinleri 1839-1980*, 2nd Edition, AÜSBF, Ankara, 1982, pp. 27-42.

[41] *"Saltanat, Seniyye-i Osmaniye Hilâfet-i Kübrâ-yı İslâmiyet'i haiz olarak sülâle-i Âl-i Osman'dan usûl-ı kadimesi vechile ekber evlâda aittir."* This was the original article. With the first amendment, these words were added: *"Zat-ı hazret-i padişah-i hin-i cülûslarında Meclis-i Umûmîde ve Meclis müctemi değilse ilk ictimaında şer'-i şerif ve Kanun-ı Esasi ahkâmına riayet ve vatan ve millete sadakat edeceğine yemin eder"*.

[42] *Ibid*. pp. 49-54.

[43] Birol Akgün & Şaban H. Çalış, "Tanrı Dağı Kadar Türk, Hira Dağı Kadar Müslüman: Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Terkibinde İslâmcı Doz" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce – Milliyetçilik*, 3rd Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2008, pp. 584-600.

Çetinsaya,[44] the confusions were dispersed and it was justified that these intellectual movements had indeed articulated with each other in the late Ottoman times.

The first article claimed that the early Turkists in the late Ottoman period were formulating their theses with Islam. The famous Turkist organization *Türk Ocakları* (Turkish Hearth) placed *akvâm-ı İslâmiyye* (ethnies of Islam) in their program while explaining its ultimate goal, Mehmet Emin [Yurdakul] claimed both his religion and race were supreme, Ziya Gökalp had explained his famous trinity[45] with Islam in it, the Turkists introduced the famous Islamist Jamal al-Din al-Afghani to the Ottoman society, and also the Turkists had established a journal named *İslâm Mecmuası* (Islamic Journal). These efforts of Turkists were to introduce a Turkist-Islam (or perhaps Turco-Islam) to the Ottoman society; because, in that time, it was impossible to defend a nation understanding without the religion in it.[46]

On the other hand, Çetinsaya claimed that contrary to general belief, Turkism and Islamism in the late Ottoman period had never become archenemies of each other; instead, they had preferred to cooperate on 'saving' the state. Even their disputes and criticisms in their periodicals were through the perpetuity of the state and the success in the international politics. Hence, the Islamist critiques towards Turkism could be analyzed in three periods: 1908-1911/1912, 1912/1913-1918, and after 1918. He claimed, during the first period, the Islamists and Turkists had a *de facto* alliance. Islamist journals had allowed Turkists like Yusuf Akçura and Ahmed Ağaoğlu to write their articles in the Islamic journals while the Islamists had contributed to the Turkist periodicals. In the second period, with the sociopolitical changes within the Empire as the results of Tripoli and Balkan Wars and also the independence of Albania, the Islamists became hesitant towards Turkists. In the last period, due to the [ethnic] nationalism movements had vastly emerged within the Ottoman subjects, the Islamists had started to criticize Turkists harshly; but, even in this time, they did not consider each other enemies. Additionally, during the third period, at some point, Islamists had 'mildly' accepted the nation and nationalism concepts

---

[44] Gökhan Çetinsaya, "İslâmcılıktaki Milliyetçilik" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce – İslâmcılık*, 2nd Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2005, pp. 420-451.

[45] *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (Turkification, Islamicization, Modernization).

[46] Akgün & Çalış, *op. cit.*

and separated the Turkists in two groups. For instance, Babanzade Ahmed Naim claimed[47] the Turkists had two camps as 'pure Turkists' which was considered wrong in Islam and 'Turko-Islamists' which was suitable for Islam.[48] These two articles had helped the thesis a lot to differentiate the 'authentic' addressings of the nation word in the works of Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp as well as revealing the importance of reviewing their understandings of nation in different periods particularly.

3. Organization of the Thesis

Since this thesis emphasizes to analyze the changes of the understandings of nation in Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp's original writings throughout their intellectual lives in parallel to the sociopolitical changes in Turkey, it could be beneficial to mention the preferred approach which was used to introduce Akif and Gökalp first. These two intellectuals had born within the same sociopolitical environment, they both had characterized their own intellectual thoughts via their particular identities, and their identities were the sole actors in shaping their thoughts. This is why the thesis preferred to pick three core concepts while introducing them to the audience.

First, since the education matter was one of the core concepts not only for Akif and Gökalp to lean on but also for almost every other intellectual representing various intellectual movements during the Second Constitutional Era, the research had preferred to review Akif and Gökalp's thoughts and their activities on this matter within their biography sections.[49] Second, while reviewing the Second Constitutional Era extensively, one can notice that the periodicals during this time had an enormous impact on both defending and championing the intellectual trends; also, these periodicals had a great impact on attracting supporters. Hence, the sociopolitical impact of the press was briefly mentioned in the first chapter while introducing Akif and Gökalp through their contributions to the late Ottoman publishing in their particular chapters deeply. Third, since the civilization concept was one of the central issues of the Second Constitutional Era which was defined according to the

---

[47] This article was written in 1332 (1913/1914) and titled *İslâmda Da'vâ-yı Kavmiyyet* (Ethnicity Claims in Islam). For the simplified version of this article, *see.* İsmail Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi 1 Metinler Kişiler*, 3rd Edition, Dergâh, İstanbul, 2017, pp. 329-337.

[48] Çetinsaya, *op. cit.*

[49] Various proposals on the education from different intellectuals represented particular intellectual movements in the late Ottoman times will be reviewed in the first chapter briefly. For detailed and comprehensive information, *see.* Mustafa Ergün, *İkinci Meşrutiyet Devrinde Eğitim Hareketleri*, Ocak, Ankara, 1996.

particular characteristics of the intellectual movements emerged in this time differently and also it became one of the major origins of the intellectual debates among the late Ottoman intellectuals; the thesis preferred to introduce Akif and Gökalp to the audience through this concept as well.[50]

---

[50] The civilization word was first introduced in the mid-18th century as *'civilisation'*, and it was used interchangeably with the 'civility' and the 'urbanity' words. This word was introduced as to correspond to a general situation which was occurred by the newly established city-life and population booms in major cities of Europe. Tuncer Baykara, *Osmanlılarda Medeniyet Kavramı ve Ondokuzuncu Yüzyıla Dair Araştırmalar*, Akademi, İzmir, 1992, p. 1. The civilization concept in Turkish is corresponded to *medeniyet* and *uygarlık* words. *Medeniyet* word was derived from the Arabic m-d-n (م د ن) root which means to inhabit in a place. Additionally, in 1940s, the *uygarlık* word was invented and introduced in Turkish language. *Ibid.* pp. 30-32. Considering the term derived from the Uyghurs, who were considered the first Turkish community that preferred a inhabited life (Mustafa Demir, "Türk-İslam Medeniyetinde Şehirleşme", *İslami Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 2003, pp. 156-165), it can be said that the civilization term in both the European and Turkish languages was seeking to cover a meaning which was defined within the condition of being inhabitant in a place. However, the civilization concept had witnessed several changes in its meaning in the Empire until it had found its ultimate meaning. In 1828, the *civilisation* word was described as habituation, and also rehabilitating the morals. In 1831, it was described as learning the pillars of civility/manners, humanity, and courtesy. In 1840 it became 'gracefulness', and in 1843 it was described as becoming educated, becoming rehabilitated, humanity, and *medeniyet*. By 1856, the *civilisation* word was described as *sivilizasyon* and *medeniyet*. In 1870 it was described as to become urbanized and *medeniyet*; and finally in 1882 it was described as *medeniyet* alone. Baykara, pp. 22-23. The important part here is, the changes in the society and government style made by the hand of the state were following a similar path with the changes in the definition of civilization. The defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the Ottoman-Russo War of 1787-1792 was occurred in the early times of Sultan Selim III's reign. Although the Ottomans were greater in the numbers of the soldiers, military equipments, and military rations they were not able to become victorious. Therefore, Sultan Selim III decided to understand the European values to become victorious in the military field once again. He is best known with his reorganization process on the army as it was called *Nizâm-ı Cedîd* (New Order). Actually, that pair of words was not referring to a reform in the army alone but a complete reform process in various fields; besides, the name also defines itself: *Nizâm-ı Cedîd*, which means 'the new order'. Indeed, the European scholars who witnessed these changes in the Ottoman society in time claimed the attempts of Sultan Selim III in this new order were the first steps towards the civilization. *Ibid.* 3-5. The path Sultan Selim III opened had continued with Sultan Mahmud II and it can be said that it never stopped until the end of the Empire. However, the concept of civilization introduced by the state was misevaluated in the society. As a good example, the European voyagers who travelled Turkey in the early 19th century had written their experiences and observations on the Ottoman society and also the meaning of civilization for them. According to these writings, the indicators to be considered 'civilized' in the Ottoman society shall include some particular actions like drinking alcohol publicly, dancing with female, playing card games, attending stage plays in theaters, following the fashion trends, eating potatoes, and using cutlery while eating on the table. On the other hand, the new advances in science, literature, art, industry, commerce, and agriculture were not taken as indicators of the civilization. Additionally, the Ottomans who had travelled to Europe at the same time also did not mention anything related with the technical advances of the civilization. The civilization on their regards was including the beauties and elegancy of the daily life alone. *Ibid.* 24-27. For instance, Mustafa Reşid Pasha (1800-1858), who is considered the architect of the *Tanzimat* Era, used the *'sivilizasyon'* word for the first time in Turkish. He introduced the French lifestyle to the Turkish elites which he learned during his diplomatic travels to France, and started a new trend in the Ottoman society named *à la franque* (*alafranga* in Turkish, which means related with the French culture) which was the dominant social characteristic of the 19th century. *Ibid.* pp. 16-17. Therefore, the miscalculated and misinterpreted meaning of the civilization concept caused the Ottoman society to seek a new Europeanized lifestyle rather than seeking the technological advances of the Europe, which can also be tracked with the changes of the definition as it was stated above. In short, the civilization concept was first defined as to be inhabited, shifted into to be as elegant as Europeans in the lifestyle, and finally became a part of the Westernization process which will be widely described in Chapter 1 and also it will become one of important reference points while solving the problem of this thesis.

In the first chapter, the general characteristics of the Second Constitutional Era were reviewed along with the intellectual movements emerged in this era. At first, the reform movements in the Ottoman Empire were mentioned briefly. After a brief look to the [First] Constitutional Era, The Young Ottomans and their legacy were examined, the sociopolitical contributions of the Young Turks were reviewed, and the genesis and development of CUP was mentioned. Later, the Second Constitutional Era was described. With the declaration of the Second Constitutional Era, the boom in the Ottoman media and removal of the censorship were analyzed. The intellectual movement trends during this time which were Westernism, Islamism, Turkism, Socialism, and Liberalism were reviewed extensively through the written works of their particular intellectual figures. This chapter was concluded with a general review.

The second chapter is about Mehmet Akif. It begins with his short biography and since Akif had placed a special emphasis on the education in his life, his thoughts on and the contributions to the education was mentioned briefly. Additionally, his efforts on the literature and publishing were also reviewed through his famous journal *Sırat-ı Müstakim* (which had changed its name to *Sebilürreşad* with the 183rd issue) and his poetry book *Safahat*. Since Islam was positioned on top among the other identities he carried, Akif's attitude towards civilization as an Islamist was extensively analyzed. Additionally, Islam in politics, or Islamism in short, was reviewed through its various definitions and descriptions in both late Ottoman and contemporary times. After the various aims and goals that Islamism carried were reviewed, the Islamism understanding Akif championed was reviewed chronologically and contextually. His hopes, efforts, successes and failures in exalting Islamism were reviewed and a summary of Mehmet Akif and his understanding of Islamism were placed as a conclusion.

The third chapter is about Ziya Gökalp and it followed a relatively similar path with the previous chapter towards reviewing his contributions to the Turkish nationalism, or Turkism in short. The chapter started with a short biography of Gökalp and due to Gökalp had also placed a special emphasis on education similar to Akif, his thoughts and contributions to the education in Turkey were reviewed. Gökalp was also a prolific penman, and he had written numerous articles, books, poems, and letters during his life to express his ideas. Therefore, a sub-chapter for Gökalp's contributions to literature and publishing were also analyzed. Similar to Akif, Gökalp's approach to the civilization

concept was reviewed extensively. In the following section, the nationalism and Turkism concepts were vastly examined, and Gökalp's Turkism understanding was reviewed through his written works. A general conclusion in the end completed this chapter.

The fourth chapter is where the main argument of the research was discussed. The origin of the research question is the 'nation' word had lost its former meaning in the late Ottoman times and therefore the Islamists and Turkists during the Second Constitutional Era tended to conceptualize nation through the discourses of their very own intellectual movements. After reminding the conceptual framework mentioned in the introduction chapter, Mehmet Akif's conceptualization of nation was discussed. The chronological scans suggested that Mehmet Akif had conceptualized nation in three different ways in accordance with the changes of the sociopolitical environment Turkey had witnessed. On the other hand, Ziya Gökalp had conceptualized nation in two different ways in his life with the impact of the same sociopolitical changes along with the changes in his identity. These chronological stages were extensively examined. Regardless of these stages, in order to make a comparison between Akif's and Gökalp's nation concepts, three common elements were picked among the definitions of nation introduced in the introduction chapter which were political community, sovereignty, and common values; and Akif's and Gökalp's thoughts on these constitutive elements of nation were extensively analyzed. A brief conclusion part concluded this chapter.

4. Methodology of the Thesis

The main purpose of this research is to find out when the conceptualization processes were completed over the selected term, and whether the two different intellectual approaches represented by these two different intellectuals, Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp, met at the same point or not. In order to do this, their original writings were reviewed through a chronological order. Both Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp were indeed industrious and prolific writers and they had produced several poems, articles, and books while championing their own intellectual movements. Mehmet Akif had written several poems and also articles for *Sırat-ı Müstakim* and *Sebilürreşad* journals, and also his speeches in several mosques during war times were recorded in these journals. Additionally, his complete poetry book, *Safahat*, which includes seven chapters published in different times, was a beneficial source to consult in order to track his intellectual thoughts on different, and also the same issues in some cases, chronologically. Ziya Gökalp on the other hand,

had written his articles in numerous journals like *Türk Yurdu*, *Milli Tetebbular Mecmuası*, *Yeni Mecmua*, and *Küçük Mecmua* along with several newspapers like *Peyman*, *Yeni Gün*, and *Cumhuriyet*. Additionally, he had some poetry books like *Kızıl Elma* and *Yeni Hayat* where he explained his intellectual thoughts via poems. Last but not least, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* book where his thoughts on sociopolitical environment of the Empire were analyzed, and also his manifesto book of Turkism titled *Türkçülüğün Esasları* were scanned thoroughly. It can be said that in order not to drift off the main course and not to be persuaded, the journeys through their conceptualizations of nation were reviewed through their original accounts first instead of consulting other researchers. The main resources of the thesis were consisted of the books, articles, letters, and poems they have written and also the speeches they have delivered. The secondary resources were the works that were written to review Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp by other researchers.

In the beginning of this section, it was claimed that this thesis had two hypotheses originated from two particular comparisons of Akif and Gökalp: A chronological comparison and a conceptual comparison. Instead of simply naming the methods which were used to present these comparisons, it would be righteous to mention the inspirations of these methods taken from, along with naming them.

For the chronological comparison, since it was mostly based on scanning the *millet* word one by one through the original works of Akif and Gökalp, it can be said that a TÜBİTAK project which was coordinated by Alev Çınar and completed in 2018[51] was a huge inspiration for this thesis to determine the precise method. The mentioned project focused on reviewing and analyzing the conceptualizations of 'civilization', 'justice', and 'order' from the Islamic perspectives in Turkey from 1990 onwards. In order to do that, the project focused on scanning these words in 'over ten thousand articles' published in numerous Islamic periodicals, classified the conceptualizations of these words, and reviewed their attributed meanings in the accounts of the late Islamists in Turkey.[52] Since this thesis preferred a relatively similar approach in reviewing the conceptualizations of nation by scanning the *millet* word in Akif's and Gökalp's accounts, it would be beneficial to check which method Çınar preferred to use in her project. According to the project, the applied

---

[51] Alev Çınar (Coord.), *Türkiye'de Güncel İslami Siyasi Düşüncenin Üretimi, Dinamikleri ve Ana Kavramları: Medeniyet, Adalet ve Düzen*, TÜBİTAK 1001 Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Projelerini Destekleme Programı – SOBAG, Project No: 115K283, Ankara, January 2018 (Dr. Güliz Dinç was the one who introduced the mentioned project to the thesis. Her contributions are greatly appreciated).
[52] *Ibid.* pp. i-ii.

method was 'interpretive method' which aims to determine and review the meaning-making practices.[53] The main claim of this method can be summarized with "making words mean whatever we want them to"; therefore, the conceptualizations of some words need to be a subject to 'interpretation'. Similar to the various meanings attributed to the same national flag by different citizens of the same country, the long-ingrained concepts as well as some newly introduced words could become a subject to different conceptualizations.[54] Considering the fact that the selected word, *millet*, had also become a similar subject to various conceptualizations along with different definitions in the late Ottoman period as it was mentioned in the previous pages, the utilized method for the first hypothesis of this thesis which was about a chronological comparison and also which focused on the chronological changes in the understandings of nation from Akif's and Gökalp's perspectives, could be named 'interpretive method'.

For the second hypothesis, which was presented with a conceptual comparison in this thesis, Mustafa Serdar Palabıyık's innovative article[55] on methodology in social sciences was a tremendous inspiration. His intention on writing this article was to utilize the 'comparative historical analysis method' –which was 'traditionally' taken as a part of historical analysis– in the wide-range of issues the International Relations discipline deals with. With his words, the most simplified definition of comparative historical analysis is "the systematic study of two or more historical phenomena to put forward similarities and differences in order to contribute to the description, explanation and interpretation of these phenomena". The origin of this utilization he introduced had two purposes: First, he proposed an alternative solution to the deep-rooted conflict between the History which deals with 'the past' and International Relations which deals with 'the present'. In order to accommodate the past and present in the troubling researches the International Relations students and scholars are busy with, Palabıyık proposed to use comparative historical analysis method. Second, he wanted to introduce a 'fruitful' method to the interdisciplinary characteristic of International Relations discipline which deals with history, politics, anthropology, literature, economics, sociology, etc. by its nature. Moreover, he claimed he had already utilized this method in his various works. In order to do that, he picked a

---

[53] *Ibid.* p. 21.
[54] Dvora Yanow & Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (Ed.), *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, M. E. Sharpe, 2006, pp. xii-xxvii.
[55] Mustafa Serdar Palabıyık, "Broadening the Horizons of the 'International' by Historicizing it: Comparative Historical Analysis", *All Azimuth*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2019, pp. 307-325.

'constant' first, which was 'civilization' in one work, 'the East' in another, and 'national catastrophe' in one other. Second, he had compared the conceptualizations of these 'constants' from the perspectives of selected subjects which were Turkish and Japanese people for the first one, the orientalists and the ones who reside in 'the East' for the second one, and Turkish and Greek soldiers and statesmen for the third one.[56] As a matter of fact, the second hypothesis this thesis deals with is not different from Palabıyık's works when it comes to comparing the conceptualizations of the selected constant. In this thesis, the joint constant is 'nation'; and the selected constants to compare the conceptualizations of nation from Akif's and Gökalp's perspectives are political community, sovereignty, and common values. With this information, it can be justifiably asserted that the utilized method for the second hypothesis which deals with a conceptual comparison is 'comparative historical analysis'.

As the last paragraph before starting to introduce Akif and Gökalp to the audience along with their conceptualizations of nation as well as an extensive comparison on this issue, it can be said that the nation concept in the accounts of Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp had indeed studied by several researchers before, separately. However, these works were mostly based on quoting the simple definitions of nation made by either Akif or Gökalp. This research however, had taken Kara's formerly mentioned remark into consideration, respected it as a precious advice, and reviewed the 'underlying' meanings of not only Akif's but also Gökalp's understandings of nation and examined the changes of their conceptualizations of nation chronologically as well as comparing them through the constitutive elements of modern definitions of nation. Hence, it can be put forward that this work has some promising merits along with some notable diversifying approaches to contribute to the social sciences by testifying that the long-ingrained and accepted sociopolitical terms can become subjects to some deep semantic shifts through various perspectives of different intellectual understandings. Additionally, it is expected from this research to be a contribution to the social sciences in the English literature of the Turkish sociopolitical history, to the late Ottoman times in particular.

---

[56] *Ibid.*

CHAPTER 1

INTELLECTUAL MOVEMENTS IN THE SECOND CONSTITUTIONAL ERA

Whenever the Second Constitutional Era (1908-1918)[1] of the late Ottoman times is the case to be studied, it is about to become a tradition to refer to the Tarık Zafer Tunaya's description on that era. According to Tunaya, "the Second Constitutional Era was -in some sort of- a political laboratory".[2] Tunaya's observation had an actual value, and the Second Constitutional Era presented a vast amount of elements to study on. This chapter will focus on the intellectual environment of the Second Constitutional Era. Additionally, a brief review on the reasons and the leading actors that led the declaration of the Second Constitutional Era would be beneficial to mention in order to preserve the integrity of the late Ottoman intellectual development. In account of the fact that this thesis is focused on comparing two late-Ottoman intellectuals, Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp, and their intellectual claims on selected concept, nation, it would be useful to start with reviewing the period they shined first in order to understand the environment their ideas sprouted.

1. 1. Background of the Second Constituonal Era

The modernization attempts in the *Tanzimat* Period introduced Western-style educational institutions, newspapers, books, and journals. The students in this period, who were born

---

[1] Although it was used 'Second Constitutional Era' here, Aykut Kansu argued that the 'Revolution of 1908' term would address the sociopolitical change of Turkey better. According to him, the Kemalist ideology which was introduced after the establishment of Turkish Republic had influenced the historians and chronicles so intense that, at some point, these scholars had preferred to take 1923 as the year zero while ignoring the enormous sociopolitical contributions of the 1908 Revolution whenever the political and economic origin of the contemporary Turkey were the cases to be studied. This was the reason that the first two decades of the 20th century were mostly ignored in modern historiography; these times were mostly taken as weak and slight steps towards modernization along with promoting an idea that the 'degenerated' and 'despicable' monarchy which was the roots of the all the undesired conditions caused the nation to go all to pieces in these times. Aykut Kansu, *1908 Devrimi*, Ayda Erbal (Trans.), İletişim, İstanbul, 1995, pp. 5-9. In this work, both terms will be used interchangeably.

[2] Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri*, Yedigün, İstanbul, 1960, pp. 97-98.

during the Westernization process of Sultan Mahmut II or after the Edict of *Gülhane*, were educated in the European languages; they were able to read and interpret the works of the European intellectual currents, and some of them even travelled to Europe to study and research. With the help of the 'Westernized' education and the 'positivist' approach they acquired throughout their student days, these students were able to compare the two styles of governance between the European constitutional monarchies and Ottoman absolute monarchy. Hence, the natural outcome of the *Tanzimat* Era was transforming these Ottoman students into modern Ottoman intellectuals, in the European sense.[3] Although they made use of this modernization period's opportunities, they urged to say something about the failing parts of the *Tanzimat* Period. As Bernard Lewis stated, the old question of "Why is the Empire declining?" restated as "Why is the Empire declining while the Europe advances and progresses?", and they questioned the essences of the European success.[4]

1. 1. 1. The Young Ottomans

In the summer of 1865, during a picnic in the woods named Forest of Belgrade in Istanbul, six young men with the names of Mehmed Bey, Namık Kemal Bey, Nuri Bey, Reşad Bey, Ayetullah Bey, and Refik Bey decided to form an organization which had a single goal in the beginning: Changing the absolute monarchy into a constitutional one. Şerif Mardin claimed these men were well-educated, able to speak European languages, and also they were carrying the great names of their families.[5] Their organization, which was going to be named *Genç Osmanlılar Cemiyeti* (Society of Young Ottomans) soon, was a secret society; the membership principles were built on the basis of secrecy, and also it was carrying some inner circles and little organizations within its framework, inspired from the Italian *Carbonari* society.[6] The society grew within a few years, and the number of its members reached to 245; they added several important figures into their ranks including ministers, high-ranking generals, high-ranking police officers, and even princes. The ultimate program of this society was to lead a constitutional monarchy in the Empire, and the decided action to materialize this program was presenting an *ariza* (petition) to Sultan Abdul Aziz. However, this program was offering a slow process and would take a lot of time to be completed; thus, some other ideas started to sprout within the society such as

---

[3] Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi VII. Cilt*, 6th Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 2003, pp. 300-301.
[4] Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 2nd Edition, Oxford University, 1968, p. 130.
[5] Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas*, Syracuse University, 2000, pp. 10-13.
[6] *Ibid*. pp. 20-23.

assassinating the current grand vizier and replacing him. Although they were not able to assassinate the vizier, after their intended actions were heard by the government officers, the Young Ottomans were forced to flee from the country.[7]

Young Ottomans stayed in Europe from 1867 to 1870.[8] As it was stated before, the ultimate goal of the Young Ottomans was to change the absolute monarchy of the Empire to a constitutional one. However, this secret society was not a homogenous entity. Some of them were following Rousseau's ideas on politics whereas others were following Robespierre, Lamartine, and more. Some were in favor of a gradual and modest approach whereas others were championing to establish a republican regime right after establishing the constitutional monarchy. Young Ottomans were lack of a leader, a common worldview, and an exact political program to follow. Tunisian Hayreddin Pasha's famous work written in French named "Reforms Necessary to Muslim States" in 1868 had helped the Young Ottomans to see how a political program should be.[9] Besides, the Young Ottomans were not sitting idle; they were busy with publishing their ideas through their newspapers in various cities of Europe, including *Muhbir* of Ali Suavi and *Hürriyet* of Ziya Pasha and Namık Kemal. In these newspapers, Young Ottomans shifted the agenda of their articles

---

[7] Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi VII…* pp. 302-303.

[8] It could be said that the funding Mustafa Fazıl Pasha provided had helped the Young Ottomans a lot that they were able to publish their ideas via newspapers, and more importantly they were able to survive in the Europe. Although Pasha was carrying different motives, for the memory of his contribution to Turkish revolution history by aiding the Young Ottomans, it would be the beneficial to mention his relationship with them. Mustafa Fazıl was the brother of İsmail Pasha, khedive (*hidiv-* the hereditary governor) of Egypt. Although traditionally it was Mustafa Fazıl's right to ascend to the throne after İsmail's death, İsmail was looking for options to change the tradition and secure the throne for his son after his death. İsmail persuaded sultan who granted what Pasha desired. Soon, Mustafa Fazıl left the country. Mustafa Fazıl was aware the Young Ottomans were working as an opposition force in Europe against the sultan. Thus, he had written a letter to the sultan from Europe in French, and sent a copy of this letter to Young Ottomans. In his letter, he dispraised the Ottoman government of his time and offered a new model by strictly emphasizing on two elements: Freedom and constitution. According to the letter, with the constitutional monarchy, the division between two main elements of the Ottoman society, *millet-i hakime* (the Muslims) and *millet-i mahkume* (non-Muslims) would be disappeared, and the European powers could no longer interfere in the domestic affairs of the Empire. With the impact of this letter and his call for Young Ottomans, Mustafa Fazıl was taken as carrying sincere feelings towards the freedom and constitutional monarchy. Yet, his only genuine desire was to discredit his brother, restore the former tradition of Egypt succession rule, and to get an official pardon from the sultan. Eventually, during Sultan Abdul Aziz's visit in France, Mustafa Fazıl redeemed himself and got a pardon from the sultan, and returned the country with him. The real agenda the sultan was carrying by pardoning Mustafa Fazıl was to leave the Young Ottomans headless, poor, and politically weak. Indeed, soon after his arrival to Istanbul, Pasha stopped funding Young Ottomans and asked them to stop publishing their famous Hürriyet newspaper. Mardin, *The Genesis…* pp. 28-31, Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi VII…* pp. 303-305, 312-313.

[9] Mardin, *The Genesis…* pp. 385-395.

into a program-alike; they had written several articles which were similar to a party program except to be named one.[10]

The main worldview of the Young Ottomans could be summarized as: Young Ottomans were not against the sultan, they were in favor of a constitution, and they had the utmost respect for Islam as long as it does not interfere with the elements of the Ottoman society judicially, which could be named an early phase of secularism. Enver Ziya Karal argued that, many years later, in a book he had written in 1930s named *Zamanımız Avrupa Tarihi*,[11] Yusuf Akçura investigated the articles written in *Hürriyet* newspaper, and summarized the program of Young Ottomans, or the program which could have been if it was organized. According to that, the individuals of the Ottoman society were legally equal, their rights and freedoms were guaranteed by the throne, the justice should be worldly not religious, the love for the fatherland was essential, the government should be transformed into a constitutional one, and in order to achieve these goals propaganda and persuasion were vital rather than violence.[12]

It could be seen that the Young Ottomans was the first political organization in the Ottoman Empire which was seeking a change in the government style. Although its members were mostly conducting their propaganda abroad, they did not have a political leader, and they did not own a stationary headquarters or branches; the Young Ottomans still could be named the first political opposition party in Turkish history, in a modern sense.[13] In some sense, if *Tanzimat* was the origin of Ottomanism as a political ideology by defining all the subjects of the Empire as 'citizens', Young Ottomans could be considered as filling the missing part of this ideology by organizing themselves as a political party.

1. 1. 2. The First Constitutional Era

The roots of the reform quest in the Ottoman Empire that lasted till its collapse could be dated back to the early 17th century. Changing the enthronement system and ending the traditional fratricides in the reign of Sultan Ahmed I, the *Koçi Bey Risalesi* (Koçi Bey's political report) submitted to Sultan Murat IV, the reforms during the vizierate times of the Köprülü family, the reforms during *Lale Devri* (the Tulip Period), and the vast amount of

---

[10] Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi VII...* p. 307.
[11] This book was a compilation of Yusuf Akçura's lecture notes for his 'Political History' courses in his professorship times in the Ankara University Law School during 1929-1931.
[12] *Ibid.* p. 308.
[13] *Ibid.* pp. 313-314.

reform series during Sultan Selim III's and Sultan Mahmut II's reigns could be named among the early official reform attempts. The scope of these proposed reforms varied from military to economics, from administrative to organizational, and from arts to literature. Those reforms were essentially focusing on the imitation of the Western modernization; they were aimed to be implemented to the appropriate areas in order to eradicate fully or at least to stop further worsenings of the adverse situation the Empire witnessed, mostly in military and political fields. Although the initial reforms focused on especially single fields mostly, the *Tanzimat* (Reorganization) Period starting with the Edict of Gülhane (1839) united the reforms in social and political fields at the same time. The complementary chapter of this edict named *Islahat Fermanı* (Ottoman Reform Edict) of 1856 expanded the combination of the mentioned political and social reforms. In fact, these edicts were actually one-sided political actions in the legal sense; sultan was granting the reforms to the public by his own will. The one potent tool that changed the political system from bottom to the top was the declaration of *Kanun-i Esasi* (Ottoman Constitution) in 1876.

The political, economical, and social problems both internally and externally started to grow in the Empire, especially after 1875. On 30 May 1876, a group of political activists led by Ahmet Midhat Pasha deposed Sultan Abdul Aziz from the throne and they replaced him by Sultan Murad V. It was expected from Sultan Murad V to declare a constitution. Soon, after Sultan Murad V went sick and became unable to rule, the same political activists got a promise out of Abdul Hamid, the crown prince, to declare the constitutional monarchy. Thus, on 31 August 1876, the prince ascended to the throne under the name of Sultan Abdul Hamid II. In his early sultanate days, he assigned a commission consisted of twenty-eight men, and ordered the commission to prepare a constitution. The commission that included many Young Ottomans, under the management of Ahmet Mithat Pasha, had translated French and Belgium constitutions with the help of Ziya Pasha and Namık Kemal. Although the first draft was changed a lot by sultan and his viziers, additionally Mithat Pasha, Ziya Pasha, and Namık Kemal insisted on another review, on 23 December 1876 Sultan Abdul Hamid II had put the constitution into force. From that moment on, sultan had to share the power with a parliament.[14] In fact, this constitutional attempt was nothing more than 'tidying up' the absolute monarchy of the Empire. The translated

---

[14] For brief version of reforms during the Empire *see*. Mehmet Karagöz, "Osmanlı Devletinde Islahat Hareketleri ve Batı Medeniyetine Giriş Gayretleri (1700-1839), *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi OTAM*, Vol. 6, No. 6, 1995, pp. 173-194. For detailed version of the same issue, *see*. Donald Quataert, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu 1700-1922*, 3rd Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2003.

constitutions were the most conservative ones of the Europe, the power of the parliament was very limited, and the constitution was biased to sultan rather than the society.[15]

With the inauguration of the parliament on 19 March 1877, the [First] Constitutional Era *(Birinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi)* of the Ottoman Empire had officially started. However, thirty-six days later, Russia declared war on the Empire. The heavy defeat of Ottomans in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 gave Sultan Abdul Hamid II an excuse to suspend the constitution and he dismissed the parliament in 1878. Thus, the first chapter of constitutional monarchy came to an end and over three decades-long absolute rule of Sultan Abdul Hamid II had started.[16]

1. 1. 3. The Young Turks

The Young Ottomans were not able to institute their political desires in their active times completely. Indeed, they had managed to introduce a constitution to the Ottoman society; yet, the presented text with Sultan Abdul Hamid II's several interventions while the constitution was prepared made it a text which was more biased to sultan than the society, which the Young Ottomans did not desire.

Authoritarian rule of Sultan Abdul Hamid II created his own opposition organization: *Jön Türkler* (the Young Turks). In some cases, the researchers tended to divide the Young Ottomans movement and the Young Turks movement into two different and distinctive organizations. Apart from the different periods they lived in and different political situations each camp faced, it was not a meaningful separation. It would be more meaningful to see the Young Turks as a follow-up formation of the Young Ottomans. As one of the eye-witnesses of the Young Turks era, Ahmet Bedevi Kuran stated that regardless of the period, any group seeking for a political transformation which would fit the contemporary needs of the Empire could be named Young Turks.[17]

The Young Turks were consisted of Ottoman males, who were born between 1875 and 1885.[18] They were educated in the modern and Westernized Ottoman schools like *Mülkiye*, *Tıbbiye*, and *Harbiye*; they were reading and discussing the books of the Young Ottomans

---

[15] Kansu, pp. 1-2.

[16] Rifat Uçarol, *Siyasi Tarih 1789-2010*, 8th Edition, Der, İstanbul, 2010, pp. 368-376.

[17] Ahmet Bedevi Kuran, *İnkılâp Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler*, 2nd Edition, Kaynak, İstanbul, 2000, p. 13.

[18] Erik J. Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, I. B. Taurus, London & New York, 2010, p. 110.

which were about liberal ideas, constitutional formulations, and Ottoman patriotism.[19] The Young Turks went beyond the inherited legacy they acquired from the Young Ottomans; they formed a persistent and operative organization, they influenced great number of people from almost every social layer within the Empire, and eventually they were able to transform themselves into a political party. At this point, Kuran's approach fails. From Kuran's perspective mentioned above, the Young Turks were taken as an opposition group which sought a transformation in the political system in the beginning; yet, after they were able to seize the power of the government, secured the transformation they sought and became a government, which group shall be named the Young Turks? Kuran did not mention that.

1. 1. 4. The Committee of Union and Progress

The idea of being organized as an underground political community, named the Committee of Union and Progress shortly afterwards, dated back the Sultan Abdul Hamid II's reign. Although researchers mentioned various approaches to the origins and backgrounds of this organization, they unanimously accept this committee was shaped within the *Mekteb-i Tıbbiye* (Royal Medical Academy) in 1889. Şükrü Hanioğlu claimed that there were several oppositions simultaneously in almost all of the Ottoman schools at this time; yet, this school was serving as a stronghold of the opposition forces. Moreover, he asserted that these political opposition movements had its inception at medical school because of the impact of the biological materialist courses the students deal with, which had an impact on them to carry a vision for an ideal society. Thus, the students confused with what their vision proposed and what they actually experienced.[20] Additionally, in his memoirs, as one of the co-founders of the organization, İbrahim Temo argued that CUP was first established under the shadows of the trees across the Royal Medical Academy building by İshak Sukuti, Mehmed Reşid, Abdullah Cevdet, and by himself on some day of 'May' in order to fight with the 'evil despotism' of Sultan Abdul Hamid II.[21] Although Temo indicated there were four of them at the beginning and did not mention another name,

---

[19] Erik J. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 3rd/Revised Edition, I. B. Taurus, 2004, p.86.
[20] M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, *The Young Turks in Opposition*, Oxford University, 1995, p. 71.
[21] İbrahim Temo, *İbrahim Temo'nun İttihad ve Terakki Anıları*, 2nd Edition, Bülent Demirbaş (Ed.), Arba, İstanbul, 2000, pp. 13-15.

many researchers prefer to add Hüseyinzade Ali as the fifth co-founder[22] whereas some others prefer to count four names only.[23]

On the other hand, Şerif Mardin did not find that purpose on fighting with despotism of Sultan Abdul Hamid II was acceptable alone; instead, he argued that the *'İttihad'* (union) word within the name of the organization actually referred more meaning on preventing the dissolution of the Empire by uniting its elements than a quest for liberty from Sultan Abdul Hamid II's oppression.[24] Mardin indeed accepted CUP was founded as a political organization against the oppression;[25] however, he claimed that the fatherland concept promoted in the written works of the Young Ottomans which were continuously read by the students, and also the instilled patriotism via the lectures as a result of the reforms made in the royal military schools by Süleyman Pasha caused the founders of CUP became more patriotic, therefore more biased to unity.[26] Additionally, Tunaya argued that the organization was established under the name of *İttihad-i Osmani* (Union of Ottomans) first on 3 June 1889 (21 May 1305 in *Rumî* calendar, this is why Temo named the month 'May' in his memoirs); the group contacted with Ahmet Rıza Bey, the leader of Young Turks who was in Paris, and changed its name to *Osmanlı İttihad ve Terakki Cemiyeti* (Ottoman Committee of Union and Progress).[27] With Tunaya's statement on the former name of the organization, it can be said that this group were indeed in favor of the *'ittihad'* (union) word as Mardin pointed out.

In some sense, from the beginning to the end, the biggest actor of the Second Constitutional Era was CUP. During the ten-years-long period from 1908 to 1918, fourteen governments were formed.[28] Sina Akşin argued CUP had always a control over these governments, in one way or another. Moreover, in order to materialize his approach, Akşin

---

[22] *see*. Cemal Kutay, *Prens Sabahattin Bey, Sultan II. Abdülhamit, İttihat ve Terakki*, Tarih, İstanbul, 1964, p. 68. and Enver Ziya Karal, *Osmanlı Tarihi VIII. Cilt*, 6th Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 2007, p. 514.

[23] *see*. Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, *Türk İnkılâbı Tarihi Cilt I Kısım I*, 4th Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1991, p. 64.

[24] Şerif Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri 1895-1908*, 15th Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2008, pp. 76-77.

[25] *Ibid*. p. 33.

[26] *Ibid*. p. 62.

[27] Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler – Cilt I: İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi 1908-1918*, 2nd Edition, Hürriyet Vakfı, İstanbul, 1988, p. 19.

[28] These governments in chronological order were: Mehmet Said Pasha Government, Kamil Pasha Government, Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha Government, Tevfik Pasha Government, Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha Government (second time), İbrahim Hakkı Pasha Government, Mehmet Said Pasha Government (second time), Mehmet Said Pasha Government (third time), Gazi Ahmed Muhtar Pasha Government, Kamil Pasha Government (second time), Mahmut Şevket Pasha Government, Mehmed Said Halim Pasha Government, Mehmed Talat Pasha Government, and Mehmed Talat Pasha Government (second time). *Ibid*. p. 7.

divided the Second Constitutional Era into two large political periods in terms of the tightness of the mentioned control. According to him, due to their youth and being inexperienced in active politics, from the beginning of the Second Constitutional Era to the formation of Mehmed Said Halim Pasha Government in 1913, CUP was pulling the wires of the governments behind the veil. With the Said Halim Pasha Government till the end of the Second Constitutional Era, as a result of adding politically influential members to their ranks, CUP had the "absolute power" on the Ottoman governments.[29] From the perspective of Akşin's division, the fate of the governments in the first period was depending on the satisfaction of CUP; some of the governments lasted only less than a week whereas some of them lived for months.[30] Lastly, it should be mentioned that the influence of Enver Pasha, Talat Pasha, and Cemal Pasha, three high-ranking officers of CUP, was so intense in the Ottoman politics in the second period that the famous historian Cemal Kutay named this period *"Üç Paşalar İktidarı"* (Triumvirate of Three Pashas), and pointed out the whole ruling power was 'supposedly' attached on them.[31]

1. 2. The Second Constitutional Era

As a very generalized and simple definition, the Second Constitutional Era (*İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi)* was a constitutional monarchic era in the late Ottoman Empire history which started with the reinstatement of the Ottoman parliament *(Meclis-i Mebusan)* and the Constitution *(Kanun-i Esasi)* on 23 July 1908. The beginning of the era was clear; however, its end was controversial.[32] Tunaya claimed the Second Constitutional Era was a

---

[29] Sina Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, 5th Edition, İmge, Ankara, 2009, pp. 144-145, 387-388. These periods indeed could be helpful to understand the influence of CUP over the Ottoman political system; however, Akşin's division makes the small but influential timeline between these two periods blurry. The first period reflects his approach clearly, also the second one. However, the grey part which could include *Sopalı Seçimler* (Election of/through Clubs) in 1912, *Bab-ı Ali Baskını* (Ottoman coup d'etat) in 1913, and the assasination of Mahmud Şevket Pasha in 1913 provide some important events alone to deserve forming another period between the mentioned two large periods.

[30] In order to review the exact lives of these governments and also their political programs, *see*. İhsan Güneş, "II. Meşrutiyet Dönemi Hükümet Programları (1908-1918)", *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi OTAM*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1990, pp. 171-269.

[31] Cemal Kutay, *Üç Paşalar Kavgası*, Tarih, İstanbul, 1964, p. 5.

[32] According to Tunaya, the end of the Second Constitutional Era varied, and various scholars claimed various dates for it. According to these various dates, the era ended with the Treaty of Mudros on 30 October 1918, the last congress of the Union and Progress Party on 5 November 1918, the occupation of Izmir on 15 May 1919, the declaration of the decisions taken in the Sivas Congress on 11 September 1919, the occupation of Istanbul on 16 March 1920, the establishment of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on 23 April 1920, the Treaty of Sèvres on 10 August 1920, ratifying the Turkish Constitution of 1921 on 20 January 1921, the abolition of the Ottoman Sultanate on 1 November 1922, and the declaration of the Turkish Republic on 29 October 1923. Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *Hürriyet'in İlanı: İkinci Meşrutiyet'in Siyasi Hayatına Bakışlar*, Cumhuriyet Gazetesi, July 1998, pp. 20-23.

part of the Empire; therefore, it had to be considered within the Ottoman time. Hence, the abolition of the Ottoman Sultanate on 1 November 1922 would be a precise date to end the era.[33] However, after looking from Tunaya's perspective, the end of the First Constitutional Era does not fit the profile. It was indeed already a part of the Empire; yet, it had started with the establishment of the parliament and ended with its dismissal. Therefore, if the same method applied to the Second Constitutional Era, it would be more meaningful to end the era precisely on 11 April 1920 when the parliament was 'officially' dismissed with the pressure of the invasion forces, or 16 March 1920 with the occupation of Istanbul which 'eventually' caused its dismissal.

The 'over three decades long' absolute monarchy of Sultan Abdul Hamid II came to an end with the beginning of this era. Just like the controversy about end of the era, there are various views on the intellectual and political contributions of the Second Constitutional Era; some scholars praised its outcomes whereas others were hesitant on its contributions. For instance, according to Tunaya, the Second Constitutional Era was an introduction to the hopes on easing the troubles and materializing long-awaited aspirations for the Ottoman society, and it was presented as a project to end the oppression and secure the liberty. However, from the legal perspective, Tunaya asserted that neither the oppression was fully removed nor the liberty was authentically secured during this period.[34] On the other hand, Feroz Ahmad appreciated the Second Constitutional Era, and he claimed the Empire entered the 20th century not with the year of 1900 but precisely on 23 July 1908.[35] Additionally, as one of the most prolific historians of the recent century, Halil İnalcık claimed the 1908 Revolution set the stage for the modern Turkish Republic, and it was essential to fully understand the Second Constitutional Era in order to comprehend the characteristics of today's Turkish Republic.[36]

The Second Constitutional Era lasted merely a little longer than a decade; however, this decade was perhaps 'the longest decade' of the Ottoman Empire, inspired from İlber Ortaylı's characterization for the 19th century as 'the longest century of the Empire'.[37] The

---

[33] *Ibid.* pp. 20-23.
[34] Tunaya, *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler – Cilt I...* p. 3.
[35] Feroz Ahmad, *Turkey: A Quest for Identity*, Oneworld, Oxford, 2003, p. 49 and also Feroz Ahmad, *The Making of Modern Turkey*, Routledge, London & New York, 1993, p. 31.
[36] Halil İnalcık, "II. Meşrutiyet: Anayasa Rejimi Geliyor, Cumhuriyet Yolu Açılıyor" in Taşkın Takış & Sunay Aksoy (Ed.), *Doğu Batı Halil İnalcık: Makaleler II*, Doğu Batı, Ankara, October 2008, pp. 203-209.
[37] İlber Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, Timaş, İstanbul, 2008.

Armenian Question, the Battle of Tripoli, the Balkan Wars, the 31 March Incident, the revision of the Constitution, and frequent government changes were some important political events happened during the Second Constitutional Era. Additionally, with the end of the 33-years-long reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid II and also his despotism and censorship policies, the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 revived the long-restrained activities like writing, publishing, printing, and reporting which reached their peak in this time, both in quality and quantity. The emergence of new intellectual movements, the emphasis on positive sciences in the social fields, the adaptations of Western-oriented methods into the politics and economics were all simultaneous actions of the same era. Lastly, in some sense, the most remarkable characteristic of the Second Constitutional Era was the rise and the domination of CUP in the Ottoman politics.

1. 2. 1. The Press and its Influence on Intellectual Movements

The critiques on the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid II underlined two particular characteristics: Informant spies and censorship on publications. The spies who worked coordinated with the law enforcement agencies were reporting anyone who said anything wicked about the sultan or declared anything related with the opposition to the regime, even slightly. The information and spying organization of Sultan Abdul Hamid II was so developed that almost all the government offices and departments, regardless of their official rank, had a few informants within; even within the chamber of council of ministers (*meclis-i vükela*) there were several spies to monitor the ministers. Additionally, after transferring every single government chapters to Yıldız Palace, where Sultan Abdul Hamid II resided, even the lowest ranked officers were eager to inform their colleagues to the sultan. The spy network within the country was incredibly developed; any news from any of the provinces of the Empire was able to reach to the capital rapidly.[38]

The censorship Sultan Abdul Hamid II applied to publications however was in a whole different league. According to the last Ottoman official chronicler Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi, in order to keep the public uninformed about the adverse situation the Empire was experiencing, Sultan Abdul Hamid II applied a strict censorship on publications; even on the textbooks the students read in schools. The lectures of teachers during class hours, the books which the teachers prefer for the students, even the short-talks of the lecturers during

---

[38] Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi, *Son Vak'anüvis Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi Tarihi: II. Meşrutiyet Olayları (1908-1909)*, Bayram Kodaman & Mehmet Ali Ünal (Ed.), Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1996, pp. 5-6.

break times were all monitored. Şeref Efendi claimed the whole Ottoman education system was transformed into an *"encümen-i hamuşane"* (council of silence). The historical books, story books, scientific books, even the religious and Islamic law books were censored. The newspapers could be closed for an indefinite time because of a single 'inappropriate' word they used in their articles or news.[39]

The combination of spying organization and censorship on publications under the shadow of Sultan Abdul Hamid II's autocratic regime resulted in the hunger for getting information. Indeed, right after the 1908 revolution, according to the official records, from July 1908 to December 1911, although many of them did not publish anything, the permit applications to the government's press office in order to get permission to publish periodicals[40] were around 2000. The total amount of newspapers in Istanbul rose from 52 in 1907 to 377 in 1909, whereas the total amount of newspapers in all over the country rose from 120 in 1907 to 730 in 1909. However, although the number of periodicals was low during Sultan Abdul Hamid II's reign, they were not in a poor quality. In his time, anything was allowed to be written, except politics. Thus, the newspapers during the oppression period focused on writing in a vast variety of cultural articles; and they served as a beneficial tool to acculturate the Ottoman society. However, with the immediate genesis of a new chapter in the Ottoman history, 1908 Revolution, the former periodicals lost their bearings. They had no experience on writing about politics and many of them were once pro-Hamidian. In the early days of the revolution, former major newspapers like *İkdam*, *Sabah*, *Tercüman*, and *Saadet* began to exalt the constitution and also the 'freedom fighters'. They started to fire their former personnel and replace them with new pro-constitution writers. As a good example of this media transformation, on the second day of the revolution, 25 July 1908, *İkdam* showed itself with a 'refreshed' writer army; added several writers from various intellectual backgrounds to its ranks including Babanzade İsmail Hakkı, Hüseyin Cahit, Abdullah Cevdet, and Ahmet Rasim. Moreover, Orhan Koloğlu claimed that the 'true' missions of the media like warning and balancing the government, recording the history, and being the voice of the public which are still valid

---

[39] *Ibid*. pp. 6-7.

[40] The non-Muslim elements of the Empire had also benefited from this boom in media. According to Çağlar Keyder, between 1908 and 1914, the Armenian communities alone had published more than 200 journals. Additionally, the non-Muslim population of the Empire was interested in cultural activities like theatre and literature during this period. For detailed economic analysis of the 1908 Revolution, *see.* Çağlar Keyder, *State and Class in Turkey: A Study in Capitalist Development*, Verso, London & New York, 1987, pp. 49-69).

today were originated in the early times of the 1908 Revolution. The familiar Turkish words like *muhabir* (reporter) and *efkâr-ı umûmiye* (public opinion) were invented in this period. Additionally, the Press Law *(Matbuat Kanunu)* which was valid till 1931 with some minor amendments and Printing Press Law *(Matbaa Kanunu)* were two important products of this era.[41]

The intellectual movements inspired from the West and their adaptations into the Empire were not a new fact for the Ottoman elites. However, with the Second Constitutional Era, as a result of a booming variety of periodicals including dailies, weeklies, bi-weeklies, and monthlies, the intellectual movements could finally be introduced to the masses. The periodicals like *Türk Yurdu*, *Milli Tetebbular Mecmuası*, *Halka Doğru*, *İçtimaiyat Mecmuası*, and *Yeni Mecmua* had helped to spread the Turkish nationalism movement.[42] *Volkan*, *Beyan-ül Hak*, *Sada-i Din*, *Tarık-i Hidayet*, *Medrese*, *İlmiye*, and *Sebilürreşad* (former *Sırat-ı Müstakim*) were some famous periodicals which were promoting Islam in the political area.[43] Some periodicals such as *Servet-i Fünun* and *Ulum-i İktisadiye ve İçtimaiye* were in favor of Westernization.[44] The intellectuals who were promoting the Ottomanism ideal were writing their articles in their famous *İctihad* journal.[45] Apart from these popular intellectual movements, some other 'not-so-popular' movements were also represented in the press during this time. For instance, although not many of them were able to last longer than a few months, the periodicals including *Sosyalist*, *Beşeriyet*, *Medeniyet*, *İdrak*, and Hüseyin Hilmi's famous *İştirak* were championing the socialism movement.[46]

1. 3. Intellectual Movements in the Second Constitutional Era

Halil İnalcık, who was a respected scholar of Ottoman history, asserted that the classical Ottoman society had two main classes: The Ottoman officials (he named these *"askeri"*) and the Ottoman subjects *(reaya)*. The *askeri* class varied; included the government officers in the palace and provinces, and also the Muslim scholars *(ulema)*. *Reaya* on the

---

[41] Orhan Koloğlu, *Osmanlı Dönemi Basınının İçeriği*, İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi, İstanbul, 2010, pp. 220-245.
[42] *Ibid.* p. 246.
[43] Hıfzı Topuz, *100 Soruda Türk Basın Tarihi*, Gerçek, İstanbul, 1973, pp. 102-105.
[44] Akşin, *Jön Türkler...* pp. 381-383.
[45] Selçuk Akşin Somel, "Osmanlı Reform Çağında Osmanlıcılık Düşüncesi (1839-1913)" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce – Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası: Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi*, 8th Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2009, pp. 88-116.
[46] Koloğlu, *Osmanlı Dönemi Basınının İçeriği...* p. 246.

other hand, consisted of the public who paid taxes alone and did not involve in politics and government affairs.[47] From this perspective, it can be claimed that whenever the political agenda in the Empire shifted into a quest for a reform, the *askeri* class had always directed the operation of these reforms. Indeed, the reforms were solely performed by the 'hand' of the government, especially after the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699. For instance, when the 'society' needed a reform, the *askeri* class tried to fix it by inventing tools such as the *Tanzimat* Edict or Ottomanism. When they realized the 'military' was in need of a reform, they tried to fix it with importing some reforms from the Europe like modernizing the army or sending military officers to Europe. Additionally, the *askeri* class did not only send military officers to Europe but also several Ottoman students to be educated in contemporary sciences during the *Tanzimat* Era. At some time, sending students to Europe during this era became a state policy for the Empire. Similarly, the Western-style schools in the Empire were established simultaneously. As a result of these, the state started to apply these 'learned' advances of the Europe to the Empire.[48]

These students indeed had brought what they learned from Europe to the Empire; however, they also brought some political ideas with them. The Young Ottomans, the Young Turks, and eventually CUP members were simply the outcomes of this decades-long state policy on modernization. By this, another element participated in the centuries-long reform-making tradition which was conducted by the 'hand' of the state earlier: The Ottoman intellectuals. The Second Constitutional Era had granted the Ottoman intellectuals a liberal environment and promotion of freedom of speech. Thus, the intellectuals had also participated in reform actions, and they called all these reform processes 'modernization'. Due to the centuries-long source on importing scientific and technical materials for the Empire was Europe, which was eventually the West, this modernization term was often used interchangeably with the 'Westernization'. Hence, during the Second Constitutional Era, regardless of their ultimate or vital goals, every single intellectual movement attached the utmost importance to modernization. At some point during this era, regardless of their intellectual approaches, the modernization concept was embraced so tight by the Ottoman intellectuals that the concept was taken as the sole salvation which was taken as to be able to save all the Ottoman sociopolitical system alone. Considering the fact that the

---

[47] Şerif Mardin, *Din ve İdeoloji*, 4th Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 1990, pp. 80-81.
[48] Aynur Erdoğan, "Tanzimat Döneminde Yurtdışına Öğrenci Gönderme Olgusu ve Osmanlı Modernleşmesine Etkileri", *İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Dergisi*, Vol. 3, No. 20, 2010, pp. 121-151.

intellectual movements in the late Ottoman period were mainly focusing on to find a remedy to the adverse situation of the Empire through their own intellectual agendas; indeed, almost all of the intellectuals accepted and exalted the modernization concept. Thereby, the intellectual movements of this era focused on justifying and explaining themselves by interpreting the proposals of modernization, and adjusting its proposals along with their very own intellectual discourses.

In his famous book *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri* (Westernization Movements in Turkish Political Life) Tunaya divided the intellectuals during the Second Constitutional Era, according to their political proposals, into five distinctive trends as Westernists, Islamists, Turkists, Socialists, and *meslekçiler* (liberals). All of these trends were represented by some famous intellectuals, and each of these trends was convinced that they were providing the best answer for the famous "How to save this state?" question. Additionally, almost all the intellectuals during this era were affiliated with one trend or another; even so, there were some intellectuals like Tevfik Fikret, Nüzhet Sabit, and Ali Kemal, who did not prefer any kind of obvious affiliation but they also involved in debates started by other members of these trends.[49] These trends were spreading their ideas via their periodicals as it was stated above. Thereby, depending on the number and the circulation of their periodicals, their promoted ideas were able to reach to the masses. During the Second Constitutional Era, almost all of these ideas were represented either as large groups or a few members in the parliament. Nevertheless, some of these intellectual trends were represented within the organizational body of CUP whereas some were capable of organizing as an opposition party against CUP. Regardless of these five intellectual trends were organized as a political party or not, they all had a sociopolitical program to follow and dictate.

1. 3. 1. Westernists

The Westernists in the Empire during the Second Constitutional Era were not a homogenous group. They accepted the West as the 'genuine' civilization with their both heart and soul, and their solution on the contemporary question about saving the state was transforming into a civilized state and eventually civilized society which could be 'scientifically' formulated as 'to be Westernized'. Their first and foremost purpose on this

---

[49] Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında…* pp. 76-77.

formulation was to import the economic and social life models of the West (addressing Europe) while equipping the society with contemporary scientific and technical developments. The Westernists were indeed not a homogenous group; however, the 'importing the European social life' caused them to split into two large camps. According to Celal Nuri and his followers, there were two types of civilization: The technical civilization and the 'authentic' civilization. As the authentic civilization, European and the Christian world could never be considered as advanced; the Japanese advancement in science and technique was a good example on this. Thus, there was no need to import anything else from the West other than the technical civilization. On the other hand, Abdullah Cevdet and his followers were taking the European civilization as a whole; they advocated importing 'everything' about that civilization. They were not worried about a cultural transformation of the Empire after this trade; hence, their motto of this approach was explained by Tunaya as 'to take the rose with its thorns'. At this point, Tunaya claimed that due to the Ottoman government was promoting a Turkist and Islamist program during the Second Constitutional Era, Westernism movement could not find an efficient position within the government and they had to wait for a change in the regime or state-policy. Yet, with the establishment of the Turkish Republic, many followers of the Westernism trend were assigned in some effective official positions and they were able to promote their ideas which varied in time.[50]

The two large camps of Westernism that Tunaya divided indeed offer a good vantage point to review the Westernism movement in the late Ottoman times. According to Celal Nuri, the intellectual who represented one camp, the Western civilization was nothing but a source to be benefited in liberty, democracy, science, and commerce. He claimed the Empire had many challenges in various areas and these challenges could only be solved by

---

[50] *Ibid*. pp. 78-81. Although it would not fit what this thesis focus on, and it would require some serious efforts to scan 'all' the Westernists, Tunaya's claim on this 'official assignment' needs a brief explanation. For instance, Tunaya's claim could be valid for Celal Nuri since he had represented Gallipoli in the Ankara Parliament in 1921, revised the constitution in order to make the declaration of the republic possible in 1922, Recep Duymaz, "Celâl Nuri İleri" in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 7, TDV, İstanbul, 1993, pp. 242-245, and became a deputy in Grand National Assembly of Turkey for four times after the establishment of the Turkish Republic. Necmi Uyanık, "Celal Nuri İleri ve Tarih Anlayışı", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, No. 16, Fall 2004, pp. 239-258. On the other hand, another Westernist, Abdullah Cevdet was officially banned from all possible official positions for the rest of his life with the decision of the Ankara Government due to his actions against the national forces during the Turkish War of Independence. M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak Doktor Abdullah Cevdet ve Dönemi*, Üçdal, İstanbul, 1981, pp. 385-386. Therefore, it can be said that 'some' of the Westernists had indeed participated in shaping the new regime after the fall of the Empire while 'some' of them were not welcomed by the new regime.

importing different 'modern advances' from different advanced nations per area. The Japanese managed to do that, and Russia which was actually an Asian state, as conservative as the Ottomans, and stationed next to the Empire had also managed to advance and became Europeanized. Hence, the Western civilization could be separated into two parts as the 'industrial' and the 'ethical'. The ethical West was cruel, imperialistic, and immoral. For the Empire, it was not needed to import that part of the West but the industrial one with its science, technique, and skill. Celal Nuri formulated his Westernism approach by reviewing three major characteristics of the Empire as being Muslim, being Ottoman, and being Turk. In order to advance in contemporary sciences and become Europeanized, the Empire had to consider these three main characteristics to secure a successful Westernization process.[51]

On the other hand, the second camp that was represented best by Abdullah Cevdet had a different perspective on the Westernism. In the early times of the 1908 Revolution, Abdullah Cevdet was influenced by Muhammad Abduh and he was championing a synthesis between the Western technique and the Eastern culture; he was promoting a selective Westernization just like Celal Nuri by mentioning the famous Japanese technological advance example.[52] However, in time, Cevdet gradually left this kind of synthesis and started to promote the supremacy of the Europe in all aspects after 1914. According to him, it was clear that the Empire had to be Westernized; however, this Westernization could not be completed simply by imitating the Western technique but it was required to implement the cultural values of the West to the society as well. Moreover, he had written a book about the European way of living in order to introduce the Western culture to the Ottoman society. He claimed that the existing traditional structure of the Empire and also the East should be abandoned completely, and the Western civilization should be replaced with it. According to Cevdet, the first and foremost step towards Westernization was changing the mentality of the members of the Ottoman society. In order to do that, he had translated several works of European authors like Shakespeare, and these translations became so popular in the Empire that they could only be found in the black markets for very high prices. However, Hanioğlu claimed that the translated books were selected precisely by Cevdet to support his ideas and they included so many footnotes

---

[51] Necmi Uyanık, "Batıcı Bir Aydın Olarak Celâl Nuri İleri ve Yenileşme Sürecinde Fikir Hareketlerine Bakışı", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 1, No. 15, 2004, pp. 227-274.
[52] Hanioğlu, *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak…* pp. 183-191.

written by Abdullah Cevdet himself that he was explaining almost every single sentence written by the original author.[53]

Although they were not organized as a political party, it could be claimed that the Westernists had a "program" to follow and dictate which could be summarized through their articles and speeches. Indeed, regardless of the two major camps mentioned above, Peyami Safa considered the Westernism movement as a whole by ignoring two specific camps, and he managed to retrieve the Westernist agenda under twenty-one topics in two articles written in *İctihad* (Interpretation) journal through 'a dream' of an unnamed Westernist. Although the program of the Westernists had various items; yet, these could be categorized under seven main chapters. Their first category of this program was about removing the drawbacks of the 'unnecessary' religious institutions. According to Westernists, dervish convents and lodges were two shady products of Islamic tradition and shall be eradicated. Additionally, the imposters like religious healers shall be removed from the society. As the second category, they focused on making reforms on the fashion in clothing. They were in favor of removing the fez and replacing it with something else which they weren't able to decide what it would be or name it yet. The turbans shall be allowed to be worn only by professors, and women shall not be hidden behind the chador. The third category was about improving the education system. The girls of the Ottoman society shall not be restricted on education including medical schools, and also there shall be orally-education institutions for the oldies and illiterates. Madrasahs shall be transformed into high schools like *Collège de France* or higher education schools like *Ècole Politechnique*. Additionally, instead of following a path to educate the Ottoman princes with the pointless preaches of the black servants and the eunuchs, the heirs of the throne shall be trained within the army.

The emphasis on women and women's rights showed itself on the fourth category in the program of the Westernists. Thereby, the women shall wear as they desire and they shall be able to go out alone; no men including the police or the religious fanatics shall interrupt them as long as they did not disturb the public peace. No men, including the sultan himself, shall marry more than one woman. Arranged marriages shall no longer be accepted as a tradition, and divorcement shall not be completed with three words alone. The fifth category was about the language. The Westernists rejected the *Turan* language (archaic

---

[53] *Ibid*. pp. 357-370.

Turkish), and they insisted on defining the 'genuine' language of the Empire as the Ottoman language. The Ottoman language shall be re-shaped in the Latin alphabet, a new introduction book to introduce the grammar rules to the society shall be prepared, and the heavy burden on Ottoman language to require learning Arabic and Persian shall be eased. As the sixth category, the Westernists focused on a reform on the judiciary system and laws. The traditional Shari'a courts shall be abolished, and the legal courts shall be reformed. All the laws shall be improved, and *Mecelle* (Ottoman code of civil law) shall either be abolished or be remodeled according to a European type of civil law. The last category on the program of the Westernists was claiming that the members of the Ottoman society should build the roads, bridges, ports, ships, canals, ferries, and factories by their own individual enterprises, without expecting anything from the government or the foreigners. With the growth of these individual enterprises, the domestic products would grow and vary, and all the personnel of the governmental and military institutions including the sultan would be constrained to use these domestic products.[54]

This program of the Westernists asserted by Safa had two problems within: First, Safa had preferred to veil the name of the writer of this article; however, it was Kılıçzade İsmail Hakkı who was a Westernist and these two articles he had written titled *Pek Uyanık Bir Uyku* (A Very Awake Sleep) was not only considered a Westernist program to follow and dictate but also a draft of Atatürk's future reforms.[55] Second, Safa had preferred to consider Westernists as a whole and he had forgotten the heavy impact of Abdullah Cevdet, who was a fierce Western fanatic and he had even proposed to import 'men' from the West to add European blood to Turkish veins.[56] With the help of these two points, it would be more meaningful to consider the Westernism movement during the Second Constitutional Era as not homogenous which was stated in the first sentence.

1. 3. 2. Islamists

Yusuf Akçura claimed that the origin of Islamism was based on the teachings what the Young Ottomans had learned from the West, and Islamism had emerged by implementing these Western teachings to Islam.[57] Ali Bulaç agreed to this comment and claimed the

---

[54] Peyami Safa, *Türk İnkılâbına Bakışlar*, Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1981, pp. 49-53.
[55] Celal Pekdoğan, "Kılıçzâde Hakkı" in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 25, TDV, İstanbul, 2002, pp. 415-416.
[56] *Ibid.* and Hanioğlu, *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak…* pp. 387-388.
[57] Yusuf Akçura, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1976, p. 21.

Islamic teachings had likened to the dominant teachings with Western concepts; the main purpose was to advance the East in a Western-style.[58] However, in time, Islam became tended to articulate itself to the new teachings emerged in the West, which caused to miss the 'essence' of Islam.[59] This essence was based on the individuals. Since Islam was a social entity, the individuals were precious for Islam; because, they were the nucleus of ummah. On the other hand, the Western teachings had always ignored the individuals and focused on the state alone.[60] Since the Islamism was also based on 'saving the state' idea, it was forgotten that Islam had already a supra-ages message and the '-isms' introduced by the Western intellectual teachings were constituted by men. Therefore, none of these '-isms' could be modern, except Islam.[61] Hence, the modernization approach was a 'destructive' policy, and the Islamists missed the point that Islam was modern but not contemporary. Therefore, it was required to distinguish these two differences before anything else.[62]

Tunaya argued that Islamism was the most influential and the strongest movement among all the political and ideological movements during the Second Constitutional Era. He claimed that, apart from being an intellectual movement, Islamism was indeed both an ideological and a political movement. According to him, Islamism was an 'ideological' movement because it claimed it was originally an idea and belief system which had the ability to create institutions and mobilize the social masses. Additionally, Islamism was a 'political' movement because it sought to preserve the Empire as a whole, and sought to direct the Empire to a common goal to remain its desired integrity.[63] The Islamists argued that the Empire was in need of an Islamic *renaissance*. Due to the fact that Islam was supreme and complete in all senses, it also included all the possible answers for any question within. Thus, in order to implement that intended *renaissance* into the Ottoman society, it was required to head towards the main sources of Islam rather than seeking an adventure by importing the civilization from the West. The West was cruel, exploiter, selfish, and vindictive; the Westerners lacked in the morale whereas the Muslims had the furthest range in morale and ethics. The politics needed morale and ethics more than

---

[58] Ali Bulaç, *İslâm Dünyasında Düşünce Sorunları*, 2nd Edition, İnsan, İstanbul, 1985, pp. 73-74.
[59] *Ibid.* p. 78.
[60] Ali Bulaç, *İslâm ve Demokrasi Teokrasi – Totaliterizm*, 2nd Edition, Beyan, İstanbul, 1993, pp. 157-163.
[61] Ali Bulaç, *Çağdaş Kavramlar ve Düzenler*, 11th Edition, Endülüs, İstanbul, 1991, pp. 17-18.
[62] *Ibid.* pp. 20-21.
[63] Tarık Z. Tunaya, "Amme Hukukumuz Bakımından İkinci Meşrutiyetin Siyasî Tefekküründe «İslâmcılık» Cereyanı", *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası*, Vol. 19, No. 3-4, 1954, pp. 630-770.

anything else. In order to seek the answers for the contemporary questions, it was required to consult to Islam. However, *içtihad kapısı* ([the gates of] ijtihad – the ability to read Quran and hadith and interpret them according to the needs of the contemporary problems) had already been closed for a long time, and it should be re-opened in order to be a great civilization again. During its quest for a transformation, after seeing the gates were closed, the Empire consulted to the West in order to make the *renaissance* real. Importing everything from the West was unacceptable; the Muslims should only take the science and technique from the West, which belonged to the Muslims once. There was no need to import 'unnecessary' things from the West; for instance, importing a French civic law was unnecessary while the Ottomans had their own *Mecelle*.[64]

The Islamists during the Second Constitutional Era were not a homogenous group. There was a group which could be named conservatives like *Şeyhülislam* (Shayk al-Islam) Musa Kazım Efendi.[65] According to this group, Shari'a was the sum of pure wisdom, pure truth, and pure justice; it was not proper to deviate, even slightly, from the path of religion and Shari'a. On the other hand, Islamists had a second group which followed a modernist path while championing Islam, including Mehmet Akif, Mehmet Şemseddin [Günaltay],[66] and Said Halim Pasha.[67] The members of this group were capable of speaking and reading in both a Western language and Arabic. A combination of their readings from both sides of the world brought them an idea on interpretation of the main sources of Islam in order to find answers for the contemporary questions.

Due to the Westernization process was the dominant approach in the Empire for centuries, every particular movement during the Second Constitutional Era tried to answer the Westernists with their own agenda, instead of building a unique one. From Peyami Safa's approach, the agenda of the Islamists, regardless of their clique, can be summarized under four chapters. According to this, the Islamists believed in establishing a great Islamic union, a selective method should be followed while importing modernization from the West, the women's rights and polygamy shall be taken into consideration within the God's

---

[64] Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında...* pp. 81-86.

[65] For his life and selected articles written in various periodicals *see*. İsmail Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi 1 Metinler Kişiler*, 3rd Edition, Dergâh, İstanbul, 2017, pp. 105-137.

[66] For his life and selected articles written in various periodicals *see*. İsmail Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi 2 Metinler Kişiler*, 3rd Edition, Dergâh, İstanbul, 2017, pp. 1069-1117.

[67] Said Halim Pasha's Islamism program alone will be discussed in the next chapter. For detailed information on Said Halim Pasha, *see*. Kudret Bülbül, *Siyasal Bir Düşünür ve Devlet Adamı Said Halim Paşa*, Tezkire, İstanbul, 2015.

rules, and the jurisdiction should be based on Shari'a.[68] Although Safa claimed these titles were the main characteristics of the Islamists as a whole, it would be beneficial to review these titles under the light of conservative and modernist Islamist discourses.

Tunaya claimed that the Islamists were indeed agreed with each other on establishing a great Islamic union in the political field. According to Said Halim Pasha, such a union would counter-weigh the European pressure against the Empire and also the Muslim world. The Western interest was working hard to destroy the last stronghold of Islam, the Empire. However, such a unity could not be established overnight. Therefore, the first attempt on this unity should be focused on the non-materialistic elements. The bond of Islam would gather and unite the Muslims; and only by then, a political unity could be on the agenda. The Islamists were all agreed this part; however, the problem surfaced when it was time to find the 'best' political system for such a great unity. Tunaya claimed there were not many proposals on this issue. Yet, with the inspiration from the nationalist movements emerged in the Muslim world, it was planned to make the unity real which the Islamist named this theory *aile-i İslâmiye* (Family of Muslims) by following two phases: First the Muslim [ethnic] nations would become independent states, and later the whole [ethnic] nations of Islam would unite and create the Islamic union.[69]

In the Islamist works in this period, even in the smallest brochures, Islamists defended Islam was not an obstacle to progress *(İslam mani-i terakki değildir)*.[70] Indeed, in several works of Said Halim Pasha, this approach can be tracked. For instance, in a book he had written in 1917 with the name of *Taassub* (Fanaticism), he claimed: "[…] the opinion about our Shari'a was the reason that caused us to fell behind is nothing but a groundless, vain, and wrong idea*"*.[71] The same tendency on defending Islam in the same issue showed itself in Mehmet Akif as well:

> Your thinkers did not understand the religion at all;
> Their understanding on the soul of Islam is very wrong.
> They think: It (Islam) cannot tolerate the progress;

---

[68] Safa, pp. 55-59.
[69] Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *İslâmcılık Akımı*, 2nd Edition, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, İstanbul, 2007, pp. 80-81.
[70] *Ibid*. pp. 14-16.
[71] *"[…] Şeriat'imizin, geri kalmamıza sebep olduğu hakkındaki kanaat, asılsız, boş ve yanlış bir düşünceden başka bir şey değildir."* in Said Halim Paşa, *Buhranlarımız ve Son Eserleri*, 5th Edition, M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (Ed.), İz, İstanbul, 2006, p. 150.

It cannot advance with the contemporary works.[72]

Due to the Islamists were also making an effort to position themselves against the Westernists, and also the modernization was the common element that all the intellectual movements tried to comment on with their own discourses, the Islamists had also participated in what to take from the West and what to preserve. According to them, the Muslims were only in need of the science and technique of the West. The East had already some 'superior elements' against the West like the justice and brotherhood; therefore, there was no need to import these.[73] The Islamists were in favor of establishing an imaginary customs office at the borders to check what to import. This tendency showed itself in Mehmet Akif's poem as well:

> The things of the West can pass if they are worthy;
> The sins that come as fashion will rot in the customs![74]

According to the former Ottoman Shaykh al-Islam Musa Kâzım Efendi, who was representing the conservative camp of the Islamists, the liberties could not only limited with the laws but also by the religious rules. He claimed the women had to veil themselves by the order of Shari'a; additionally, according to the 4th and 13th articles of the Ottoman Constitution, the religion of the state was Islam and therefore this proposal could be taken as a law as well. Moreover, he claimed that the marriage had two main purposes: Continuity of the generations and preserving the modesty and honor. Therefore, marrying with four women could not be taken as a false act but a great act for the benefit of the society by increasing the population and restraining the men to commit a sin by committing adultery. He complained and also wished that if there were more men that were able to marry with four women; only by then, there would be fewer women in their homes desperately waiting to getting old.[75] The conservative Islamists had preferred to give evidence to Shari'a on the matters about women through particular examples. However, the modernists either preferred to answer the women's rights and liberties through the feminism idea as a whole like Said Halim Pasha:

---

[72] *"Mütefekkirleriniz dîni de hiç anlamamış; / Rûh-i İslâm'ı telâkkîleri gâyet yanlış. / Sanıyorlar ki: Terakkîye tahammül edemez; / Asrın âsâr-ı kemâliyle tekâmül edemez."* Mehmed Âkif Ersoy, *Safahat*, 9th Edition, M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (Ed.), Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, Ankara, 2013, p. 169.

[73] Tunaya, *İslâmcılık Akımı…* pp. 62-65.

[74] *"Garb'ın eşyâsı, eğer kıymeti hâizse yürür; / Moda şeklinde gelen seyyie gümrükte çürür!"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 154.

[75] Tunaya, *İslâmcılık Akımı…* pp. 94-96.

[…] no civilization, in any time, started with women's liberty; on the contrary, all the civilizations perished when the women acquired their full liberties […] it is a concrete evidence that the women do not deserve the liberty that the feminists want for women socially […][76]

or they accused and criticized women through the actions women preferred to perform like Mehmet Akif:

Women and men running towards Europe, in debt…
[…]
To Paris, in order to learn the 'motherhood' without shame.[77]

Hence, it can be said that once the 'women' matter, even the modernist Islamists came closer to the conservative ones, and the Islamists in the late Ottoman times had preferred to limit the women's rights with tradition and Shari'a in general. Tradition and religion assigned the women with specific duties in the social life, and the Islamists tended to preserve these duties through their discourses.

For Shari'a's superiority over the jurisdiction and legislation instead of contemporary Westernized implementations, the Islamists convinced themselves that in the hierarchy of norms, the Shari'a was positioned on top. Therefore, they championed two ideas on this issue: The laws could not be against Shari'a, and the legislative parliaments could only write codes that are in conformity with Shari'a. In this case, Mustafa Sabri Efendi[78] claimed that the *teşrî* word (which means legislate) was originated from the Shari'a word; the legislation was assigned to Shari'a alone, and he addressed the parliament's duty with this word.[79] Said Halim Pasha had also participated in this debate and he claimed the Constitution was not in accordance with the social structure of the Empire. He asserted that importing foreign legal institutions and laws was the most evil thing the Empire did.[80] Additionally he defined the Shari'a as the sum of ethical, social, and natural realities and he claimed the salvation could only be guaranteed by applying the laws of Shari'a.[81]

---

[76] *"[…] hiçbir medeniyet, hiçbir vakitte, kadın hürriyeti ile başlamadığı gibi, aksine bütün medeniyetlerin, kadınların tam hürriyetlerini ele geçirmeleri ile mahvolup gittikleri […] feministlerin kadınlar için sosyal bakımdan hürriyet istemelerinin, onların o hürriyete lâyık olmadıklarına kat'î bir delil teşkil etmesi gibi […]"* Said Halim Paşa, *Buhranlarımız...* p. 126, 131.

[77] *"Kadın, erkek koşuyor borç ederek Avrupa'ya… […] Analık ilmi için Paris'e yüksünmeyerek…"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 161.

[78] For his life and selected articles written in various periodicals *see*. Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi 2...* pp. 913-975.

[79] Tunaya, *İslâmcılık Akımı…* pp. 92-93.

[80] Said Halim Paşa, *Buhranlarımız …* pp. 59-68

[81] *Ibid*. pp. 220-222.

Hence, it can be said that the Islamists preferred to apply the Islamic law to the society instead of imported institutions and laws.

Although it is hard to say that it was representing all the fractions within the Islamism followers, the Islamists had also participated in the active politics by founding a political party named *İttihad-ı Muhammedi Fırkası* (Union of Muslims Party). This party was founded in the editorial office of the famous Islamist newspaper *Volkan* (Volcano) in Istanbul on 5 April 1909. The party was actually the political formation of the *Volkan* newspaper, which was known with its Islamic revolutionary ideas; and the Ottoman society was using *Volkancılar* (Volcan supporters) word to address the followers of the party. The founders of the party were religious leaders; one of them was Bediüzzaman Said Kurdî[82] who became a well-known Islamic cult leader later. The only purpose of the *Muhammedi* Party was to protect the *Şeriat-ı Garra-i Muhammediye*, which means the brightest and the greatest path Prophet Mohammad introduced, Islam in short. Thus, according to the party, under the extraordinary situations, both the military and *ulema* class (including the religious scholars and preachers) should fight together. However with the disappearance of the danger, the military should go back to their barracks and leave the political power to the hands of the *ulema*. With this approach, the *Muhammedi* Party had encouraged and inspired masses through their *Volkan* newspaper; allowed the members of the party to become member of another party (for instance, anyone could be a member of CUP and *Muhammedi* Party at the same time), and also the party claimed all the military personnel was the 'natural' members of the party. The party was addressing the ummah in all over the world, not only the Empire; it claimed the leader of the party was Prophet Mohammad, and any Muslim could become a member of the party. Eventually, the indoctrination of the party and also the *Volkan* newspaper produced its fruits and the famous 31 March Incident[83] happened. With this incident, Sultan Abdul Hamid II was

---

[82] For his life and selected articles written in various periodicals see. Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi 2...* pp. 977-1068.

[83] The 31 March Incident was happened on 13 April 1909. Due to it happened on 31 March 1325 in *Rumî* calendar, it is known as *31 Mart Vak'ası* in Turkish literature. The incident can be dated back to the early times of the declaration of the Second Constitutional Era in 1908. From this time on, several opposition groups had emerged against the CUP regime behind the curtain. These groups accused CUP of despotism. On 14 February 1909, the 3rd government of the Second Constitutional Era was established, which was Hüseyin Hilmi Pasha Government and it was known as a CUP sympathiser. On 7 April, Hasan Fehmi, a critical writer of *Serbesti* (Liberty) newspaper, was assassinated and the assassin could not be identified. This murder grew the tension on the Ottoman society against the CUP regime. On the night of 12-13 April, the soldiers of a battalion in Istanbul imprisoned their officers and gathered in front of the parliament. Soon, *Muhammedi* Party members including Dervish Vahdetî (the owner of the *Volkan* newspaper) and madrasah students

replaced with Sultan Mehmed V, several officers of the party and the newspaper were executed, and the 'not even one-month-old' *Muhammedi* Party was closed.[84] Although this incident was the end of the party and also *Volkan* newspaper, it is important to know that this revolutionary and radical camp within the Islamists was not representing the Islamist intellectual trend as a whole; hence, even after its closure, the Islamists continued to present their ideas on various periodicals throughout the Second Constitutional Era.

1. 3. 3. Turkists

Similar to the other intellectual movements in the late Ottoman times, the Turkism movement had also claimed they had represented the needs and sensations of the Ottoman society. The movement spreaded their ideas almost in all the social layers of the Ottoman society through their publications like *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Fatherland)[85] and *Yeni Mecmua* (New Journal). Additionally, an institution, *Türk Ocağı* (Turkish Hearth), had played an important role on spreading the Turkism idea. The Turkists' answer to the famous question on saving the Empire was simple: The state could only be saved by Turkification. According to the Turkists, the subjects of the Empire had lost their consciousness on their 'authentic' [ethnic] nationalities and the first step on the Turkism should be leaned on that issue. After waking the Turkish nation up, the next step could be turning the nation's face towards the West in order to acquire the elements of the modern civilization. From this perspective, it could be seen that the Turkists were grounding their intellectual movement on the Turkish people within the Empire more than anything, the

---

joined the crowd. They chanted 'We want Shari'a!' and several people including the ministers and high-ranking military officers were murdered during this riot. The government resigned in the next afternoon and on 19 April an army from Salonika was arrived in Istanbul. The army suppressed the riot on 24 April after several hundreds of deaths. The military court sentenced many leaders of the riot to death and executed them in front of the public. For detailed information on the 31 March Incident, *see*. Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, *Türk İnkılâbı Tarihi Cilt I Kısım II*, 4th Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1991, pp. 182-217, Sina Akşin, *Ana Çizgileriyle Türkiye'nin Yakın Tarihi 1789-1980 1. Cilt*, Cumhuriyet Gazetesi, 1997, pp. 63-78.

[84] Tunaya, *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler – Cilt I...* pp. 182-205.

[85] Türk Yurdu Cemiyeti (Society of Turkish Fatherland) was establihed on 18 August 1911 and its bi-weekly journal Türk Yurdu published its first issue on 24 November 1911. Its purpose in the first issue was mentioned as "to serve the Turkishness". In 1917, with 13th volume, it became a media organ of *Türk Ocağı*. The journal promoted the national culture and national consciousness in various fields including philosophy, sociology, architecture, history, economics, law, etc. during the Second Constitutional Era, and had helped the Turkism movement to be introduced to the masses. Among the contributors to the journal Mehmed Emin Yurdakul, Ömer Seyfeddin, Ziya Gökalp, Ali Canib, Yusuf Akçura, Ahmed Ağaoğlu, Gaspıralı İsmail, Ahmet Zeki Velidi, Mehmed Fuad [Köprülü], Halide Edip, and Reşad Nuri can be counted. Although it had to stop its publications for six times due to various sociopolitical changes in Turkey in different times, the journal was managed to organize itself for the 7th time in February 1987, and it is still publishing the issues which makes it the most aged periodical that promotes Turkish nationalism in Turkish media history. Hüseyin Tuncer, "Türk Yurdu" in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 41, TDV, İstanbul, 2012, pp. 550-551.

ones who were 'not aware' of their Turkishness yet. Similarly, the founder of modern Turkish nationalism, Ziya Gökalp, had also reserved a special emphasis on the Turkish people. According to him, the Turkish people had the wisdom, and that wisdom would light the path for the Turkish nation which stretched through the Western civilization. According to Tunaya's summarization, Gökalp had borrowed the fragments of the Turkishness consciousness which dated back to the Young Ottomans, named each of these fragments ideals, applied Durkheim's sociological method on them; renamed the pieces of these ideals *mefkure* (ideal), *hars* (culture), *medeniyet* (civilization), *millet* (nation), and presented a combination of these ideas under an ideology which was known as Turkism.[86]

The Turkists were a homogenous group compared to the other intellectual movements during the Second Constitutional Era. Additionally, Ziya Gökalp's sociological contribution on this matter made the program of the Turkists more precise and clear than the others. Peyami Safa analyzed the program of the Turkists under seven categories, which showed similarities with the Gökalp's Turkism manifesto *Türkçülüğün Esasları*; yet it was less ripe than that: Pan-Turkism, Turkish history and culture, Turkish language, Turkish internationalism, the civilization, national economic system, national art and literature.[87] These categories worth to examine in details; however, the national culture, internationalism, and advancing to a modernized civilization of the Turkism movement will be widely discussed on the 3rd chapter of this thesis; therefore, it would be a repetitive action to put these here as well. Additionally, these categories indeed showed some similarities with Gökalp's manifesto. However, due to this manifesto will be widely analyzed in the following chapters through Gökalp's writings; it would be beneficial to review the proposals of other Turkist intellectuals on these selected categories.

The shortest definition of Pan-Turkism could be made as to unite all the Turks in the world under a single political authority. François Georgeon claimed Pan-Turkism was originally based on the Turkish culture; yet, it moved from a cultural league to a political league by Yusuf Akçura's claims and he named Akçura 'the father of Pan-Turkism'.[88] In his famous book *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Three Ways of Politics), Akçura offered a nationalism type which was based on race, and his Turkish union idea was based on uniting all the Turkish people

---

[86] Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında…* pp. 86-92.
[87] Safa, pp. 45-48.
[88] François Georgeon, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935)*, Alev Er (Trans.), Yurt, Ankara, 1986, pp. 7-8.

politically from Europe to Asia.[89] This was a clear definition of Pan-Turkism. However, with Ziya Gökalp's influence on Turkish nationalism, the Pan-Turkism understanding shifted from being a political agenda as it was proposed by Akçura to a future political ideal. Gökalp described Turkish nationalism as a cultural nationalism;[90] built a road towards Turkish nationalism, re-described Pan-Turkism as *Turan* and positioned it as a far ideal to reach while determining the way of actions to reach that ideal. With his influence, many Turkist writers focused on praising *Turan* in their writings. For instance, Süleyman Aktuğ had written a long poem about *Turan* with the name of *Turan Yolcularına* (to the *Turan* Pilgrims) on 14 August 1913 and defined *Turan* as any place which have Turkish martyr and Turkish graveyard.[91] That similar approach on glorifying the *Turan* ideal and also naming it as an 'ancient' concept showed itself in Mehmed Emin [Yurdakul]'s poem titled *Selâm Sana!...* (Salutations!) published in *Türk Yurdu* journal on 30 December 1913.[92] Therefore, Safa's claim on Pan-Turkism as a part of Turkism program can be taken as acceptable, and it can be said that the *Turan* concept had always occupied a special place in Turkish nationalism discourses either within the political area as Akçura offered or as a far ideal to be chased after as Gökalp proposed.

The Turkish language and purification on the language was one of the top principles for Turkists. In *Türk Yurdu* journal, the journal itself had written several articles with its initials as T.Y. on the purification of the Turkish language. In one of these articles published on 4 September 1913 titled *Dilimiz* (Our Language), by summarizing an article written in Baku, the journal claimed that the Ottoman language was a sum of Turkish, Arabic, and Persian. Therefore, in a debate which language shall the Azeri people choose for their own country, the article that the journal summarized had offered to pick their own Turkish language rather than the Ottoman language. The article claimed the nation was Turkish; therefore, the nation's language should be Turkish language alone, other than a compilation of several languages like the Ottomans had.[93] The same tendency on having a national language had also shown itself in the Turkish art and literature. For instance, Ali

---

[89] Akçura, pp. 33-34.
[90] Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, 7th Edition, Varlık, İstanbul, 1968, pp. 15-21.
[91] Süleyman Aktuğ, "Turan Yolcularına" in Murat Şefkatli (Ed.), *Türk Yurdu Cilt 3*, Tutibay, Ankara, 1999, pp. 50-52.
[92] Mehmed Emin, "Selâm Sana!..." in *(Türk Yurdu'nun İstiklal Günü Hediyesi Üçüncü Yılın Sekizinci Sayısına İlave)* in *Türk Yurdu Cilt 3...* pp. 2-3.
[93] T. Y., "Dilimiz", in Murat Şefkatli (Ed.), *Türk Yurdu Cilt 2*, Tutibay, Ankara, 1999, pp. 430-431.

Canib had written an article on national literature and he defended the Turkish literature did not mean the Ottoman literature alone, it could be dated back to the Central Asia.[94]

The establishment of a national economic system was a popular principle the Turkists leaned on. In *Türk Yurdu* journal, even there was a specific column reserved for the Turkists to write on national economics. For instance, in the second issue published on 24 December 1911, the purpose of this column was presented as:

> It is our greatest desire to serve the Turkish nation's economical progress; because, the life and perpetuity of every nation were based on its material strength. […] 'Türk Yurdu' will never refrain from the services that could help the Turkish nation to get stronger in material, which means getting stronger physically and economically.[95]

In time, several Turkist intellectuals and also foreign writers had penned in this column. Tevfik Nureddin explained the adverse status of Turkish artisans, Alexander Parvus Efendi gave advices on the Turkish economics, Mustafa Zühdü analyzed the balance sheets of the Empire, etc. The ideas of Turkists on economics could be summarized with Ziya Gökalp's discourse. According to Gökalp, the economic ideal of Turkism should focus on preserving social wealth without abolishing the private ownership and using this social wealth for the prosperity of the public's interest. In order to materialize this ideal, the Turkish economists should observe the realities of Turkish economy first, and then prepare a 'scientific' and essential program for the national economy.[96] Therefore, it can be said that the articles that Turkists and economists had penned in *Türk Yurdu* and also Gökalp's own discourses were based on observing the realities of the Turkish economy more than anything. Yet, apart from some particular advices given by the writers such as specific examples on agriculture and artisanship, there was no concrete program the Turkism should follow in order to reach a national economic system.

The Turkists were represented within the active politics during the Second Constitutional Era as well. *Milli Meşrutiyet Fırkası* (National Constitutionalism Party) was founded on 5 July 1912 with several famous Turkists including Yusuf Akçura and several former deputies and columnists. This party was the first 'openly-declared' Turkist political party

---

[94] Ali Canib, "Milli Edebiyat Meselesi" in *Türk Yurdu Cilt 3…* pp. 100-103.

[95] *"Türk kavminin iktisâdî terakkîsine hizmet etmek en büyük arzumuzdur; çünkü her kavmin hayat ve bekâsı maddeten kuvvetli olmasına bağlanmıştır. […] 'Türk Yurdu' Türk kavminin maddeten yani bedenen ve iktisâden sağlamlaşmasına yardım edebilecek hizmetlerden asla geri durmayacaktır."* in "İktisat" in Murat Şefkatli (Ed.), *Türk Yurdu Cilt 1*, Tutibay, Ankara, 1998, p. 32.

[96] Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün…* pp. 160-164.

in the Turkish political life, and the official periodical of the party in order to reach out to the masses was *İfham* (to Tell).[97] Apart from *Milli Meşrutiyet Fırkası*, considering Ziya Gökalp was the ideologue of CUP, it could be expected that CUP represented the Turkism ideology in the political field. Indeed, CUP championed this ideology; yet, with a synthesis with Islam. The pure representation of Turkism ideology in the active politics showed itself in the *Müdafaa-i Hukuk* (Defence of the National Rights) spirit after the Armistice of Mudros. The evolved version of this spirit established the modern Turkish Republic. Therefore, Tunaya claimed that the Turkism movement became an ideological foundation to the Turkish Republic which was established after the Second Constitutional Era, except for the irredentism chapter of the original ideology.[98] Additionally, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's explanation on the roots of the Turkish nation and the definition of Turkish nationalism showed some similarities with the Turkism ideology of Gökalp as follows:

> The natural and historical facts which were influential on Turkish nation to take root are, union as a political entity, union in language, union in fatherland, union in race and ethnicity, historical kinship, and moral kinship. […] Turkish nationalism means walking with the same speed and harmony and in parallel to all other civilized nations on the road to progress and advance, and also during the international meetings and relations, while preserving the unique origin of the Turkish society and its individual independent identity.[99]

1. 3. 4. Socialists

The socialism movement was the weakest among the other movements during the Second Constitutional Era. The ultimate goal of this movement was to be able to apply socialism into the Ottoman politics and society. According to Socialists, the only path to guarantee Western style social life for the Ottoman society passed through socialism. Therefore, the 1908 Revolution was a successful revolution but it was not enough. The liberation of the society from the oppression of Sultan Abdul Hamid II was only the beginning; the society had to accept socialism, had to mobilize, and eventually had to make a 'social' revolution to achieve a higher level. These words were indeed effective on some small groups. Socialists in the Empire during the Second Constitutional Era were good at using the

---

[97] Tunaya, *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler – Cilt I...* pp. 351-363.
[98] Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında...* pp. 86-88.
[99] *"Türk milletinin kökleşmesinde etkili olduğu görülen doğal ve tarihi gerçekler şunlardır: Siyasi varlıkta birlik, dil birliği, yurt birliği, ırk ve köken birliği, tarihi yakınlık, ahlaki yakınlık. […] Türk milliyetçiliği, ilerleme ve gelişme yolunda ve uluslararası görüşme ve ilişkilerde, bütün çağdaş milletlere paralel ve onlarla aynı uyumda bir ahenkte yürümekle birlikte, Türk toplumunun özel yaratılışını ve başlı başına bağımsız kimliğini korunmuş tutmaktır."* in Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, *Medeni Bilgiler*, 2nd Edition, Afet İnan (Ed.), Toplumsal Dönüşüm, İstanbul, 2010, pp.44-48.

socialist templates through their writings: Their main periodical was the weekly journal named *İştirak* (Participation); besides, they had published several dailies which did not last longer than a few weeks. Tunaya claimed although the Socialists were in favor of printing out Karl Marx's face in their periodicals, they were not good at understanding the main proposals of Marxist ideology. Thus, in order to be educated, they had to open a branch of their party in Paris to study on Marxism through the French Socialist Party leader Jean Jaurès in 1913.[100]

Socialism and Marxism understandings of the late Ottoman socialists that Tunaya preferred to use interchangeably during the late Ottoman times needs to be clarified. At this point, Murat Belge's approach could be helpful.[101] According to him, the first 'slight' movements of the leftist political ideas could indeed be tracked back to the late Ottoman times. However, the proposals that the 'left' offered were not addressing the Turkish and Muslim communities in the beginning. Due to the Empire was experiencing a pre-capitalist structure in general and a great percentage of the industrial workers were non-Muslims, unionization and industrial strikes were mostly seen among the Ottoman Greeks and Armenians. According to Belge, it would be easier to track the socialist tendencies in the late Ottoman times through the Marxism branch of socialism. He claimed, after the 1908 Revolution, the relatively liberal intellectual environment in the Empire did not last long, and with the defeats in the Balkan Wars and Tripoli, some of the Ottoman intellectuals tended to approach to more 'radical' movements to 'save' the state. Therefore, some of these radical intellectuals preferred Marxism; Mustafa Suphi, Ethem Nejat, Şefik Hüsnü could be named the first Marxist intellectuals in the Empire. He did not count *İştirakçi* Hilmi among the Marxists; he claimed Hilmi was neither a Marxist nor a socialist that learned the socialism through the academic books. Belge's claim on the origin of the preference of Marxism among the radical Ottoman intellectuals had three reasons: Marxism was offering an anti-imperialist theory, the dialectic and historical materialism concepts were offering a scientific approach which they could 'proudly' count themselves in the scientific community, and 1917 Russian Revolution was successfully completed which justified that the Marxism was more than 'words'. Hence, the Marxism theory was represented in the Ottoman intellectuals as a result of some practical concerns. It was

---

[100] Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında…* pp. 95-97.
[101] Murat Belge, "Türkiye'de Sosyalizm Tarihinin Ana Çizgileri" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce – Sol*, 2nd Edition, Vol. 8, İletişim, İstanbul, 2008, pp. 19-48.

accepted as a salvation recipe for the Empire; yet, the social classes that Marx built his theory upon were not valid for the Ottoman society, and the movement was not able to offer much to the workers.[102]

Although the first worker committees of the Empire can be dated back to the last quarter of the 19th century, the real boom in numbers was after the 1908 Revolution. The liberal environment that the revolution offered had also influenced the workers. During the first two months of the Second Constitutional Era, several transportation, communication, and industrial workers went on strike in various cities of the Empire. These strikes were not organized, and the main demand of 'these over-fifty strikes' was to shorten the working hours. Additionally, the workers precisely indicated that these strikes were not carrying any political agenda towards the government. However, with the *Tatil-i Eşgâl Kanunu* (Strike Law) which was put into force in 1909 and was valid till 1936, the strikes became difficult to go. According to this law, the workers had to consult a three-men-council which was assigned by the government, and solve the problem through negotiations. This law caused the workers to look for another solution, and several worker federations had emerged within the Empire after 1910, especially in Salonika and Macedonia. These federations were based on class differences and they were carrying socialist intellectual agendas. However, in a formal letter sent from Salonika to the Ministry of Internal Affairs in November 1911, it was stated that all the workers in Salonika were applying for permit to form worker unions and the governor stated his hesitations on granting these permissions. Additionally, the governor stated that these unions were in favor of socialism and if they would not be stopped earlier, the socialism would gradually become stronger and it would ruin the domestic commerce.[103] From these two perspectives, it can be said that there were two main reasons which caused the socialism movement in the late Ottoman times to become weak: It was not efficient on addressing the class differences, and the government was afraid of harming the domestic economy.

Although the Socialists in the late Ottoman times were representing a politically weak movement, they were able to establish a political party. *Osmanlı Sosyalist Fırkası* (Ottoman Socialist Party) was founded in 1910 by several owners of pro-socialism periodicals including the famous socialist Hüseyin Hilmi. *Sosyalist Fırkası* introduced new

---

[102] *Ibid.*

[103] Mesut Gülmez, "Tanzimat'tan Sonra İşçi Örgütlenmesi ve Çalışma Koşulları (1839-1919)" in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Collective, Vol. 3, İletişim, İstanbul, 1985, pp. 792-802.

concepts to the Ottoman parliament such as *tatil-i eşgal* (worker strike), worker rights, worker union, and socialism. Due to the nature of the movement, Socialists tended to solve problems with proposing a social revolution. This tendency showed itself in the official periodical of the party, *İştirak*, which was trying to mobilize the factory workers for a revolution. The ironic part of this political party was none of its founders or directors was a worker.[104] Hence, the socialist ideology could not find a place for itself among the public. Although it offered some positive changes to the rights and prosperity of the newly emerging worker class and also the poor people of the society, socialism was embraced neither by the workers nor by the public. The roots of this failure need an explanation. According to Niyazi Berkes, the fathers of the socialism movement in the Empire were started their intellectual life with populist ideas in the *Genç Kalemler* (Young Pens) journal which was considered as a stronghold for the early Turkish nationalism. Later, their intellectual attention shifted through socialism. These 'new' socialists were represented in the parliament; however, most of these representatives were coming from Macedonian, Armenian, and Greek ethnicities. Since the Macedonian and Armenian revolutionary movements accepted socialism as the main ideology, and the residues of Ottomanism ideology were still strong within the parliament, the socialism movement could not find an appropriate habitat to blossom. Therefore, although the Socialists were able to raise their party banners once, the movement remained merely as an academic interest which had no relation with the classes, peasants, workers, or poor people.[105]

1. 3. 5. Prince Sabahaddin Bey and *Meslekçiler*

Mehmed Sabahaddin or mostly known as Prince Sabahaddin Bey, who was the nephew of Sultan Abdul Hamid II, had to flee from the country after his mother and father involved in a conspiracy towards the sultan. In Europe, Prince joined the Young Turks, and became one of the main figures of the opposition against Sultan Abdul Hamid II. During his years in Europe, he was influenced by the famous French sociologist Frédéric le Play and his social science school. Applying the famous French pedagogue Edmond Demolins' observations about education in various European states to le Play's teachings caused Prince to come up with new ideas on the politics. From this perspective, German and French students expected everything from the state to be provided whereas the British

---

[104] Tunaya, *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler – Cilt I...* pp. 247-262.
[105] Niyazi Berkes, *200 Yıldır Neden Bocalıyoruz – 1*, Cumhuriyet Gazetesi, İstanbul, 1997, pp. 79-80.

students had to struggle for their successes by becoming self-sufficient. Besides, the decentralization rule which were applied to the British political system by the Municipal Corporation Act of 1835 had helped the Britain to perform better in political aspect. Prince realized that both the educational and political sections of Britain were based on glorifying and encouraging the individual members of a larger system. Thus, the combination of these ideas with the 'Social Darwinism' approach, which had an important impact on the Ottoman intellectuals in Europe along with the positivism, Prince had completed his political doctrine.[106] In 1906, several Ottoman intellectuals who lived in Europe consulted Prince to formulate his ideas and establish an association. Thus, a new community was formed under the name of *Adem-i Merkeziyet ve Teşebbüs-i Şahsi Cemiyeti* (Committee of Decentralization and Individual Initiative) and a new journal named *Terakki* (Progress) was established as the voice of this committee.[107]

Meslekçiler, which can roughly be named 'liberals', were the followers of Prince Sabahaddin Bey and the representatives of a unique socio-political approach during the Second Constitutional Era. The program of Prince was carrying a liberal approach more than others; yet, calling this movement as 'liberals' will not be a complete description. The followers were named in Turkish literature as *meslekçiler* by several scholars including M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, Tarık Zafer Tunaya, and Zafer Toprak; therefore, it would be better to stick with this name to address Prince's followers in this thesis. The origin of the *meslekçiler* name came from Prince Sabahaddin's emphasis on the necessity of a social system in the Empire. Prince applied the sociological method he had learned from le Play's writings to the social problems of the Empire, and invented a new term called *meslek-i içtima* (social system). According to this term, the main problem of the Empire was its loyalty in the templates and patterns. During the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid II, the Ottoman society was in the belief of the declaration of another constitutional era would

---

[106] M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Meslek-i İçtima Akımı" in *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e…* Vol. 2, pp. 382-386.

[107] The biggest controversy during the establishment of this committee occurred in the decentralization concept. In Turkish, decentralization word is corresponded to *adem-i merkeziyet*. Originally, the *adem-i merkeziyet* word was used in the French version of the Ottoman Constitution of 1876, and Prince derived that word from there. However, during the early meetings of this future committee, which was ahead of the formation, decentralization concept offered by Prince was misunderstood by the attendees; it was taken as 'no centrality' and therefore 'no government at all'. According to them, this word had a potential to make the society anarchic and it was against the Constitution. The main motive on this issue was the possible members did not want to participate in any kind of formation without a constitutional basis. After several debates and meetings, one of the members brought a French copy of the Constitution and showed the decentralization word actually existed in it. This action alleviated the anxiety of the future members, and the community was established. Kuran, *İnkılâp Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler*, pp. 211-214.

instantly solve all the problems. However, although the constitution was reinstated in 1908, the problems remained same; because, the roots of the problem were not solved. Thus, instead of acting as a whole, the society had to act through individuals. The government and economics should be transformed into 'individual' pieces. In order to do this, the education system should focus on educating the youth as individuals first. The *meslek* (system) term was so embraced by Prince's followers that his disciple Mehmet Ali Şevki established a *Meslek-i İçtimaî* Association during the armistice times. The *meslek* concept was not only taken as a social system by Prince's followers but also in the meaning of 'profession' as well, which literally corresponds to the word in Turkish. This idea influenced the Ottoman politicians too; in order to protect the small business owners and artisans, on 25 February 1910 a new law was put into the force and the ancient professional guild system of the Empire was abolished while the supervision authority on the artisans was granted to the municipalities. From that time to the first year of WWI, fifty artisan associations were established in Istanbul. Additionally, this *meslek* concept evolved into a pure economical approach in time. Necmetin Sâdık [Sadak], Ahmet Midhat [Metya], Kara Kemal Bey, Kör Ali İhsan [İloğlu], and even Ziya Gökalp championed different versions of this concept and introduced some corporatist and unionist ideas like establishing an artisan assembly, educating the profession classes, ingraining altruistic professional ethics, and introducing a professional solidarity. Lastly, Taninci Muhittin [Birgen] published a journal named *Meslek* in 1925 which was championing a unionist professional community.[108] From this point, it is clear that instead of naming Prince Sabahaddin's followers with a long description, the *meslekçiler* word would address them neatly.

Although their proposals were not accepted by the masses, the main items of their doctrine were introduced through almost all the sociopolitical programs of the opposition political parties represented in the Ottoman parliament. Naturally, *Meslekçiler* had also started their intellectual journey by asking the same question as other fellow intellectuals with different worldviews had done once: How to save the Ottoman Empire? However, instead of dictating a complete list of suggested changes, they preferred to examine the roots of the problem first. According to this approach, there was a constantly growing tension and a

---

[108] Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*, 3rd Edition, Ülken, İstanbul, 1992, pp. 332-342, M. Cavid Tütengil, "Prens Sabahaddin", *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, Vol. 2, No. 4-5, 1954, pp. 176-220, Zafer Toprak, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Korporatif Dünya Görüşü: Meslekçilik" in *Tanzimattan Cumhuriyet'e…* Vol. 2, pp. 371-376, Taha Parla, *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp: 1876-1924*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1985, pp. 65-69.

conflict between the East and the West. The reason lying beneath this conflict was nothing different than a clash between two different social types. In this respect, the world had two types of society which were called communal societies *(tecemmüi)* and individualistic societies *(infiradi)*. The communal societies were consisted of passive, prone to consume, and irresponsible individuals who could not take care of themselves alone. The individualistic societies on the other hand, were based on capable individuals who were able to take care of themselves without expecting anything from the sociopolitical system. From this perspective, the East was within the inner circle of the communal societies whereas the West was representing the individualistic societies. According to *Meslekçiler*, the ideal society was the individualistic one; hence, the first and the foremost step towards Westernization shall be transforming the Ottoman society from communal to individualistic. Regardless of how many revolutions would happen within this sociopolitical environment, no revolution would complete the quest for modernization the Empire had been seeking for centuries. Therefore, the required revolution shall be completed within the social framework first, and this social revolution shall be based on two elements: Individual initiative and decentralization.[109]

With the 1908 Revolution, Prince Sabahaddin Bey brought his father's (died in 1903) ashes to Anatolia. Prince was welcomed by the masses in both Izmir and Istanbul. During the second funeral ceremony of his father in Istanbul, several statesmen, high-ranking religious officers, intellectuals, academicians, students, and the members of CUP expressed their deepest condolences. However, soon, CUP felt unease about the public's love towards Prince, and started a smearing campaign on him through their periodicals. As a counter-attack, the followers of Prince established a new organization named *Nesl-i Cedid* (New Generation) in order to explain the doctrine of Prince to the public through their publications.[110] Although the impact of Prince's movement could not be considered strong in the Turkish political life, it was successful on representing its doctrines within the active politics. On 14 September 1908, a group of industrious followers of Prince had decided to establish an opposition political party named *Osmanlı Ahrar Fırkası* (Ottoman Party of

---

[109] Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında…* pp. 92-95.

[110] Apart from its regular publications, this organization had also translated Edmond Demolins' work which was showing the routes of the ancient tribes emigrated from the Asian steppes, under the name of Yollar (Routes). Kuran, *İnkılâp Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler*, pp. 323-329.

Free People) in order to balance CUP in the parliament.[111] This party was in favor of individualism, liberalism, individual initiative, decentralization, and cosmopolitanism whereas it was drastically against the Turkism. The party did not have an official newspaper to promote its worldview; but, almost all other periodicals against CUP were in favor of promoting this movement including *İkdam* (Effort), *Sabah* (Morning), *Yeni Gazete* (New Newspaper), *Sada-i Millet* (Voice of Nation), and *Servet-i Fünun* (Wealth of Sciences). *Ahrar Fırkası* was not able to get any deputies in 1908 elections; however, it was successful on directing the trends of the opposition forces in the parliament.[112]

1. 4. Conclusion

The sociopolitical dominance of the intellectual movements which the Empire had witnessed in its last century was actually started by the hand of the Empire in the beginning. The students that were sent to Europe for education by the Empire had brought several different intellectual and political ideas and concepts with them. The Young Ottomans introduced these ideas, the Young Turks processed them, and late Ottoman intellectuals distinguished them into particular movements after the 1908 Revolution. The hunger for political writings within the society during the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid II caused hundreds of political periodicals to be established by the early days of the Second Constitutional Era. Hence, the 'distinguished' movements derived from the legacy of the Young Ottomans and Young Turks were introduced to the public in various shapes through different periodicals. It can be claimed that the variety and great number of these periodicals, writings, and also intellectuals were the main reason to made Tunaya to define the Second Constitutional Era as a political laboratory. Among the others, five distinctive intellectual movements shined during this era: Westernists, Islamists, Turkists, Socialists, and *meslekçiler* (liberals). As it can be seen above, the main agenda of these intellectual movements was saving the Empire. Indeed, each of these movements approached this issue through their own perspectives and offered their own proposals; yet, they actually were putting the same solution to the center of their own perspectives: Modernization.

The main challenge for these intellectual movements was the necessity of an Ottoman modernization. Westernists approached this problem by importing the new pieces for the

---

[111] In order to review the events starting from the Prince's arrival to Turkey chronologically as well as the impact of *Ahrar Fırkası* on the Ottoman politics and its relations with CUP in detail *see*. Kansu, pp. 259-270.
[112] Tunaya, *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler – Cilt I...* pp. 142-170.

failing parts of the Empire from the 'modernized' West; they had even suggested importing the institutions and the culture from Europe. Islamists preferred a selective method by importing the materialistic parts from the West while preserving the traditional and religious non-materialistic parts that the Ottoman society already had. Turkists on the other hand, showed a similar tendency with the Islamists; yet, they excavated through the history and brought an ethnic identity while taking Turkishness as the non-materialistic part with respect to Islam. Socialists were no different than these; they were in favor of importing a new sociopolitical theory from Europe and applying this to the Empire. However, this theory actually did not have many common elements with the sociopolitical characteristics of the Empire, and was not able to mobilize the masses as their movement grounded on. Prince Sabahaddin's approach was also an inspiration of the British system. He championed decentralization and individualism, and emphasized education; yet, these concepts were also foreigner for the Ottoman society. Thereby, it can be said that the modernization which different intellectual movements sought was their main agenda. The crucial part in this same agenda was all the movements were in favor of 'importing'. Some were in favor of overnight change through imports like Westernists whereas some were advocating a long process which might take decades like *Meslekçiler*.

During the very same times these different intellectual movements presented their ideas, there were also some not-so-old and newly-introduced terms which were conceptualized through their own perspectives. *Millet* (nation) was among these new concepts. In the last chapter, the Islamist and Turkist conceptualization of nation from the perspectives of Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp will be widely discussed. But first, it would be beneficial to review the characteristics, ideas, and intellectual achievements of Akif and Gökalp while analyzing their contributions to their particular intellectual movements.

CHAPTER 2

MEHMET AKİF AND ISLAMISM

Mehmet Akif is considered an important figure among other intellectuals in the late Ottoman society, especially during the Second Constitutional Era. Akif's political ideas had a strong tendency towards Islam, and he had introduced a synthesis between the Islamism and modernization in his works. Although Islamism was introduced as a political ideology to save the Empire from a possible political catastrophe in the late 19th and early 20th century, it became a widely accepted political movement which had also dominated Turkish political life from time to time. The path Akif opened towards Islamism had many followers even after his death, which can be named his 'legacy'. For instance the *Milli Görüş* (National Vision) movement founded by Necmettin Erbakan which was embodied in several different political parties, and the recent *Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi* (Justice and Development Party) of the 21st century respected the codes of Akif's Islamism[1] and built their frameworks around this understanding. Additionally, the legacy of Akif continues not only in active politics but also in academic world. Mehmet Akif and Islamism is one of the most studied areas in different branches of academia; including political sciences, international relations, religious studies, history, philosophy, education, and literature. His ideas on applying Islam into both politics and social life attracted many intellectuals as well. The most noteworthy intellectuals who tried to apply and reinterpret the ideas of Akif are Nurettin Topçu who inspired from Mehmet Akif's Islamism and came up with a branch of nationalism by formulizing his ideas as *Anadoluculuk* (Anatolian Nationalism), and İsmet Özel who is a respected poet and intellectual among the Islamist-conservative society in Turkey and also the founder and the honorary general president of *İstiklâl Marşı Derneği* (Association of the Independence March) which aims to implement the Islamic

---

[1] Except for some members who disfavor Mehmet Akif for his anti-Hamidian stance (This emendation and comment credited to Dr. Mustafa Serdar Palabıyık. His contributions are greatly appreciated).

values coded inside *İstiklal Marşı* (Turkish Independence March –written by Akif) into the whole Turkish society and also to preserve these values.[2]

The legacy of Akif and the Islamism he had promoted are still alive in daily-social life, and in both governmental organizations and non-governmental organizations as well. For instance, on 30 October 1949, the City Council of Ankara had decided to rename the street where it includes the house which Akif had stayed while penning *İstiklal Marşı* as Mehmet Akif Ersoy Street;[3] and also in 2009, the Turkish Directorate-General of Foundations restored *Taceddin Dergahı* (*Taceddin* Dervish Lodge), which is the exact place where Akif had penned the Turkish Independence March, and converted it into Mehmet Akif Culture House.[4] Additionally, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism announced the year 2011 as the "Year of Mehmet Akif" and organized several activities and events throughout the year in country-wide.[5] *Türkiye Yazarlar Birliği* (Writers Union of Turkey) established a research center on Mehmet Akif, his works, and his ideas which is named *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Araştırmaları Merkezi* (Center of Mehmet Akif Ersoy Researches).[6] The municipalities and city halls in Turkey are also interested in introducing Mehmet Akif to the masses. The name of Mehmet Akif is one of the most used names in naming a district, a street, a public school, or a mosque in Turkey. Additionally, in 2013, the municipality of Bağcılar district of Istanbul started to transliterate and republish the formerly published *Sırat-ı Müstakim* journal in modern Turkish alphabet, which is planned to be published in 25 volumes, and the first 15 volumes were completed as May 2019.[7] In addition, as an actual example of the interest in Akif's works in modern times, in 2016, some Islamist thinkers and writers came together and started a new initiative called *Sebilürreşad Derneği* (*Sebilürreşad* Association); and in March 2017, this association started to republish *Sebilürreşad* journal from where the journal left off with new Islamist writers including Abdurrahman Dilipak, Mehmet Şevket Eygi, and Selma Ersoy Argon who is the granddaughter of Akif.[8] In short,

---

[2] "Manifesto", İstiklâl Marşı Derneği, available at http://www.istiklalmarsidernegi.org.tr/Sayfa.aspx?SID=13.
[3] Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, *Mehmed Âkif Ersoy (Hayatı ve Eserleri)*, 3rd Edition, Mehmet Akif Ersoy Fikir ve Sanat Vakfı, 1991, p. 198.
[4] Mehmet Kurtoğlu, "Mehmet Akif Kültür Evi", *Vakıflar Dergisi*, No. 44, December 2015, pp. 131-144.
[5] Emel Kılıç, "Mehmet Akif Ersoy Yılı Etkinlikleri", *T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Araştırma ve Eğitim Genel Müdürlüğü*, available at http://aregem.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR-12228/mehmet-akif-ersoy-yili-etkinlikleri.html.
[6] "Mehmed Âkif Ersoy Araştırmaları Merkezi", *Türkiye Yazarlar Birliği*, 19 July 2010, available at http://www.tyb.org.tr/mehmed-akif-ersoy-arastirmalari-merkezi-1170h.htm.
[7] "Sıratımüstakim Dergisi Yeniden Yayında", *Bağcılar Belediyesi*, 4 July 2013, available at http://www.bagcilar.bel.tr/icerik/523/9822/siratimustakim-dergisi-yeniden-yayinda.aspx.
[8] For more information about this new journal, see. https://www.sebilurresad.com.tr.

the legacy of Akif was and is well-embraced by the Turkish society, both in intellectual and academic levels, and also by the public, too. For Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, even after ignoring all these efforts mentioned above, the Turkish Independence March alone is and will be enough to sustain Mehmet Akif's legacy in Turkey.[9]

The legacy Mehmet Akif had built was not an overnight success but a long and troublesome journey which took many years. Akif had grown at the time of Sultan Abdul Hamid II's reign, memorized Quran, learned several languages, examined both the Eastern and the Western intellectual studies, became a veterinarian, travelled to several parts of the Empire and Europe, published a journal which had an enormous impact on the intellectual life of the Second Constitutional Era, mobilized masses with his religious speeches, joined the Turkish War of Independence, became a deputy, written a national march for the new regime in Turkey, resided abroad after having some disputes with the new regime, and came back to the country to complete his journey in life. From this point, after seeing various stops he had experinced, it can be said that Akif's conceptualization of nation had a chance to be varied during this journey. In order to understand Akif's conceptualization of nation and also the changes of this concept in Akif's discourses which will be discussed in the last chapter, it would be beneficial to review his life, his thoughts, and more importantly his Islamism understanding first.

2. 1. Mehmet Akif's Biography

Mehmet Akif was born in 1873 in Fatih, Istanbul. He started his education at Emir Buhari local school in Fatih when he was four years old. His father Mehmet Tahir Efendi, who was a professor in *Fatih Medresesi* (Fatih Madrasah) taught him Arabic, and the *başimam* (chief prayer) of Fatih Mosque lectured him on religious subjects. Later, he studied both Persian and French. After *Fatih Merkez Rüştiyesi* (Fatih Central Intermediate School), he graduated from the high school section of *Mülkiye İdadisi* (Civil High School). When he was about to continue his education within the university section of the same institution, *Mülkiye*, his father died and the family house was burned. Facing with some financial troubles after these two incidents, Akif enrolled in *Halkalı Mülkiye Baytar Mektebi* (Halkalı Civil Veterinary School) which was providing free higher education. His interest in poetry had started during this time. He graduated as top student of his school in 1893,

---

[9] Tansel, *Mehmed Âkif…* p. 198.

and worked as a deputy-inspector in Directorate-General of Veterinary for four years in several parts of Rumelia, Anatolia, and Arabia. In 1894, Akif got married with İsmet Hanım. In 1906, he was charged as a professor in *Halkalı Ziraat Mektebi* (Halkalı Agriculture School), and in 1908 he was assigned to the *Daru'l-Fünun* (Istanbul University) as a professor of public literature. With the poems he published in *Sırat-ı Müstakim* journal, including *Küfe* and *Seyfi Baba*, his fame popularized. He collected his poems, which were generally reflecting his impressions on the poorest people of Istanbul, into a book named *Safahat* (Phases) in 1911. After the 1908 Revolution, he had contacted with *İttihat ve Terakki Partisi* (Union and Progress Party), became a member of the party, taught Arabic in intra-party institutions, and delivered speeches in the greatest mosques of Istanbul about Islamic unity during the Balkan Wars. In 1913, he resigned from his position in Directorate-General of Veterinary. Later he was asssigned as an officer in *Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa* (The Special Organization, which served as an intelligence agency) and sent to Germany and Hejaz by the Empire to inspect the Muslim prisoners in Germany and the nationalist movements in Hejaz. In 1920, he travelled to Anatolia to join the national resistance forces, and delivered several speeches in different mosques in Anatolia to keep the spirit of the public alive. Akif got into parliament as Burdur deputy. In 1921, *Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi* (Turkish Grand National Assembly) approved his poem to be the national anthem of Turkey, *İstiklal Marşı* (Independence March), which he wrote on the basis of unity. In 1926 he resided in Egypt, taught Turkish language in a university in Cairo. In 1936, he got sick, travelled back to Istanbul, and died a few months later.[10]

Mehmet Akif, who is considered one of the leading figures of Islamism in Turkish political and intellectual history, was a versatile intellectual. Throughout his life, he was actively and intellectually involved in arts, education, religious issues, and publishing. On the other hand, he also actively participated in the politics; he believed in an Islamic ideal, represented an ideology named Islamism, and shaped both his career and life according to this ideal. This short biography of Mehmet Akif could be helpful to track the sections of his intellectual and political journey. However, every section that was mentioned above has its own importance on the development of Akif's thoughts. Therefore, Mehmet Akif's intellectual life can be examined under three sections as his thoughts on education and

---

[10] Tansel, *Mehmed Âkif...* pp. 3-13, Mehmed Âkif Ersoy, *Safahat*, 9th Edition, M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (Ed.), Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, Ankara, 2013, pp. 19-38, M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ & M. Orhan Okay, "Mehmed Âkif Ersoy", *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 28, TDV, Ankara, pp. 432-439.

science, his thoughts on literature and publishing, and his thoughts on civilization and the West. After acquiring enough information on Mehmet Akif's life and comprehending the cornerstones of his intellectual and political views, an analysis on Islamism in the contemporary literature, Islamism in the Second Constitutional Era, and Mehmet Akif's 'own' Islamism understanding would provide enough information to interpret the value of the concept of nation for Akif which will be examined in the fourth chapter of this thesis.

2. 1. 1. Mehmet Akif on Education and Science

Throughout his intellectual life, education and tutoring played a significant role for Mehmet Akif. The first activities of Akif as an active educator can be traced back to a few years earlier than 1906, where he was tutoring some high-ranking officers[11] of the Empire in private lessons[12] and his close friends in weekly meetings in his home.[13] Akif travelled several parts of Anatolia, Rumelia, and Arabian Peninsula to educate villagers on the modern methods to raise stock in order to prevent contagious animal diseases. Furthermore, he was charged as a professor in different schools to teach *kitabet-i resmiye* (official correspondance) and Turkish language between 1906 and 1907. After the 1908 Revolution, with the insistence of his close friend, Fatin Hoca (Mehmet Fatin Gökmen), he joined CUP and lectured Arabic literature in *Şehzadebaşı İlmiye Mahfeli* (Şehzadebaşı Education Club), which was also attached to CUP. After 1908, Akif was charged as a professor in *Dar'ul-Fünun* (Istanbul University) on folk literature, which had helped him to devote further time on his poems.[14] It can be seen that his growing fame among the public with the help of his poems, and his relationship with CUP caused Akif's education career to shift from veterinary-based lecturing to linguistic/literature tutoring. Also, Akif was one of the most competent intellectuals of his era on Arabic language who was able to translate pre-Islam Arabic poems;[15] and during his self-exiled times in Egypt, from 1926 to 1936, he taught young Egyptians the Turkish language in a university in Cairo.[16]

---

[11] As an enlightening anecdote on Akif's attention on the education, Akif had dedicated the first chapter of his famous *Safahat* poetry book to his favorite student Mehmet Ali, the son of Ratip Pasha. Mehmet Âkif Ersoy, *Safahat*, Şenol Tanju (Ed.), Türk Telekom, İstanbul, 2011, p. 20.

[12] Mithat Cemal, *Mehmet Akif Ersoy*, Türkiye İş Bankası, Ankara, 1986, p. 43.

[13] *Ibid.* pp. 29-36.

[14] F. A. T., "Ersoy, Mehmed Âkif", *Türk Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 15, Milli Eğitim, Ankara, pp. 337-344.

[15] Düzdağ & Okay 2003, *op.cit.*

[16] "Ersoy, Mehmed Âkif", *Türk ve Dünya Ünlüleri Ansiklope*disi, No. 36, Anadolu, İstanbul, 1983, pp. 2021-2023.

Akif's thoughts on education could be beneficial to comprehend his views on Islamism. Instead of citing various particular examples one by one, his thoughts on education could be summarized by tracing the advices of his famous character, *Köse İmam* (Beardless Prayer), which was mentioned in his poems. In one of his early poems named *Köse İmam*,[17] Akif vividly described the environment about the adverse characteristics of the Ottoman people carried within themselves on educational matters. In this poem, *Köse İmam* was described as a man with deep knowledge on social matters. In the poem, one day Akif had visited him and soon after his arrival a young couple came to *Köse İmam* and the woman complained about his husband. His husband was beating her and seeking to marry with other women up to four, since Shari'a allowed it. After several descriptions on the social problems and conversations, *Köse İmam* finally reconciled the husband and wife, and started to describe the adverse situation of the society and the lack of knowledge on the Islamic teachings through the education. In the conclusion part of the poem he described the problem of the society with ignorance and lack of education. In the final part of the poem, through the words of *Köse İmam*, Akif stated:

> This illiteracy cannot work; look at the age: Age of science!
> Start the education from the family my son.[18]

The "age of science" definition showed itself again in the fourth chapter of Mehmet Akif's *Safahat*, which was published in the *Sebilürreşad* journal between 1913 and 1914. In this poem, Akif described the victory of Germany over France in 1871, and claimed it was not a result of the superior firepower the Germans had but the superior teachers that educated the youth of Germany well. Therefore, it would be a rightful act to learn from Germany's education system, open primary schools in every neighborhood like the Germans did, and eradicate the ignorance which was the major reason of the calamity the Ottomans suffer. According to Akif, the elements of the society were unable to read, write, and they did not have books:

> Neither Kurd knows the alphabet nor the Turk reads, or Arab;
> Look, neither Circassian has a book in his hand nor the Laz!
> In short, the individuals of the society lack knowledge.
> But remember this: "Age: Age of science!".[19]

---

[17] Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, pp. 110-115.
[18] *"Bu cehâlet yürümez; asra bakın: Asr-ı ulûm! / Başlasın terbiyeniz, âilelerden oğlum."* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 115.

Thereby, Akif's claim on reaching the "age of science" emphasized a reform in the institutions of the education. Akif's solution on the educational reform was to establish more primary schools in all around the country. With this reform, Mehmet Akif wished to spread the education to every layer of the public, and break the taboo that the felicity of the education belonged to the intellectual elites. Indeed, in his article Akif stated:

> Unless you enhance the intelligence of the layer of the society you call 'commons', and you leave your peasants intellectually where they remain right now, even you train –let's assume that– the greatest men of the world, it means nothing! […] our [intellectuals] who cannot even reach a hundred men […] do not once remember the millions of people who wait their share of enlightenment from the lands where they were physically attached! […] isn't it the greatest [injustice] not to think the producer who we call peasant for once, and still to make these poor ones to read [the ancient works]?[20]

In the sixth chapter of *Safahat*, which is named *Asım*, Mehmet Akif brought the peasants he had mentioned in this article and his famous character *Köse İmam*, who introduced the 'age of science' concept to Akif, together. In this poem, a poor village was described by Akif to *Köse İmam*. According to that, in that village, the peasants built a primary school just like Akif adviced above, with their own wealth and asked the government to send a teacher for the school. But later they kicked the teacher out of the village as a result of his continuous wrongdoings in time. Akif described the teacher as dirty, lack of common sense, and no interest in religion. Therefore, although the peasants were aware of the modern education was required to reach a higher level in the contemporary scale of civilization; they did not want their youth to be educated with 'that' teacher.[21] After a few lines on arguments between Akif and *Köse İmam*, Akif revealed the solution he had formulated in his mind for many years on the duality of the education in the Empire with the following words:

> Tell me, [my boy], who destroyed the madrasahs?
> Was that us, or you? You of course… – Of course!

---

[19] *"Ne Kürd elifbeyi sökmüş, ne Türk okur, ne Arap; / Ne Çerkes'in, ne Lâz'ın var bakın, elinde kitap! / Hülâsa, milletin efrâdı bilgiden mahrûm. / Unutmayın şunu lâkin: 'Zaman: Zamân-ı ulûm!'"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 243.

[20] *"Sizler 'avam' dediğiniz halk tabakasının idrakini yükseltmedikçe, köylülerinizi bugünkü hallerinde bıraktıkça, farz-ı muhal olarak dünyanın en büyük adamlarını yetiştirseniz de boştur yine boş! [...] bizim, adedi yüze bile varamayan, erbab-ı fikir ve nazarımız [...] nasib-i nurunu maddeten bağlı bulunduğu topraktan bekleyen şu milyonlarca halkı bir kere olsun hatırlarına getirmezler! [...] köylü dediğimiz sınıf-ı müstahsili hiç düşünmemek, zavallıya hala Âşık Garibler, Âşık Keremler okutmak en büyük vazifesizlik olmuyor mu?"* Mehmed Akif, "Köy Hocası", *Sebilürreşad*, 8 Rebiülevvel 1337/12 Kanunievvel 1334 (12 December 1918), Vol. 15, No. 382, pp. 331-332.

[21] Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, pp. 351-355.

[…]
– Because we were going to build a primary school [on] its wreck.[22]

After this assessment and many other assessments Akif and *Köse İmam* shared and argued with, the *Asım* poem and also the opinions on education of Mehmet Akif concluded with a conversation between Akif and Asım. According to this, a society could only prosper with the help of 'science' and 'merit'. The science revealed the conditions that would provide welfare and happiness to the society, and the merit put what the science revealed into practice. In order to be exalted as a society, these two conditions had to work harmoniously. Therefore, Asım and his friends should go to Berlin to complete their education on positive sciences, and fulfill the requirements of the reforms the country needed for a very long time.[23]

In sum, Mehmet Akif attached a special emphasis on the education. According to him, the education required starting within the family and it shall follow a modern path in order to compete with the contemporary education systems. Indeed, after examining Akif's life, it can be seen that he had followed the same path with his teachings. Since the early ages of his adulthood, Akif spend some serious time on educating the society and he had placed a vital importance on the education in the family, and his own children had benefited from this virtue of Akif as well.[24] For instance, Emin, the most known child of Akif, enrolled in a primary school during Akif's active participation to the Turkish War of Independence.[25]

---

[22] *"Söyle, mirasyedi bey, kimdi yıkan medreseyi? / Biz miyiz, siz misiniz? Sizsiniz elbet… - Elbet! […] Çünkü mektep yapacaktık onun enkaziyle." Ibid*. p. 356.

[23] *Ibid*. pp. 400-405.

[24] Mehmet Akif had six children with İsmet Hanım: Cemile, Feride, Suad, İbrahim Naim, Emin, and Tahir. Dücane Cündioğlu, *Akif'e Dair*, 2nd Edition, Kapı, İstanbul, 2010, p. 131.

[25] Akif joined the national resistance movement and participated in the Turkish War of Independence. He travelled to Ankara with Eşref Edib (co-owner and editor of *Sebilürreşad*) with the cliché of *Sebilürreşad* in April 1920. The statement of Eşref Edib afterwards indicates that Akif was invited to Ankara by the national movement forces in order to raise the public awareness: "[…] It is not the time to stay here anymore; we need to go and work. It is said the public needs to be enlightened by us. They are calling. We must go. I will set out to Ankara tomorrow […]" *("[...] Artık burada duracak zaman değildir, gidip çalışmak lazım. Bizim tarafımızdan halkı tenvire ihtiyaç varmış. Çağırıyorlar. Muhakkak gitmeliyiz. Ben yarın Ankara'ya hareket ediyorum [...]"* Necat Birinci, "Akif'in Hayatı ve Eserleri", *Türk Edebiyatı (Mehmed Âkif Anıt Sayısı)*, December 1986, No. 158, pp. 70-77). Akif's journey to Ankara was also announced in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* (National Sovereignty) newspaper, which served as the media outlet of resistance forces during the Turkish War of Independence with the following words:

> Islamic poet Mr. Akif: Even Mr. Mehmed Akif, who is very sensitive and divine, left Istanbul a few days ago and arrived Ankara […] The patriotic fight that the nation committed will be enlightened and strengthened with the zealous favor of Islamic poet Mr. Mehmet Akif. We have gladly heard that the Islamic poet will deliver a speech to public on this Friday.

(*"İslam şairi Akif Bey: Pek hassas ve ulvi İslam şairi Mehmed Akif Bey dahi İstanbul'dan çıkarak birkaç gün evvel Ankara'ya muvasalat eylemiştir [...] Milletin giriştiği mücadele-i vatanperverane İslam şairi Mehmed Akif Bey'in himmet-i hamiyyetkarından pek çok feyiz ve kuvvet olacaktır. Şair-i hakim-i İslam'ın önümüzdeki*

However, after he insisted on travelling with his father, Akif decided to keep Emin in his side during his journeys in Anatolia by saying "Let him die with me where I die". Additionally, during his residence in Egypt after 1926, Emin was with Akif along with all the family.[26] It can be deduced that Akif wished his son to be educated in modern way by sending him to primary school instead of madrasah; and also he tried to fill the 'modern educational' gap by teaching his son himself whenever he was not able to send Emin to a primary school. Although there is not many information what kind of education Emin Ersoy got, an anecdote can be helpful to learn his skills. In 1947, a little more than a decade after his father's death, after having some dire financial problems, Emin applied to a job with the following statement:

> I am very good in Arabic, and I have a complete grasp of Arabic literature. I can also speak English. My Turkish is also very strong. I came here to request from you to mediate a proper post for me to be placed. […] I am suffering a lot. I need to be helped. I need a moral and material support.[27]

With this statement, it can be said that Mehmet Akif was successful on providing his child a competent education. However, years later, Emin became a drug addict,[28] he lacked of a place to sleep,[29] and he begged money from others.[30] These can be some proof that his

---

Cuma günü halka bir mev'iza irad buyuracağını memnuniyetle haber aldık." İslam Şairi Akif Bey", *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No. 25, 28 Nisan 1336. From this time on, Mehmet Akif delivered many speeches in various mosques of Anatolia, including the mosques in Eskişehir, Burdur, Sandıklı, Dinar, Antalya, Afyon, Konya, and Kastamonu; but few of them were recorded. M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ, *Mehmed Akif Ersoy*, 2nd Edition, Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1996, pp. 96-98. Some of his speeches during the Turkish War of Independence were published in *Sebilürreşad*, printed in Kastamonu, and delivered several fronts and towns of Anatolia (From 25 November 1920 to 13 December 1920, *Sebilürreşad* [No.464, 465, and 466] was printed in Kastamonu with the cliché Mehmet Akif brought with him. By 3 February 1921, *Sebilürreşad* [starting with No.467] was printed in Ankara). In November 1920, he delivered a speech in Kastamonu Nasrullah Mosque about uniting against the enemy, fighting against enemy, and tearing down the Treaty of Sevres (This treaty was signed on 10 August 1920 between the Empire and the Allied Powers, and it was parceling out the Empire's remaining lands between the Allied Powers). Within the same month, in his another recorded speech in a province of Kastamonu, Mehmet Akif addressed the audience to be united, to work hard, and to fight with the enemy in the name of the homeland, and even to die with fighting. On December 1920, Mehmet Akif delivered two more recorded speeches in the provinces of Kastamonu. He used Islamic terms in these speeches, encouraged public to keep fighting, and he tried to soothe the growing doubts among the public on victory by addressing the religion. These speeches were also published in *Sebilürreşad*; the 464th issue which had Akif's famous Nasrullah Mosque speech within was printed several times and sent to the war fronts in Anatolia. Additionally, the speech in this issue was printed out by the national resistance forces in Diyarbakır once again and delivered the people of Diyarbakır, Elazığ, Bitlis, and Van along with the war fronts of the country. Düzdağ, pp. 100-104.

[26] Mustafa Özgen, "Mehmet Akif Ersoy'un Türk Eğitimine Katkıları", *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, No. 4-5, 2016, pp. 146-164.

[27] *"Çok iyi Arapça bilirim, Arap edebiyatına tamamen vâkıfım. İngilizcem de var. Türkçem çok kuvvetlidir. Sizden münasip bir vazifeye yerleştirilmem hususunda tavassutunuzu ricaya geldim. […] Hâl-i hazırda çok mağdur durumdayım. Elimden tutulması lâzım. Maddî-manevî müzaherete ihtiyacım var."* Cündioğlu, 138.

[28] *Ibid*. p. 145.

[29] Barış Terkoğlu, "İsmail Kahraman'ın Yanıt Veremediği Soru", *Cumhuriyet*, 26 November 2018.

father's evaluation about the complementary conditions of the sought prosperity as it was mentioned above through the amalgamation of the 'science' and the 'merit' conditions was genuine. Thus, Emin had justified his father by carrying the contemporary 'scientific' knowledge within with all the contemporary education he had acquired; but in the end, he lacked in the merit condition which his father constituted half of his education model upon.

2. 1. 2. Mehmet Akif on Literature and Publishing

Mehmet Akif's efforts on the literature and publishing could be taken as a reflection of his emphasis on education. Throughout his life, Akif had penned several works, including poems, articles, and translations; and he was able to publish most of them. Akif had published several of his articles and poems in *Sırat-ı Müstakim* (the Straight Path) journal since its first issue and became its editor-in-chief in 1913.[31] Apart from his poems and the articles he had written in *Sırat-ı Müstakim* and *Sebilürreşad* (the Path of Righteousness)*, Mehmet Akif was very prolific as an author. He had over fifty pieces of *tefsir* (interpreting Quran and hadith, analyzing the 'authentic' meanings of words in details rather than a simple translation) of hadith (Prophet Muhammad's words) and several verses of Quran, and some of them were written as poems.[32] Additionally, he penned the translation of Quran; but this work was known to be burned after his death by one of his friends as a result of his testament recently. However, some parts of this translation were found and it was published in 2013. The translation starts from the beginning of Quran with Surah al-Fatihah and ends with Surah al-Tawbah. Considering it takes 206 pages, roughly one third of the whole book, it provides enough information to review Akif's competency on the Arabic language.[33] Apart from his poems, articles, and interpretations of the religious

---

[30] Çetin Altan, "Enver Paşa'nın Kız Kardeşi ve Mehmet Akif'in Oğlu", *Sabah*, 5 August 1999.

[31] Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2011, p. 9.

[32] The third book of *Safahat*, titled *Hakkın Sesleri*, can be a good example of these interpretations written as poems. This book includes eight interpretations of Quran verses, and one interpretation of a hadith.

[33] In 1925, the newly established Turkish Republic had decided to teach Islam to the Turkish nation in its own language, and the decided action was to prepare three works for this purpose: A translation of Quran, an interpretation of Quran, and a translation of hadiths. The duty for picking the right people for this intention was given to Aksekili Ahmed Hamdi Efendi, who was the vice-president of the Presidency of Religious Affairs. The vice-president assigned Babanzade Ahmed Naîm Bey with the translation of hadiths, Elmalılı Hamdi Efendi with the interpretation of Quran, and Mehmet Akif with the translation of Quran. Mehmet Akif accepted the job offer and started to work on translation. Later, he travelled to Egypt, worked on translation until 1928, and completed the first draft. In 1932, his translation was fully completed. Mehmet Emin Erişirgil, *İslamcı Bir Şairin Romanı Mehmet Akif*, 3rd Edition, Aykut Kazancıgil & Cem Alpar (Ed.), Nobel, Ankara, 2006, pp. 333-337, Mehmed Âkif Ersoy, *Kur'an Meali Fatiha Sûresi – Berâe Sûresi*, 2nd Edition, Recep Şentürk & Asım Cüneyd Köksal (Ed.), Mahya, İstanbul, 2013a, pp. XI-XII. However, Akif decided not to submit the translation. The hypotheses on Akif's hesitation on submitting the translation varied. On 11 April 1926, in an article he penned in the *Milliyet* newspaper, Ahmed Ağaoğlu introduced a new idea on

sources, Mehmet Akif had translated over fifty articles from Arabic and French, and published them in his journal with *Sa'di* or *Laedri* pen-names or under his own name after 1908. Additionally, he had five article translations from French and Arabic to Turkish which were also published as complete books: *Müslüman Kadını* (Muslim Woman) of Ferid Vecdi, *Hanoto'nun Hücumuna Karşı Şeyh Muhammed Abduh'un İslam'ı Müdafaası* (Sheikh Muhammad Abduh's Defending of Islam against Hanotaux's Attack) of Muhammed Abduh, *İslamlaşmak* (Islamification) of Said Halim Pasha, *Anglikan Kilisesine Cevap* (Reply to the Anglican Church) and *İçkinin Hayat-ı Beşerde Açtığı Rahneler* (Breaches the Alcohol Opens in the Human Life) of Abdülaziz Caviş.[34]

Mehmet Akif is better known with his poems more than his articles and translations. In 1911, Akif collected all of his poems he had written in *Sırat-ı Müstakim* between 1908 and 1911 and also a few of his poems he had written earlier within a single book named *Safahat* (Phases). Although this name was given to the first chapter of his poetry book which consisted of seven chapters in time, his complete works including all these seven chapters were named *Safahat* as well.[35] The sequence of the chapters in *Safahat* reflects not only the developments in his artistic talent in poetry but also the changes in Akif's intellectual and emotional journeys along with the periodic challenges the Empire had witnessed which also show parallelism with the name of the book, phases.

The first chapter, named *Safahat* (the poems of this chapter were published in *Sırat-ı Müstakim* from 1908 to 1911) has 44 poems and these are mostly about the issues and

reading Quran in Turkish and praying in the mosques in Turkish. Additionally, around the same time, a Turkish *imam* (prayer leader) performed the prayer in Turkish, and Presidency of Religious Affairs intervened in the situation by punishing him. Therefore, Akif got suspicious on a possible transformation in the language of Islam and he did not want to submit the translation to avoid seeing the Islamic prayers in Turkish language. This story was considered genuine until 1968. In 1968, Yusuf Hikmet Bayur proposed another reason on Akif's hesitation. Bayur stated that the real hesitation of Akif on this issue was based on another rumor he heard. According to this, Presidency of Religious Affairs did not want to publish the interpretation of Quran which was prepared by Elmalılı Hamdi Efendi, and Akif did not see any benefit on submitting the translation which he claimed it was not possible to understand the translation without the interpretation. Tansel, *Mehmed Âkif...* pp. 99-101. Whatever the reason was, Akif did not submit the translation and requested from his close friend Yozgatlı İhsan Efendi (Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu's father) to burn the translation after his death. With Akif's death, İhsan Efendi claimed he had burned the translation. Actually, he did not fulfill Akif's testimony, and in 1961 in his deathbed, he asked his son to burn that translation after his death. Ekmeleddin and a group of his friends indeed had burned the translation. However, İhsan Efendi had copied some of Akif's translations, and one of his pupils had kept some of these notebooks. Ersoy 2013a, pp. XIII-XV.

[34] Suat Mertoğlu, "Akif Araştırmalarına Bibliyografik Bir Katkı: Mehmet Akif'in Arapça'dan Yaptığı Tercümeler Üzerine Notlar", *Divan: Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, Vol. 1999/2, No. 7, pp. 235-249.
[35] The chapters were published separately for many years with Ottoman letters. The book was not published in Ottoman letters; but it was first published as a complete book with Turkish letters in 1943. Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. (40).

problems of daily and social lives of people. The second chapter, *Süleymaniye Kürsüsünde* (this poem was published in *Sırat-ı Müstakim* in pieces from January 1912 to August 1912) is a single 1002 verses-long poem, which starts with a long description of Istanbul right after the 1908 Revolution, continues with the degenerated and deadlocked situation of Islam and the Muslim societies, and concludes with a solution proposal in order to eradicate this degeneration. The third chapter, *Hakkın Sesleri* (the poems in this chapter were published in *Sırat-ı Müstakim* from January 1913 to June 1913), includes ten pessimistic poems which are mostly about the Balkan Wars, partisanship and racism among the subjects of the Empire, and some vivid descriptions of massacres in the Balkans, the hunger, and the immigration. The fourth chapter, *Fatih Kürsüsünde* (this chapter was published in *Sebilürreşad* from June 1913 to July 1914), includes two long poems which actually completes each other; the second one starts where the first one has ended. In this chapter, Mehmet Akif stressed out the ignorance and laziness within the society, tried to give some advices, and strengthened his advices with some bloody incidents the Muslims witnessed during the Balkan Wars. The fifth chapter, *Hatıralar* (the poems in this chapter have a rather long publishing period compared the previous chapters; containing a timeline from July 1913 to July 1918), includes ten poems which are mostly about the transformations of the Muslim societies during WWI. Apart from that, the longest poem in this chapter called *Berlin Hatıraları* can be considered as the most famous poem of this chapter, in which Akif clearly described the Western civilization he had witnessed during his journey to Germany, and it includes several comparisons between the Islamic and the German societies. The sixth chapter, *Asım* (almost half of this poem was published in *Sebilürreşad* on September 1919, and the rest was added to a later edition of *Safahat* in 1928, which included over 100 minor revisions of Akif himself),[36] is a single 2292 verses-long poem, which is a long dialogue from the beginning to the end.[37] In this poem, Mehmet Akif summarized almost all his advices for a better Islamic society which he held dear throughout his life; including studying hard, working hard, studying the modern science and technology, being loyal to own culture, and as a result of these to have

---

[36] *Ibid*. p. (48).

[37] The dialogue in this poem includes four main characters: Hocazâde (son of master/teacher), Köse İmam, Asım, and Emin. These four characters represent four different personalities within the society. Hocazâde refers to Mehmet Akif himself, who is modernist and tolerant, whereas Köse İmam represents the typical faith and culture of Muslim people, conservative and critical. Asım, son of Köse İmam, and Emin, son of Hocazade represent the excited younger generations. For more analyses on these characters, *see*: Yunus Ayata, "Mehmet Akif Ersoy'un Asım'ında Toplumsal Meseleler", *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Vol. 2, No. 38, 2015, pp. 35-52.

a fully-equipped future generations. The last chapter, *Gölgeler* (Shades), includes 41 poems, which was published in Cairo in 1933. This chapter does not have a main theme and cannot be categorized as the former chapters; it has a wide spectrum of issues Akif had written as poems, from his spiritual feelings to his love of the God, and from the struggles he had witnessed to some interesting people he portrayed.

In his poems, it can be seen that Mehmet Akif was a good observer; he was aware of his environment, he was able to interpret the emotional impacts of the environment surrounding the society, and he was also capable of transferring these impacts to his audience. This talent of Akif can be seen almost in any of his poems. Yusuf Ziya Ortaç described this talent with the following words: "Akif […] is a realist poet. However, he did not look at the ugliness with an artistry character alone but he pictured that ugliness like a senseless camera".[38] Indeed, Akif was competent in describing the environment; yet, these descriptions were made for a purpose. In his poems, Akif pictured what he had seen and he wanted from the reader to see the same scene with some descriptive words. After the reader understands the scene, Akif directs the reader towards the main agenda of the poem: The challenge. It can be claimed that Akif preferred to formulate his thoughts in a sequence: Describing the environment, pointing out a challenge, predicting a possible negative outcome, and proposing a solution. Generally, Mehmet Akif did not prefer to point out the solution in the beginning; after describing several challenges, he preferred to conclude his poem with his solution in the end. Therefore, it can be said that Akif's poems were in tendency to be didactical.

Mehmet Akif's early poems were mostly about religious issues, ethics and morality, and love. The artistic style of Muallim Naci[39] can be seen in his first poems. During his university times, the social themes Namık Kemal and Abdülhak Hamit forged into their poems had aroused Akif's interest. His interest on folk tales and ancient poetic stories like *Leyla ve Mecnun* of Fuzuli directed Akif to write his poems with a narrated style; Akif used a lot of conversations and a lot of descriptions without breaking the main theme of his

---

[38] *"Akif […] bir realist şairdir. Ama çirkinliklere bir sanatkar mizacının arkasından bakmaz, onu, duygusuz bir fotoğraf makinesi gibi çeker."* in Yusuf Ziya Ortaç, *Bir Varmış Bir Yokmuş Portreler*, 2nd Edition, Akbaba, İstanbul, 1963, p. 64.

[39] Muallim Naci (1849-1893) was considered one of the most important poets who both represented and defended the former *Tanzimat*-style literature *(divan)* in the post-*Tanzimat* era when the dominant tendency in the Ottoman literature was promoting the Western-style poetry. For detailed analysis of his literature style, *see.* Abdullah Uçman, "Muallim Nâci" in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 30, TDV, İstanbul, 2005, pp. 315-317.

poems.[40] His actual tendency on writing didactical poems started with the Balkan Wars, and continued with several other wars including WWI and Turkish War of Independence.[41] The main purpose of this tendency was to indicate the wrongdoings of the Muslim society, to remind the society the former glorious times of Islam, to be united, and to work harder in order to achieve a better future. Hence, the long ingrained question in the artistry world about "For whom the art is performed?" had one simple answer for Akif: "Art is performed for the life".[42] Considering the life itself includes the society as well, and he had taken it as his duty to inform and warn people of a possible negative future, Akif discovered an innovative poetry style to express his opinions through his poems. In his poems, Akif preferred using folk speech rather than an archaic Ottoman language belonged to the palaces, official correspondences, and *Tanzimat*-style poems. Akif's talent on describing the environment, building the scene as a tale, giving a wide coverage to conversations, and using a simplified language made him to become a famous poet in the society. Although he preferred to use *aruz* prosody (the prosody used in *divan* literature) in his poems, the common people had no difficulties in understanding them. Thereby, the most complete definition of Akif on the poetry could be the definition of his close friend, Mithat Cemal: "The man who paints with *aruz*".[43]

2. 1. 3. Mehmet Akif, Civilization and the West

Mehmet Akif was a pious man; Islam had the top priority in Akif's lifestyle, works, and teachings.[44] Therefore, it is expected that Akif's approach on the civilization concept had a single reality which was the Islamic civilization. Indeed, Akif tended to describe the

---

[40] Tansel, *Mehmed Âkif…* pp. 147-148.

[41] *Ibid*. p. 154.

[42] Mithat Cemal, p. 259.

[43] *Ibid*. pp. 271-275.

[44] In all his life, Akif tried to live as an observant Muslim, and he tried to reflect this lifestyle through his articles and poems. This philosophy of Akif shows itself in the first issue of famous *Sebilürreşad* journal (183rd issue as *Sırat-ı Müstakim* or 1st issue as *Sebilürreşad*), by his own words as the editor-in-chief, declaring the ultimate goal of the journal as writing about Islam: "Our journal is an Islamic book. This is why we are assigning the first chapter of holy interpretation which constitutes the main pillar of the Islamic sciences" (*"Mecmuamız bir İslam mecellesidir. Onun için ulûm-ı İslamiyye'nin rükn-i esasîsini teşkil eden tefsîr-i şerife kısm-ı ilminin birinci bâbını tahsis ediyoruz."*). Mehmed Akif, "Tefsir-i Şerif", *Sebilürreşad*, 19 Rebiülevvel 1330/24 Şubat 1327 (8 March 1912), Vol. 8, No. 183, p. 5. Furthermore, during his veterinary times, while travelling several regions of the Empire, Akif completed *hıfz* (memorizing Quran) which he had started in his young ages. Düzdağ & Okay, *op.cit*. Since memorizing Quran is considered a deeply respected act among the Muslim societies, even today; with his competent knowledge on Arabic language and literature, and his good reputation within the society coming from the poems he penned, both the Ottoman governments during the Balkan Wars and the national movement forces *(Kuva-yi Milliye)* during Turkish War of Independence requested and authorized Mehmet Akif to preach sermons in several mosques to raise the public awareness on political issues, mostly about war.

civilization concept through the Islamic teachings. For him, the genuine civilization was the Islamic civilization, and the rest were nothing but the complementary elements of this single reality. Moreover, Akif was in favor of defining the civilization concept within 'the internal elements' of a society, Islamic society in this case. Additionally, it is important to remind that the Islamic civilization concept of Akif had two main sources as Quran and hadith alone.

Moving from the main sources of the Islamic civilization, in one of his articles written on 23 September 1910, Akif got involved in the *mani-i terakki* (obstacle to progress)[45] arguments, and claimed the despotism period of Sultan Abdul Hamid II had changed the fate of the Islamic civilization. According to Akif, Islam was neither against the progress nor was an obstacle to it; however, sultan transformed the meaning of Shari'a something else in order to keep his oppression alive. Therefore, the re-defined language of Shari'a caused the ideas of progress within the civilization concept prohibited. Thus, Akif claimed the certain salvation from this situation was based on reinstituting the principles of Shari'a and consulting to the teachings of the Prophet.[46] In an article written on 18 November 1910, Mehmet Akif analyzed this change in the language of Shari'a during the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid II, and the effects of this change on the Islamic society. In this article, a reader requested *Sırat-ı Müstakim* to be a mediator between the public and the government to revive the 'recent' tradition about reading Quran in all over the country in order to cure the diseases like cholera and plague. As a reply to this request, Akif explained

---

[45] The Ottoman-style Islamic civilization had deeply changed after the 1908 Revolution. The penetration of the Western civilization into the Ottoman lands forced the intellectuals to re-define the Islamic civilization. Considering the main agenda of this era was to advance and progress, almost all the intellectual products were shaped towards these two concepts. Additionally, the definition of the civilization concept in this period included more 'progress' word than before. The political parties, associations, and periodicals whose names include *terakki* (progress) and *ileri* (forward) words belong to this period. Hence, the 'progress' element became an essential component of the civilization concept. Also, the 'progress' word within the Islamic civilization context created its own opponent in time: *mani-i terakki*. Necmettin Doğan, "İlerleme ve Medeniyet Kavramlarının Türk Düşüncesinde Etkileşimi" in Süleyman Güder & Yunus Çolak (Ed.), *Medeniyet Tartışmaları Yüceltme ve Reddiye Arasında Medeniyeti Anlamak Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, İstanbul, 2013, pp. 247-267. Therefore, the 'progress' and *'mani-i terakki'* words created their own followers in time, and eventually different approaches had emerged among the Ottoman intellectuals on finding a solution between the progress and the Islamic civilization: First, the ones who alleged Islam was an obstacle to progress and desired to re-define the civilization by directly copying the Western civilization like Abdullah Cevdet. Second, the ones who claimed Islam was not an obstacle to progress and tried to prove its tendency towards encouraging the progress like Mehmet Akif. Necmettin Doğan, "Türk Düşüncesinde 'Mani-i Terakki' Meselesi", *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Year 9, No. 17, Spring 2010, pp. 177-187. Third, the ones who make a synthesis between the progress and Islam to define a unique Islamic civilization which belongs to a single nation like Ziya Gökalp. Abdülhak Adnan Adıvar, "Türkiye'de İslâmi ve Batılı Düşüncelerin Etkileşimi" in *Türkiye'de İslâm ve Laiklik (Derleme)*, İnsan, İstanbul, 1995, pp. 11-21.
[46] Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 9 Eylül 1326/18 Ramazan 1328 (22/23 September 1910), Vol. 5, No. 107, pp. 37-38.

the value of the medical sciences in Islam, and despised the ill thoughts on 'unnatural' usages of Quran. Akif claimed the paid readers of Quran in *Yıldız* (Sultan Abdul Hamid II's palace) were not reading it to cure the diseases but to present sultan as a pious man to the public. He claimed these kinds of newly introduced practices were not related with the roots of the Islamic civilization, and stated:

> […] with a little thinking it can be understood that a man who was afraid of the shadow of cholera at the Russian border and had taken all the measures in his palace while burning the furnaces-full of religious books does not give the slightest importance on the [traditional prayers].[47]

According to Akif, the Shari'a had two pillars which were Quran as the essence of the religion, and hadith as the essence of morals. He claimed Quran was neither a physical medicine as it was presented earlier nor a salvation recipe for the dead.[48] The same idea on misusing the main sources of Islam showed itself in several of Akif's poems as well, including these famous lines:

> Either we open Quran and look at its pages;
> Or we blow its verses to a grave of the dead.
> Quran was not sent to, know this,
> Be read in graveyard or to tell fortunes![49]

According to Akif, the Muslim world was once a glorious society which brought the light to brighten the future of the world and also humanity. In his unnamed poem in *Hakkın Sesleri* (the third chapter of *Safahat*), Akif used a piece of the 110th verse of Surah Ali 'Imran which praised the Islamic community,[50] and he claimed the Islamic civilization was great once:

> When the horizons of the humanity were dark,
> We erupted as lights from the chest of the darkness;
> We cracked the nights which had no prophet;

---

[47] *"[…] bir taraftan da Rusya hududundaki koleranın gölgesinden ürkerek sarayında en sıkı tedâbir-i tahfîziyeyi ifa ettiren; diğer taraftan külhanlar dolusu kütüb-i diniyeyi cayır cayır yaktıran adamın Buharîlere, Salât-ü Selâmlara zerre kadar ehemmiyet vermeyeceğini azıcık düşünenler pek kolay kestirebilir idi."* Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal Koleraya Dair", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 4 Teşrinisani 1326/15 Zilkade 1328 (17/18 November 1910), Vol. 5, No. 115, pp. 178-179.

[48] *Ibid.*

[49] *"Ya açar Nazm-ı Celîl'in, bakarız yaprağına; / Yâhud üfler geçeriz bir ölünün toprağına. / İnmemiştir hele Kur'ân, bunu hakkıyle bilin, / Ne mezarlıkta okunmak, ne de fal bakmak için!"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 153.

[50] "You are the best community that ever emerged for humanity; you advocate what is moral, and forbid what is immoral, and believe in Allah [...]" Talal Itani, *The Quran English Translation*, ClearQuran, Dallas-Beirut, 2014, p. 22.

We hailed the future when there were no thoughts on future![51]

According to Akif, the times he had described above were the best times of the Islamic civilization. Because, the Muslims were capable of distinguishing right from wrong and they were paying regard to 'what was told', not to 'the one who told'. But later, when the envelope became important than the letter; the members of the Islamic civilization started to promote the ideas which were introduced by others. The values of these new ideas were evaluated by the fame of its owner, rather than the actual value of the idea. Thus, Akif claimed this conviction in the society caused the first step of imitation.[52]

A clear example of Akif's attitude towards these kinds of imitations on ideas, and learning the wrongs from others showed itself in one of his articles as well. As a prior briefing before Akif's criticism on this issue, a Lebanese historian named Corci Zeydan had penned a book on the Islamic civilization titled *Tarih'ut-temedduni'l-İslamî* which was translated to Turkish as *İslam Medeniyeti Tarihi* (History of the Islamic Civilization).[53] This book was criticized harshly in an article written by an Indian Muslim scholar named Sheikh Shibli Nomani, and Akif had translated this critique into Turkish and published on *Sebilürreşad*.[54] Apart from that translation, Mehmet Akif had written an article on 4 April 1912 on this issue. According to that, this book about the Islamic civilization was carrying several wrong arguments within about Islam, and both the author and the translator of the book were Christian Arabs. Although both men who had contributed this book had no relation with Islam, its translation became the most famous book among the Ottoman intellectuals. The Ottoman intellectuals were showing off to each other with the false information they had acquired from the book; and eventualy it became a requisite to read and praise it among them. Akif claimed it could be understood to consult the books of foreigners to understand the history of the foreign civilizations, Europe mostly; however, it

---

[51] *"Kapkaranlıkken bütün âfâkı insâniyyetin, / Nûr olup fışkırmışız tâ sînesinden zulmetin; / Yarmışız edvâr-ı fetretten kalan yeldâları; / Fikr-i ferdâ doğmadan yağdırmışız ferdâları!"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 191.

[52] Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal", *Sebilürreşad*, 12 June 1913, 30 Mayıs 1329/7 Receb 1331 (12 June 1913), Vol. 10, No. 248, p. 221.

[53] This book was published in four volumes in Cairo between 1902 and 1906. It was translated from Arabic to Turkish by Zekî Mugamiz under the name of *Medeniyyet-i İslâmiyye Tarihi* (History of Islamic Civilization) and published in Istanbul in four volumes between 1328 and 1330 (1910-1912). The book was republished in Cairo in 1330 (1912) with several critiques penned by various scholars. For detailed information on Corci Zeydan and his works, *see.* Muharrem Çelebi, "Corcî Zeydân" in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 8, TDV, İstanbul, 1993, pp. 69-71. Recently, this book was republished in 2004 by *İletişim Yayınları* in two volumes with the name of *İslâm Uygarlıkları Tarihi* (History of Islamic Civilizations).

[54] Tansel, *Mehmed Âkif...* p. 48.

was a shame for an Ottoman-Muslim intellectual to learn his own civilization from a Christian.[55] Thus, Akif stated "The history of Islam shall be taken directly through the works of the Muslim historians; but, even the works of the most trusted ones shall be transferred after analyzing well and judging in detail".[56]

These articles were criticizing the Ottoman intellectuals who derived ideas from the non-Muslim scholars, the ones who did not belong to the Islamic civilization. In order to counterweigh this trend, Akif had preferred to introduce the ideas about the Islamic civilization from the works of the Muslim intellectuals. Muhammad Abduh, who was the pupil of Jamal al-Din al-Afghani, had a great intellectual impact on Mehmet Akif's thoughts on the Islamic unity and the Islamic civilization.[57] Therefore, between 1908 and 1909, Akif had translated thirty-two articles from Muhammad Abduh to introduce the 'genuine' Islamic civilization to the Ottoman society and published in *Sırat-ı Müstakim* under the pen-name of *Sa'di*.[58] However, as Sezai Karakoç clearly stated, the influence of Abduh on Akif shall not be considered as an imitation or an idea import from the Egyptian Muslim scholars. Mehmet Akif was not trying to implement a new civilization by citing the works of these scholars. The Islamic civilization was already existed in the roots of the society; however, Akif was in need of some help to revive it in order to secure a 'glorious'

---

[55] One of these intellectuals was Tevfik Fikret from Akif's perspective. In his famous *Tarih-i Kadim* (Ancient History) poem written on 28 April 1905 *(15 Nisan 1321)*, Tevfik Fikret described Quran as the killer of ideas and called it 'outdated'. Mehmet Akif replied this attack with calling Tevfik Fikret as 'money grubber' and named him 'church-bell ringer' *(zangoç)* in his *Süleymaniye Kürsüsünde* poem. After several pen-fights, Fikret named Akif *Molla Sırat* (the religious man of *Sırat-ı Müstakim*) and Akif had written 98 lines to insult Tevfik Fikret in *Berlin Hatıraları*, and published it. However, with the death of Tevfik Fikret in 1915, Akif had seen no purpose to keep this fight alive and removed these lines from the later editions of *Safahat* which is hard to find these lines in most of the 'newer' editions. Düzdağ, pp. 61-68, Mithat Cemal, pp. 98-100, Erişirgil, *İslamcı...* pp. 131-136.

[56] *"Tarih-i İslam doğrudan doğruya Müslüman müverrihlerinin eserlerinden alınmalıdır; ancak bunların hiç olmazsa en mevsûk tanınmış olanları iyice tedkik edildikten, uzun uzadıya muhakeme olunduktan sonra nakl olunmalıdır."* Mehmed Akif, "Tenkid ve Takriz: Medeniyet-i İslamiye Tarihi'nin Hataları", *Sebilürreşad*, 22 Mart 1328/16 Rebiülahir 1330 (4 April 1912), Vol. 8-1, No. 187, p. 92.

[57] Muhammad Abduh indeed had a great impact on Akif's thoughts. For instance, in the last pages of his famous poem *Asım*, Mehmet Akif described two different ways of reform *(inkılâb)* the leaders of Islamism offered; a fast and revolutionary way of al-Afghani and a gradual but certain way of his pupil Abduh. According to Akif, the fast and revolutionary way was a savage way, similar to Ottoman coup d'état of 1913 *(Bab-ı Ali Baskını)*. However, the gradual and certain way was passing through education, via building schools, educating and enlightening the youth, and picking its fruits years later. Between these two alternative paths towards a future Islamic reform, Mehmet Akif clearly stated he was sided with Abduh on this debate with the following words: "I want a revolution too; but just like Abduh does…" (*"İnkılâb istiyorum ben de, fakat, Abdu gibi…"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 402). This kind of approach could be a summary of Akif as an educator; training and educating masses is a slow-lasting process which was expected to eventually be successful.

[58] Tansel, *Mehmed Âkif...* pp. 48-55.

Islamic civilization for the future as it was experienced before.[59] Thus, Akif's struggle was to constitute the 'prosperous civilization' once the Muslims were capable of establishing which was about to fall to pieces in his time:

> The East which had raised the monuments of art,
> Look, its prosperous grounds turned into arid lands![60]

Mehmet Akif argued the Islamic civilization was indeed great and glorious; but, it was still boasting itself with the famous figures or contributions it had introduced once. In his Islamic unity ideal, Akif did not only point out to become united as a whole to transform into a solid political Muslim entity but also to be united at intellectual level to advance as a civilization. In order to attract the attention of the educated ones within the society, Akif claimed the individual prides shall be eradicated first in order to be united and to achieve a greater level in civilization. In his article written in 1910, Akif stated:

> As I see we are good men individually. The individuals of the societies which heavily left us behind in civilization do not have much arrogance among the individuals like we do. And then I see again that we cannot form a [civil] society when we come together because we lack that kind of training. This training shall be the one which we will be in need of.[61]

The training Akif was stressing out here was to work together as a whole to raise the Islamic civilization up. The duty of training the Ottoman individuals intellectually to form a social group in order to advance in civilization was assigned to the preachers in the mosques by Akif. This is why Akif himself tried to implement his teachings through the words of preachers in two of his poems, *Fatih Kürsüsünde* and *Süleymaniye Kürsüsünde*, along with his actual efforts as a preacher during the war times. Indeed, his plans on this assignment showed itself in an article he penned in 1910 as stated:

> The mosques are very proper places to enlighten the ideas of the society! Anyone with a proper language can go up to the rostrum and preach the truth to the community on behalf of Quran and hadith. […] However, […] the preacher shall

---

[59] Sezai Karakoç, *Mehmed Âkif*, 6th Edition, Diriliş, İstanbul, 1987, pp. 20-21.
[60] *"Bütün heyâkil-i san'at yetiştiren Şark'ın, / Zemîn-i feyzi nasıl şûre-zâra döndü bakın!"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 102.
[61] *"Bakıyorum, ayrı ayrı pek iyi adamlarız. Bizi medeniyette dünyalar kadar geride bırakan milletlerin efradında bizdeki büyüklükler yok. Sonra bakıyorum bir yere gelince bir heyet-i ictimaiye teşkil edemiyoruz, çünki o terbiyeden mahrumuz. İşte bizim muhtac olduğumuz terbiye asıl bu ikinci terbiye olacak."* Mehmed Akif, "Eski Hatıralar", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 23 Eylül 1326/2 Şevval 1328 (6 October 1910), Vol. 5, No. 109, pp. 73-74.

know the past and today of the community, and he shall prepare the community to the future.[62]

On the other hand, Mehmet Akif's attitude towards the West can be labeled as skeptical. He accepted the technological advances of the West; however, he did not trust this civilization fully. According to Akif, the West had no mercy towards the ones who did not belong to this civilization. For instance, during his famous Nasrullah Mosque speech, Akif stated:

> Indeed, […] it is impossible to deny the sciences, wisdoms, and the progresses in the civilization and industry of the Europeans. However, it is definitely wrong to measure their attitudes towards the people by their progresses in material things. […] These ones hold so intense grudges against all the people, especially against the Muslims that it is impossible to soothe them by any means.[63]

According to Akif, the West did not only hate the Muslims but also enjoyed the sufferings the Muslim world had faced. In his *Berlin Hatıraları* (Berlin Reminiscences) poem, Mehmet Akif illustrated the disasters which the East had faced, and he mentioned the West did not only close its eyes towards these disasters but also praised the ones who caused the sorrow to the East:

> While the cruelty was wreaking havoc in the East;
> While the crimson face of the lands was reflected on the sky;
> Did not even become like a man watching the sunset
> The world did not share the sorrow!
> Sharing the sorrow; no! They were applauding the executioner,
> Without shame, the sons of the great twentieth century![64]

Mehmet Akif did not accept the West as an exemplary civilization even once. According to him, the Western civilization was remorseless,

> See the buffoon creature named civilization:

---

[62] *"Camiler efkâr-ı milleti tenvîr için ne müsâid yerlerdir! Ağzı düzgün bir zat kürsüye çıkar da Kur'an nâmına, hadis nâmına hangi hakikati cemaate telkin edemez? [...] Lâkin, [...] vâiz milletin mâzisini, hâlini bilmeli; cemaati istikbale hazırlamalı."* Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 17 Haziran 1326/22 Cemaziyelahir 1328 (30 June 1910), Vol. 4, No. 95, pp. 290-291.

[63] *"Hakikat, [...] Avrupalıların ilimleri, irfanları, medeniyetteki, sanayideki terakkileri inkâr olunur şey değildir. Ancak insâniyetlerini, insanlara karşı olan muamelelerini, kendilerinin maddiyattaki bu terakkîleriyle ölçmek katiyyen doğru değildir. [...] Bunların bütün insanlara, bilhassa Müslümanlara karşı öyle kinleri, öyle husûmetleri vardır ki hiçbir suretle teskin edilmek imkânı yoktur."* Mehmed Akif, "Nasrullah Kürsüsü'nde Üstad-ı Muhterem Mehmed Akif Beyefendi'nin Kastamonu'da Nasrullah Cami-i Şerifinde İrad Buyurdukları Mevizaların Hülasasıdır", *Sebilürreşad*, 25 Teşrinisani 1336/15 Rebiülevvel 1339 (25 November 1920), Vol. 18, No. 464, pp. 249-259.

[64] *"Zemîn-i Şark'ı mezâlim kasıp kavurdukça; / O kıpkızıl yüzü hâkin fezâya vurdukça; / Gurûb seyreden âvâre bir temâşâ-ger / Kadar da olmadı dünyâ nasîbedâr-ı keder! / Keder de söz mü ya? Alkışlıyordu cellâdı, / Utanmadan koca yirminci asrın evlâdı!"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 295.

80

Spit in the masked remorse of the century, spit in![65]

cruel (Curse the cruelty named 'civilization'),[66] harlot, and impudent (The harlot which is called civilization is impudent indeed).[67] Akif claimed the West sought to divide the Muslims by implementing some discords within the community. For example, according to Akif, the Muslims in India under the ruling of the British were persuaded by British to slaughter cattle instead of sheep during Eid al-Adha (feast of sacrifice) to provoke the Hindus who regarded the cattle as sacred.[68] In his another example, Akif quoted a conversation between an Egyptian Muslim and a British. According to this, if the Ottoman government would be able to send a large army to save Egypt from the British occupation, the British would not do anything but leave the country. Then, they would bring so many troubles on the Ottomans that the Empire could not even find a chance to turn its face towards Egypt again.[69] Therefore, Akif claimed the West was only seeking to create troubles within the Islamic communities in order to restrain the Islamic civilization to prosper. In his unnamed poem written in the *Hakkın Sesleri* chapter of *Safahat*, Akif stated:

> Civilization (!) nurses a grudge to you for a long time;
> It desires to crumble you first, then to devour.[70]

With the exclamation point he had put next to the civilization word, it can be said that Akif did not regard the Western civilization as great as it was presented. In his speech at Fatih Mosque, Akif quoted a conversation between Muhammad Abduh and a famous British philosopher named *Spenser* (Herbert Spencer)[71] in which *Spenser* confessed that the West was oppressing the East only because they could. The West was strong, powerful, and able to seize the claims of the East. After this statement, Akif said: "The European civilization is not a virtuous civilization; it is not a genuine civilization of the humanity".[72]

---

[65] *"Medeniyyet denilen maskara mahlûku görün: / Tükürün maskeli vicdânına asrın, tükürün!"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 180.

[66] *"«Medeniyyet» denilen vahşete lâ'netler eder" Ibid.* p. 179.

[67] *"Medeniyet denilen kahbe, hakîkat, yüzsüz." Ibid.* p. 385.

[68] Mehmed Akif, "Hutbe ve Mevâiz: İkinci Vaaz: Üstâd-ı Muhterem Mehmed Âkif Beyefendi Tarafından Fatih Cami-i Şerîfinde", *Sebilürreşad*, 31 Kanunisani 1328/7 Rebiülevvel 1331 (13 February 1913), Vol. 9-2, No. 231-49, pp. 389-395.

[69] Mehmed Akif, Nasrullah Kürsüsü'nde…

[70] *"«Medeniyyet!» size çoktan beridir diş biliyor; / Evvelâ parçalamak, sonra da yutmak diliyor."* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 184.

[71] M. Sait Özervarlı, "Muhammed Abduh" in *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 30, TDV, İstanbul, 2005, pp. 482-487.

[72] *"Avrupa medeniyeti bir medeniyet-i fâzıla, bir medeniyet-i hakîkiye-i insâniye değil."* in Mehmed Akif, Hutbe ve Mevâiz: İkinci Vaaz...

Additionally, with the 'crumble' and 'devour' words he had preferred in the lines above which belong to animals, it can be deduced that Mehmet Akif had taken the European civilization as a beast, or a monster. Indeed, the resemblance of civilization and monster concepts shows itself in one of the most confusing lines of Akif in the Turkish Independence March along with another exclamation mark as follows:

> Let it howl, don't be afraid! How can it choke such a faith,
> The single-fanged monster you call 'civilization (!)'?[73]

Muhammed Fatih Andı, who is a respected professor in Turkish literature, made a notable analysis on these lines. According to him, with the emergence of an imperialist agenda of the West towards the East, Akif had lost his hope on the civilization concept. Akif resembled the European civilization to a monster which had been historically and traditionally considered the ultimate version of the evil by the Anatolian folks which attacks the innocent herds. Therefore, by putting up the faith against the monster, Akif referred to the ancient Islamic civilization which was originated from the faith. Additionally, the European civilization perception which Akif had stressed out as an evil thing in these lines shall be evaluated within its particular period of the time.[74] This particular period of time, its characteristics, and its effects on Akif were explained in details by Tuncer Baykara. According to him, in the 19th century, France and Britain were known as the absolute champions of the civilization; they did not want to add any other nation to their ranks, and the rest of the world was considered barbarians. However, in the last quarter of the 19th century, Germany, a 'barbaric' nation, defeated the French army; and the world had seen even the 'civilization' could be defeated. Thereby, the 'civilization' invented a new term to define 'others' while preserving its own camp: Culture.[75] By the

---

[73] *"Ulusun, korkma! Nasıl böyle bir imanı boğar, / «Medeniyet!» dediğin tek dişi kalmış canavar?"* in *İstiklâl Marşı* written by Mehmet Akif Ersoy.

[74] M. Fatih Andı, "Medeniyyet Dediğin…" in Hasan Akay & M. Fatih Andı (Ed.), *İstiklâl Marşı İstikbâl Marşı 41 Dize 41 Yorum*, 5th Edition, Hat, İstanbul, 2013, pp. 269-278.

[75] In a debate between the civilization and the culture, German scholar Johann Gottfried Herder's (1744-1803) thoughts on these two concepts could be enlightening since he "is often cited as an ancestor of modern cultural relativism, in which cultures exist in the plural". According to Herder, the "culture is much closer to a unitary Enlightenment model of civilization". He claimed that the world advanced and progressed as a result of the roles played by different cultures. By speaking the culture as plural (cultures) instead of singular (culture), he preferred to describe the civilization in the contemporary meaning with the 'chain of cultures'. According to him, the European understanding of the civilization should not judge the various cultures which did not reside in the Europe; instead, it was important to remind that the civilization of the world was actually composed of various cultures, which "constitute the universal spring of human action". Moreover, Herder could be taken as the first pioneer of the famous "What to import from civilization?" question which the late Ottoman intellectuals were busy with answering. In this debate, Herder offered "an understanding of the

20th century, the nations of the world had to pick a side, civilization or culture; and the Empire picked the 'culture' side against the 'civilization' after the loss of the Balkan Wars, with the incentives of the Germany. So, according to Baykara, the civilization concept which Akif described as a monster was representing an axis; the axis which caused the Empire to fall back, and the axis which sought to eradicate the whole Muslim entity in Anatolia after WWI. Hence, Akif was not objecting to the civilization concept in the meaning of *medeniyet*; he was protesting the 'civilization' axis which positioned itself against the 'culture', the axis where Akif belonged.[76]

Since the civilization was differentiated from the culture above from a different perspective, or vice versa, both terms need a clarification to understand the difference between them in order to comprehend where Mehmet Akif stationed himself among these two conflicting ideas. Mustafa Aydın claimed both the civilization and the culture concepts cover the meaning of all the 'things' which were done throughout ages that helped the humans to express their materialistic, spiritual, symbolic, and practical worlds. Therefore, these concepts indeed seem similar. However, while the civilization can rise with the help of scientific, technical, and political power, the culture aroused itself with the help of 'divine' inspiration in the Muslim societies. Hence, it is not necessary to import a civilization; instead, the culture of a society can be civilized. Therefore, the old teaching of Ibn Khaldun, *umran* (prosperity), which he preferred to use while defining the civilization concept would be the final stop one culture can reach.[77] Mehmet Akif's approach on the civilization concept shows some similarities with this solution of Ibn Khaldun, a 'virtuous civilization'. In the statement in one of his speeches, Akif claimed he was not against the civilization concept; instead, he was against the 'civilization' which the West was promoting:

> If I have one word to say from this rostrum, it is nothing but to wish this vile society which we call the Western civilization to be perished. O Muslim community! Do not

---

connectedness of technology and culture which is denied in modernization theory's belief that technological standardization can take place without threatening culture". David Denby, "Herder: Culture, Anthropology and the Enlightenment", *History of Human Sciences*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 2005, pp. 55-76. With this information, it can be said that Akif's selective import style from the Western civilization shows some similarities with Herder's proposal.

[76] Tuncer Baykara, *Osmanlılarda Medeniyet Kavramı ve Ondokuzuncu Yüzyıla Dair Araştırmalar*, Akademi, İzmir, 1992, pp. 78-80.

[77] Mustafa Aydın, "Kültür ve Medeniyet İkilemine Farklı Bir Bakış" in Süleyman Güder & Yunus Çolak (Ed.), *Medeniyet Tartışmaları Yüceltme ve Reddiye Arasında Medeniyeti Anlamak Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, İstanbul, 2013, pp. 103-114.

ever suppose I am a man against the science, skills, and progress. The civilization I desire for the whole humanity, especially for my co-religionists, is a pure, noble, honorable, and dignified civilization in all aspects; means a virtuous civilization.[78]

2. 2. Islamism in the Late Ottoman Period

In order to comprehend what kind of Islamism Mehmet Akif championed, it is needed to know the origins of Islamism, types of Islamism, and what the Islamism offers to the politics as an ideology. Originally, the Islamism term covers a wide selection of issues in a relatively wide timeline, and anything related with Islam and politics can simply be considered as a part or a piece of Islamism. It was interpreted in various parts of the world by different intellectuals and leaders coming from a variety of backgrounds; Wahhabism of 18th century, Salafi Movement of 19th century, Muslim Brotherhood of 20th century, and Arab Springs of 21st century were some natural outputs derived from different interpretations of Islam and politics –Islamism in short. Additionally, the term itself does not have a certain boundaries to study within; the issues Islamism deals with can easily be expanded to anything related with religion, politics, social matters, etc. Thus, the nature of the term includes several different definitions on several different issues. For instance, the same term, Islamism, was defined as an official state policy of the Empire in the early 20th century [79] whereas it was accepted as an extremist ideology and defined as being synonymous with militant Islam in the beginning of 21st century.[80]

To check the roots of Islamism as an ideology, Şerif Mardin's assesments could be helpful. He argued that Islamism dated back to 1840s, where it glimmered as an Islamic reaction first, as a background element of a formless but an insistent movement. Additionally, Islamism did not have a theoretician, and its systematic ideology developed slowly. Hence, even after a century, it cannot be claimed that Islamism has an absolute clarity.[81] Due to the term itself has no absolute shape to observe and define it clearly as Mardin pointed out, this thesis will consider "Islamism" as a liquid matter -with regard to liquid takes the shape of its vessel, and will try to define it by looking at its vessel. The mentioned vessel in this

---

[78] *"Benim bu kürsüden söyleyecek bir sözüm varsa o da, garb medeniyeti dediğimiz o rezil âlemin, bir an evvel hâk ile yeksan olmasını temenniden ibarettir. Ey cemaat-i müslimîn! Sakın bu sözlerimden benim ilim düşmanı, marifet düşmanı, terakki düşmanı olduğuma zâhib olmayınız. Benim bütün insanlar hesabına, bilhassa dindaşlarım namına istediğim bir medeniyet varsa o da her manasiyle pâk, yüksek, namuslu, vakarlı bir medeniyettir, yani bir medeniyet-i fâzıladır."* Mehmed Akif, Nasrullah Kürsüsü'nde…

[79] Cengiz Karataş, *II. Meşrutiyet Dönemi Fikir hareketleri ve Türk Edebiyatına Yansımaları*, Akçağ, Ankara, 2014, p. 60.

[80] Dale C. Eikmeier, "Qutbism: An Ideology of Islamic-Fascism", *Parameters*, No. 14, 2007, pp. 85-97.

[81] Şerif Mardin, *Türk Modernleşmesi*, 2nd Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 1992, p. 91.

work will be the time. Henceforth, this thesis will aim to define Islamism as a featured ideology during the late Ottoman period and early Turkish Republic period; precisely from the early impacts of Jamal al-Din al-Afghani's ideas in the last quarter of the 19th century in the Empire to the abolition of the caliphate by the Turkish Republic in 1924.

Islamism had several definitions which were put forward by various academics, authors, researchers, intellectuals, and politicians in time. Some intellectuals had taken Islamism as an ideology whereas others considered it as a social and political movement. For instance, as it was stated in the first chapter, Tarık Zafer Tunaya defined Islamism as an ideology; according to him, Islamism claimed it had an idea and a belief system which could establish institutions, and it summoned a social movement to execute itself.[82] Moreover, Mümtaz'er Türköne argued that Islamism sprung out by re-systematizing Islam under the form of an ideology, as an output of a synthesis of the ideological mindset coming from the West and the traditional Islamic values.[83] On the other hand, Hilmi Ziya Ülken argued it would not be correct to call Islamism (and he also added Turkism) which emerged during the Second Constitutional Era as an ideological movement. According to him, both these movements were not presented to intellectuals alone; they were supported by various social types of people and they had published their writings in various types.[84]

While determining whether Islamism is an ideology or a movement, the definition made by İsmail Kara seems the most comprehensive one among others:

> Islamism, can be defined as a movement in 19th-20th centuries which includes the sum of political, intellectual, and scientific actions, quests, proposals, and recipes with some dominant modernist and eclectic sides, performed for the sake of making Islam 're-dominant' over life as a whole (in belief, worshipping, ethics, philosophy, politics, education…), saving the Islamic world from Western exploitation, cruel and despotic leaders, slavery, imitations, and superstitions, and making the Islamic world civilized, united, and developed.[85]

Here, the "re-" prefix is the key, which summarizes the whole efforts of Islamism. By the help of this extensive definition, in the labeling struggles among the intellectuals and the academics on whether Islamism shall be considered an ideology or a politically-active social and intellectual movement, this thesis will support the second group. The lack of a doctrine, a theoretician, and a complete systematic ideology as Mardin argued above keep

---

[82] Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *İslâmcılık Akımı*, 2nd Edition, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, İstanbul, 2007, pp. 1-2.
[83] Mümtaz'er Türköne, *Siyasî İdeoloji Olarak İslâmcılığın Doğuşu*, İletişim, İstanbul, 1991, p. 25.
[84] Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*, İş Bankası Kültür, İstanbul, 2013, p. 279.
[85] İsmail Kara, *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi Metinler/Kişiler*, Risale, İstanbul, 1986, p. XV.

Islamism out from the ideology league whereas it fits with the profile as a sociopolitical movement. With this perspective, it can be said that the ultimate purpose of Islamism is to penetrate the religion into the modern era by adjusting its units, by taking the needs of the era into account and without harming the origin of the religion, in order to re-establish the glorious Islamic felicity which the Islamists claim the world had experienced once. This analysis derived from the definition above brings four elements to face in order to understand Islamism in the late Ottoman period: Glorious times of the Empire with the help of Islam, the existing adverse status of Islamic world, the failures that forced Ottoman politicians and intellectuals to seek a solution, and the idea of unity of the Islamic world.

The glorious times of the Empire with the help of Islam refer to the era started with the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, and reached its peak with Sultan Selim I's *(Yavuz)* campaign of the Mamluk Sultanate in the early 16th century. By taking the caliphate title and bringing the sacred relics to Istanbul after this campaign, the Empire claimed to be the protector and leader of Muslims in the world, and had taken this as a mission. After less than two centuries, the Muslim societies had witnessed the 'Western civilization' started to advance and progress while their own civilization experience a deadlocked situation in several areas, especially in the military area among others. At the very same time, the 'weakness' of the once glorious Empire to allow the interference of internal affairs with Treaty of *Küçük Kaynarca* in 1774, Napoleon's invasion of Egypt in 1798, the ongoing Cretan revolts, the British occupation of India in 1852 -which was overpopulated with Muslims, the political chaos in Afghanistan, and the occupation of Africa traumatized the Muslims.[86] The mission of being the protector of the Muslims originated from the caliphate title was still intact until the late times of the Empire, and saving the Empire from the difficult situation it was in was also incorporated into this mission in time. Just like all other intellectual movements in the late Ottoman period, Islamism had also aimed to find an answer to the "How to save the Empire?" which was experiencing a fragmentation period.[87]

During this deadlocked situation of the Empire, the statesmen tried to solve the problem with applying several changes into the politics and the social life. For instance, a modernization process had started with Sultan Mahmud II and the reforms he instituted led

---

[86] Fatma Bostan Ünsal, "Mehmet Akif Ersoy" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce - İslamcılık*, 2nd Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2005, pp. 72-89.
[87] Karataş, p. 62.

Tanzimat Dönemi (Reorganizational Era), and later *Meşrutiyet Dönemi* (Constitutional Era). On the other hand, the increasing national movements among the subjects of the Empire forced the statesmen to unite the subjects of the Empire not with the ethnic bonds but with loyalty to the state. Thus, starting from Sultan Mahmud II, *ittihad-ı anasır* (unity of social elements) and *millet-i Osmaniyye* (Ottoman nation) became a state policy, and evolved into Ottomanism later. However, this policy failed with the ethnic revolts occurred in various parts of the Empire, especially in Balkans and Arabia. Hence, in order to save the state, Sultan Abdul Hamid II had transformed the state policy from *ittihad-ı anasır* to *ittihad-ı İslam* (unity of Muslims).[88] Yet, this transformation should not be taken as a replacement between the state policies; instead, the former state policy Sultan Mahmud II introduced was an internal policy whereas the one introduced by Sultan Abdul Hamid II was an external policy and it can be claimed that both were valid during Sultan Abdul Hamid II's reign.

According to Şerif Mardin, "the Origin of Species", the famous book of Charles Darwin published in 1865, created a new type of politics called "Pan" nationalisms. This book was claiming that some species eradicated others during the evolution process in the nature, and only the fittest ones have survived. Applying this kind of approach into politics had caused some new types of racial/ethnic movements to emerge. After 1870, some "Pan" nationalisms have emerged throughout Europe, including Pan-Slavism and Pan-Germanism. Sultan Abdul Hamid II merged this "Pan" movement with religion instead of race/ethnicity, and used it as leverage in both internal and external politics: To rally Ottoman Muslim subjects under the "Islamic" flag internally, and to gather foreign Muslims around the caliphate seat externally.[89] Moreover, the grounds of the capital was also available to inseminate this ideology; the arrival of Jamal al-Din al-Afghani (who was championing Islam in politics) to Istanbul in 1870 and his ideas on Islamism (it was not named like this in that time), was already started to be accepted by the intellectuals.[90] By the 1890s, a new trend emerged within Ottoman intellectuals about taking the technology of the West while conserving the Islamic culture and the traditional values. Especially after the victory of Japan over Russia in 1905, this thesis became stronger. According to this, the Japanese people preserved their culture while using the war technology of the West, and

---

[88] Kara, 1986, p. XV.
[89] Mardin, 1992, pp. 92-93.
[90] Kara, 1986, p. XXVIII.

became successful in a fight against it. There was no reason for the Ottomans not to use this same strategy.[91] On the other hand, Ali Bulaç rejected this 'fondness of Japanese-type conservatism' among the Islamists and claimed this famous example vastly used by the late Ottoman Islamists was actually wrong. According to him, the Western modernization was nothing but a project that could only bring calamity to the society. He added that it was a lie that the Japanese were able to preserve their national culture while importing the Western technique; contrariwise, they became a degenerated society.[92]

The tricky part about the political Islam in the late 19th and the early 20th century is, although it is not unlikely to witness the usage of both terms interchangeably from time to time, in truth, Islamism and Pan-Islamism, they do not correspond to the same meaning. Their origins, perspectives, and ultimate goals differ from each other. Islamism can be seen as a sociopolitical movement briefly, mostly leaded by intellectuals, focusing on the revival of the religion.[93] Due to this movement takes its mechanics directly from the main sources of Islam, including Quran and hadith, it has no theoreticians to formulate the main framework of Islamism, as Mardin pointed out above. The key point on categorizing Islam as a political teaching on whether it is Islamism or Pan-Islamism is based on their main proposals. Revival of Islamic teachings, applying Islam's core teachings to the society, and adapting Islam into social life are the goals that Islamism seeks to achieve. On the other hand, Pan-Islamism also covers most of the elements that Islamism has; however, the part that distinguishes it from Islamism is the political goal that Pan-Islamism involves. The ultimate objective of Pan-Islamism was the realization of the Islamic ideal, the unity of the world in Islam, and a central government under a leader *(imam)* of the world community.[94] These goals that Pan-Islamism sought were intensely touched by the politics; uniting various people under a single identity and a single flag which was governed by a single leader are not so different targets than the other political "pan" ideologies seek. To clarify, although both Islamism and Pan-Islamism bred from Islam and its teachings, Islamism relies on a political society whereas Pan-Islamism leaned on a certain variety of political agenda with certain pre-requirements. Hence, Islamism can be championed by anyone or

---

[91] Şerif Mardin, *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset*, 17th Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2012, pp. 14-15.
[92] Ali Bulaç, *Din ve Modernizm*, 2nd Edition, Endülüs, İstanbul, 1991, p. 269.
[93] Asef Bayat, "Islamism and Social Movement Theory", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 6, 2005, pp. 891-908.
[94] Dwight E. Lee, "The Origins of Pan-Islamism", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 47, N. 2, January 1942, pp. 278-287.

any society at any given time; however, Pan-Islamism was in need of a political motive to materialize itself.

In short, Islamism is a sociopolitical movement, glimmered in the early 19th century, became dominant since the *Tanzimat* Era and then presented as a state policy by Sultan Abdul Hamid II under the characteristics of Pan-Islamism. Islamism aimed to make Islam dominant over the life in ideas, beliefs, ethics, politics, and in several other areas, to save Islamic countries (especially the Empire) from under-developing and being exploited by foreigners by providing unity and solidarity among the Muslims, and to make Islamic world more civilized. Islamism was also called as *tecdid* (renewal), *ihya* (revival), *ıslah* (reform), *ittihad-ı İslam* (unity of Muslims) or Pan-Islamism, although it was not the right usage for the last term as it was stated above. This Pan-Islamism ideology lost its validity in the Empire with the Arab Revolt of 1916 which was led by Sharif Hüseyin (the 'sharif and emir' of Mecca, descendant of Qureyish tribe) and was engineered by the British.[95] Finally, this Islamic sociopolitical movement of the Empire –regardless of how it is called– came to an end with the abolishment of the caliphate in 1924. With the removal of the article in Turkish Constitution about the "religion of the state is Islam" in 1928, the successor state of the Empire, Turkish Republic, became fully secularized.[96] On the other hand, according to Kara, the close relationship of Islam and politics did not stop with this secularization. In the beginning of politicizing Islam and naming this act Islamism, it can be understood that the survival of the Empire was the main agenda to keep Islam and the ummah alive, and this act was a remedy in some sense, an act of necessity. This necessity and therefore the remedy which was supposed to be temporary and limited with survival of the state purpose alone became a permanent tendency in time. Therefore, even there was no necessity for this remedy after the failure of *ittihad-ı İslam* policy, Islam galvanized in the politics, and penetrating Islam into politics had always continued in Turkish political life.[97]

---

[95] Kemal H. Karpat, *The Politicization of Islam: Reconstructuring Identity, State, Faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State*, Oxford University, New York, 2001, p. 256.
[96] Karataş, pp. 68-69.
[97] İsmail Kara, "İslamcı Söylemin Kaynakları ve Gerçeklik Değeri" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce – İslamcılık*, pp. 34-47.

2. 3. Mehmet Akif and Islamism

Mehmet Akif was known as a pious man; according to his close friend Mithat Cemal, Akif loved Islam not because it was beautiful but because it deals with the truth.[98] As a reflection of his faith in Islam, Akif had always tried to speak the words through his faith and he sought his words shall reflect the truth; additionally, Akif himself had also accepted his characteristic on this issue in one of his poems as follows:

> No, I do not have any transaction with the dreams…
> Believe me: Whatever I told, I told after seeing.
> This is my most favored profession in the world:
> Let my word be like a wood, as long as it is the truth![99]

Akif had appreciated the religious values and ethics in his entire life.[100] Deducing from the poems he had written, Akif was a gifted poet and a distinctive intellectual where he could see both sides of the challenges. On the other hand, throughout the thirteen centuries of Islamic civilization until his period, there were several writers, thinkers, activists who could be considered within the same league with Akif; as a gifted poet and an intellectual. However, Akif separated from his predecessors in terms of the contextual environment he lived within. The era he lived had shaped the characteristics of Akif more than anything. Akif had lived in a volatile, unusual, and chaotic period. He had witnessed the struggles of survival of a six-centuries-old Empire and the transformation of several *dar'ul Islam* (the lands that occupied by Muslims) into *dar'ul harb* (the lands that occupied by non-Muslims), including the loss of the west of Midye-Enez line to the Balkan League after the Treaty of London which was signed in 1913 after the First Balkan War. Additionally, Akif had witnessed several national uprisings and revolts among Muslim subjects of the Empire including Albanian Revolt[101] of 1910 and Arab Revolt of 1916. Nonetheless, the impact of implementing Western-oriented values along with the imported fashion into social life including the changes of the trends, and also the intellectual life were the undesired examples Akif wished to witness.[102] Additionally, the changes in state ruling and politics

---

[98] Mithat Cemal, pp. 213-219.

[99] *"Hayır, hayâl ile yoktur benim alış verişim… / İnan ki: Her ne demişsem görüp de söylemişim. / Şudur cihanda benim en beğendiğim meslek: / Sözüm odun gibi olsun; hakîkat olsun tek!"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 204.

[100] Mithat Cemal, pp. 199-200.

[101] Mehmet Akif was also coming from Albanian ethnicity; and this revolt had made him upset. For his thoughts on this revolt and his clear expressions of his origin, *see*. Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, pp. 181-184.

[102] For his opinions as well as his despises to the transformation of the society via imported traditions from the West, *see*. Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 161-167.

such as reinstitating the legislation institution, the changes in taxation, and the genesis of newly emerged political intellectual movements like Turkism and Turanism were shaping Akif's intellectual thoughts, gradually. Nevertheless, the invasion of the country by 'non-Muslims' after the Treaty of Sevres, fighting against the invaders with several irregular militia forces which were integrated into *Kuva-yi Milliye* (national forces) later, and the establishment of a new state in the form of a republic were both some changes and the challenges Mehmet Akif had faced in his life. These challenges he had witnessed shaped the ideas of Akif, and eventually shifted his Islamism into a particular and a unique set of intellectual thoughts. Additionally, it can be said that Mehmet Akif was not just witnessing the scene of his era but also he was capable of evaluating it, and also he was capable of adjusting his thoughts towards the needs and capabilities of that same era.

Since Islamism was a sociopolitical movement, Akif paid the utmost respect to the social side of this intellectual order. It can easily be seen in his poems, articles, and speeches that Akif put Islam at the center of his life, and tried to explain the source of the challenge he strived to solve within the religious sphere -within the Islamic context. The universal rules of Islam had to apply to all areas of life, regardless of subject: politics, economics, ideologies, social life, etc. For instance, in his poems, Akif criticized nationalism[103] and its associated concepts within the different ethnic elements of the Ottoman society, which he believed should not be mentioned in the first place according to Islam. According to Akif, Islam was the one and sole identity, and it should be the only identity that the Muslims should carry. Seeking an identity other than Islam, especially an ethnic identity, was so unacceptable that it had a chance to cause a Muslim to lose the faith forever:

> Wasn't your nation Islam… What is ethnicism?
> Wish you held your nationality tight.
> What does Albanian mean? Does it have a place in the Shari'a?
> Infidelity it is, nothing else, asserting the ethnicity.[104]

For instance, in several parts of *Safahat*, Mehmet Akif distinguished two words which are used in the same meaning in contemporary language, not always but from time to time: *milliyet* (nationality) and *kavmiyet* (ethnicity). In this approach, the *milliyet* word contained

---

[103] The nationalism term in this approach of Mehmet Akif should not be considered as the nationalism in the modern meaning; he preferred to use the word *"kavmiyyet"* which mostly refers to the ethnicities and minorities within the Empire, who were also Muslims.

[104] *"Hani milliyetin Islam idi… Kavmiyyet ne? / Sarılıp sımsıkı dursaydın a milliyetine. / Arnavutluk ne demek? Var mı Şeriatte yeri? / Küfr olur, başka değil, kavmini sürmek ileri"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 183.

both Islam and the Islamic world within as a whole whereas the *kavmiyet* word described the exact meaning of ethnicity in the terminology. Thus, *kavmiyet* was the archenemy of *milliyet* according to Akif's approach.[105]

In many of Akif's written accounts; regardless of the main topic (it can be about a description of a specific person like *Seyfi Baba*, or a poem on describing a situation or giving an advice like *Durmayalım!*), he quoted from hadith and Quran, prayed to the God, trusted the divine fate, pointed out the Islamic traditions, and promoted Islam. Additionally, in his famous journal named *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, Akif both kept writing himself and encouraged other intellectuals (including Abdülaziz Caviş, Babanzade Ahmed Naim, Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı, Aksekili Ahmed Hamdi, and Mehmed Şemseddin) to write on Islamic teachings; on the issues, problems, and solutions about the daily practices of Islam (i.e. *Kesb-ü Ticaret ve Tesis-i Sanayiin Nazar-ı İslamiyette Mergubiyeti*),[106] and the refutations or criticisms on the attacks towards Islam or its elements (i.e. *Tarih-i İslamiyet Nam-ı Müstearıyla Doktor Dozy'nin Türkçeye Mütercem Risalesine Karşı Reddiye*).[107]

Before analyzing the political side of Mehmet Akif's Islamism thoughts and his contributions, a roadmap provided by Said Halim Pasha on Islamism could be helpful to understand Akif's thoughts on this issue. Due to Islamism was lack of a doctrine, a theoretician, and a complete systematic ideology as Mardin argued earlier, it would be beneficial to read the manifesto of Said Halim Pasha on the political Islam. During October-December 1918, the famous article of Said Halim Pasha titled *İslamlaşmak* (Islamification) which was originally written in French, was translated and published in *Sebilürreşad* (No. 378-381) through four consecutive issues.[108] The translator and publisher was Akif; additionally, he had written a preface for the book version of this article which was published in April 1919, and praised Pasha's approach on Islamism:

> We were introduced to various [unclear concepts] like Europeanization, modernization, Turkification, Ottomanization. Yet, […] we did not see these idioms

---

[105] Ülken 2013, p. 282.

[106] Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı, "Kesb-ü Ticaret ve Tesis-i Sanayiin Nazar-ı İslamiyette Mergubiyeti", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, Vol. 2, No. 47, 29 July 1909, pp. 323-324 (The Admiration of Earning Money by Trading and Building Industry in the Eyes of Islam).

[107] Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı, "Tarih-i İslamiyet Nam-ı Müstearıyla Doktor Dozy'nin Türkçeye Mütercem Risalesine Karşı Reddiye", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, Vol. 4, No. 90, 26 May 1910, pp. 203-205 (A Refutation against the Booklet of Doctor [Reinhart] Dozy who Uses History of Islam as a Pseudonym which was Translated to Turkish).

[108] Said Halim Paşa, *Buhranlarımız ve Son Eserleri*, 5th Edition, M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (Ed.), İz, İstanbul, 2006, p. 31.

were explained properly. This is why we were not able to understand what the ones who introduced these concepts intended to tell. Some claimed we were uncomprehending ones. Now, we have clearly seen that it was not about being uncomprehending but the actual reason was [their inadequacy in explaining]. Here, we can comprehend the ideas asserted by Said Halim Pasha about "Islamification" easily.[109]

Therefore, considering Akif praised the work and he actually translated it, Pasha's article could be helpful to understand what kind of Islamism Akif sought to be implemented to the Ottoman society. Since Ziya Gökalp had explained his program on Turkism which will be reviewed in the next chapter, it would be righteous to summarize the Islamism program written by Said Halim Pasha which was translated by Akif.

İslamlaşmak[110] suggested that Islam was the 'perfect' religion with its own institutions and rules. Additionally, Islam was for humans only which made it a 'social' religion more than anything else. While executing its functions derived from its social characteristics, Islam consulted neither to positivism nor idealism; it can be claimed it already had a synthesis of both approaches. Moreover, the salvation of the Muslims alone was grounded on Islamification fully. The Islamification concept briefly means to execute the fundamentals of Islam including the faith, ethics, way of living, and politics completely. In order to do that, the Muslims shall focus on the proposals of an Islamification program which constituted of six chapters: Ethics, social life, politics, nationalism, Westernization, and education. According to that, the ethics had three pillars as liberty, equality, and cooperation. If these three could be guaranteed by the society, the social life of Muslims would eventually be enhanced. Additionally, by its nature, the politics actually did not include anything evil within like greed, grudge, and antogonism; yet, as long as it was conducted by the Shari'a. Since Shari'a was 'the greatest truth' that embraced the universe fully; it was the first and foremost requirement that the politics shall include Shari'a within. Moreover, the essential meaning of the nation was the sum of some social and political elements. The nations were the communities of individuals constituted with ethics and culture which helped in distinguishing one from another. Thus, the nationalism approach derived from this concept was inevitable and it would remain intact in the near

---

[109] *"Avrupalılaşmak, asrîleşmek, Türkleşmek, Osmanlılaşmak gibi mânâları meçhul mastarlar gördük. Fakat […] bu tâbirlerin hakkıyle izah edildiğini görmedik. Bu sebeple de bunları ileri sürmek isteyenlerin ne demek istediklerini bir türlü anlayamadık. Bazıları bunu bizim anlayışımızın kıt olmasına veriyorlardı. Şimdi iyice gördük ki, ortada anlayamamaktan çok, anlatamamak felâketi varmış. İşte Said Halim Paşa hazretleri tarafından «İslâmlaşmak» mevzuuna dair ileri sürülen fikirleri pek güzel anlıyoruz"*. Ibid. pp. 31-32.
[110] "İslamlaşmak" in Said Halim Paşa, *Buhranlarımız…* pp. 183-213.

future as well. However, the genuine policy on this issue was to articulate these nationalism tendencies with Islam. Therefore, they would remain as cultural varieties within the ummah, which represented the internationalism characteristic of Islam. Yet, determining the identity through racial concepts rather than Islam would harm the faith in the God's oneness. Because, the God wished the humans to obey his orders and claimed Islam as the sole identity; inventing new forms of Islam like Turko-Islam, Indo-Islam, Arab-Islam, etc. would be a wrong act in the eyes of Shari'a. Nonetheless, imitating the West was wrong; all the achievements the Ottomans had claimed were based on the Islamic teachings. Consulting to the West after witnessing some 'minor' failures would be disrespect to the history. Instead of imitating the Western institutions, it would be the right move to fix and modify the institutions of the society. In order to do this, the first step was education. Since the main agenda of the education was to train 'a good Muslim', which means a dignified and wise subject of the God; a contemporary education system fortified with the Islamic teachings would provide the required modernization to the Muslims by depending on their own sources alone.[111]

Mehmet Akif was and is considered an important figure of Islamism. Yet, in order to understand his exact position within the Islamism movement, it is needed to track the changes or −in some sense− the alterations of his thoughts on Islamism. Mehmet Akif's Islamism as a political movement can be examined in two stages as 'the struggle' and 'the hope'. "The struggle" represents Mehmet Akif's contributions to Islamism during the Empire times, where Islamism was accepted as one of the three major currents of that period, along with Turkism and Ottomanism. "The hope" represents Mehmet Akif's contributions to Islamism during the Empire's occupation, in the Turkish War of Independence, during the transition of the regime from an empire to a republic, and the early years of the Turkish Republic.

Starting from the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878 (*93 Harbi*) to the beginning of the Second Constitutional Era, most of the Islamists were unpleasant about Sultan Abdul Hamid II's autocratic and despotic regime, and they were opposing against him. With the Second Constitutional Era, these Islamists including Mehmet Akif, Babanzade Ahmed Naim, Manastırlı İsmail Hakkı, and many others focused on promoting the Islamic world-view with the articles they penned about constitution, caliphate, unity of Islam, and

---

[111] "İslamlaşmak", in Said Halim Paşa, *Buhranlarımız…* pp. 183-213.

ijtihad[112] in several Islamic journals including *Sırat-ı Müstakim, Sebilürreşad, Beyan'ül-Hak, İttihad-ı İslam,* and *Volkan* in order to forge a public opinion against the despotism.[113] Considering the fact that the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid II (1876-1909) was also the youth times and early adult ages of Mehmet Akif (born in 1873), he was not a stranger to the complaints and oppositions against the sultan. Akif was also not shy about criticizing the despotism he had witnessed. On 14 January 1909 he published his famous critical poem named *İstibdad* (Despotism) in *Sırat-ı Müstakim* which criticized the former despotic ruling of Sultan Abdul Hamid II and exemplified the reflection of this ruling over the public by vividly picturing an arresting incident in a neighborhood.[114] Even in this particular poem alone, Akif was not only describing the incident or criticizing the government but also he was stressing out the importance of Islamic lifestyle which he claimed brought happiness to the people.

Paying regard to Akif had reached the fame in his relatively older ages (around 45-50), which were described as "the hope" above, Mehmet Akif was carrying a hope for the

---

[112] With the second part of the 19th century, when it was claimed that an ominous aura above the Ottomans was causing the Empire fall behind the West, some intellectuals stated that the Islamic teachings were the roots of the problem. Against this approach, a new trend among the Muslim intellectuals, who had faith in the origins of the religion that wished to falsify these accusations towards Islam, became popular: Returning to the original teachings of Quran. Returning to the original teachings of Quran and the teachings of other main sources of Islam including hadith and sunnah (Prophet's sayings and doings) was first mentioned by Jamal al-Din al-Afghani and Muhammad Abduh. Suat Mertoğlu, "Doğrudan Doğruya Kur'an'dan Alıp İlhamı: Kur'an'a Dönüş'ten Kur'an İslamı'na", *Divan: Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, Vol. 2010/1, No. 28, pp. 69-113. Mehmet Akif also advocated this approach; according to him, instead of consulting to centuries-old reference books and trying to make a comment on a contemporary problem with the advices within that particular book, it would be practical and beneficial to interpret the main sources of Islam instead, to solve the contemporary problems the Muslims had faced. Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 378. Consulting to the main sources and interpreting problems with these sources, was actually experienced in the genesis of Islam, while Prophet Mohammad was alive. Hence, it was already a valid concept in Islam and called ijtihad, which roughly means spending both a physical and a mental effort to interpret a newly emerged contemporary problem with the help of original sources of Islam in order to solve it. However, in the Islamic tradition, the gate of ijtihad is known as closed for a long time, since the era of the mujtahid imams (the grand Islamic interpreters: Hanafi, Maliki, Shafi, Hanbali). Since then, the intellectuals and the philosophers of Islam (Sunni Islam in particular) kept interpreting the newly emerged issues by consulting the books of these imams, by imitating (*taqlid*) them. Abdülkadir Şener, "İslam Hukukunda İçtihad ve Taklid Problemi", *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol. 1990, No. 24, pp. 375-387. Questioning the state of Islamic tradition, analyzing the roots of the problems, and trying to solve them with the help of 'authentic' Islam was not only a bold move in the early 20th century but also considered an important action which loaded an ideological function to Islam, in the modern sense. Mertoğlu 2010, *op.cit.* This is the reason the path opened towards the religion by al-Afghani was also named *tecdid* (renewal), *ihya* (revival), and *ıslah* (reform) in Islamic teachings. The path al-Afghani opened was introduced to public by Mehmet Akif via his publications, poems, articles, and speeches. Thereby, after naming Islamism as a 'genuine' ideology or a sociopolitical movement in the modern times of Turkey, it can be considered that its father was al-Afghani whereas 'the figure on the stage' of Islamism was Mehmet Akif. In order to review al-Afghani's position in the Arabs' sense, *see.* Introduction chapter, Footnote. 38.

[113] İbrahim Halil Ozan, "II. Abdülhamid Döneminde İslamcı Muhalefet ve Mehmet Akif Ersoy", *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, No. 4-5, 2016, pp. 146-164.

[114] Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, pp. 73-79.

possibility of establishing a new type of regime after the long-ingrained despotic ages of the late Ottoman era. This hope carried his promotion on Islamism into a whole different level. As mentioned earlier, Akif travelled several cities of Anatolia to preach sermons to the public in order to raise the awareness of people, to promote the Islamic unity against the 'enemies', and to mobilize masses to help the national resistance forces. Also, he participated in the first assembly of the newly established Ankara Government. The new national anthem for the newly established state, which is called *İstiklal Marşı* (Turkish Independence March), was penned by Mehmet Akif and it was accepted by the new assembly on 12 March 1921. During February-May 1922 Mehmet Akif translated a political guidebook written by Said Halim Pasha[115] and published in *Sebilürreşad* in eight parts.[116] Within the last months of the Turkish War of Independence, the times where there were several debates among the politicians in Ankara about what type of a regime to be implemented to the new state, Akif was sided with an Islamic regime.[117] The purpose of Pasha's article Akif published was to be a pamphlet for an Islamic state model; he was expecting this pamphlet to be a taken as a guide for the transition of the new state. However, after witnessing the transition of the new regime started to show a general tendency towards a secular path,[118] Akif lost his hope on establishing an Islamic state model.[119]

2. 4. Conclusion

The first and foremost thing to know about Mehmet Akif is as it was stated earlier, he was a pious man and he placed Islam at the center of his life while constituting his thoughts and proposals around it. Therefore, it can be said that Islam had shaped Akif's identity more than anything else. Similar to the representatives of other intellectual movements during the Second Constitutional Era, with the genesis of a relatively liberal period, Akif had also felt himself obliged to say something about the social and political situation the Ottoman Empire was experiencing. Since his proposals were the reflections of his identity, therefore Islam; his thoughts had contributed a lot to the Islamism movement in the late Ottoman

---

[115] "İslam'da Teşkilat-ı Esasiye" (Political Organization of Islam) in Said Halim Pasha, *Buhranlarımız…* pp. 215-264.
[116] Düzdağ, pp. 115-116.
[117] *Ibid*. pp. 118-119.
[118] Abolishing the caliphate and establishing the Presidency for Religious Affairs on 3 March 1924, change of headgear and dresscodes, closure of religious convents and dervish lodges, and centralization of education could be named among the secularization attempts of the new regime.
[119] *Ibid*. pp. 131-132.

times. His talent in poetry as well as a respected background originated from his competence in both the Arabic language and religious matters such as memorizing Quran and ability to interpret hadiths had helped him to introduce his thoughts on Islamism to the masses, from common folk to high-ranking state officers. Additionally, it can easily be asserted that the journals he had contributed both as an author and an editor, *Sırat-ı Müstakim* and *Sebilürreşad*, had helped Akif to determine, set, and adjust the sociopolitical trends among the Ottoman intellectuals during the Second Constitutional Era.

Islamism was introduced as a sociopolitical movement; since this movement had two sides as social and political, it can be said that Akif had represented both the social and the political sides of Islamism in his life. His special emphasis on education and equipping the youth with contemporary sciences and technique, his solution proposals to the social challenges he had determined, and his persistence in the interpreting the main sources of Islam for the sake of the Muslim societies were some reflections of Akif's 'social' Islamism. On the other hand, Akif had also represented the 'political' Islamism during his life through his works as well as his active participation in politics. During the late Ottoman times, Akif did not hesitate to express his toughts on the political system of the Empire. While he was criticizing the previous regime of Sultan Abdul Hamid II harshly and claiming tyranny was not suitable for Islam, at the same time, he was also giving advices to the society via his articles and speeches to have faith in the Ottoman governments during the war times in the Second Constitutional Era. In these times, his main agenda was to unite the Muslim elements of the Empire under the Islamic flag, which was mentioned as 'the struggle' in this thesis. But then, soon after the Empire started to fail in politics as a result of the defeat in WWI and a national resistance emerged after the occupation of the country by the 'enemies', Akif had transferred all his efforts to secure the victory. His speeches in these times had some political characteristics more than anything else; his efforts on uniting and mobilizing the society with the help of Islamic contexts had produced the fruits and eventually the victory was secured. However, his 'hopes' on establishing the new regime after securing the victory in the form of an Islamic state did not find an answer. On the other hand, another intellectual, who represented a different intellectual order during the very same period with Akif, was able to influence the new regime in both social and political aspects: Ziya Gökalp. His life, struggles, failures,

achievements, and more importantly his intellectual thoughts and sociopolitical contributions to the Turkish political history will be reviewed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3

ZİYA GÖKALP AND TURKISM

Ziya Gökalp was also one of the pioneering intellectuals in the late Ottoman society. Moreover, he had some enduring influences on the modern Turkish Republic. His main intellectual agenda was based on Turkish nationalism; therefore, he had introduced Turkism as an actual program to apply to the Turkish society and also politics in order to find a remedy to the Ottoman Empire, which was about to fall apart to pieces in the early 20th century. His proposals to save the state were not able to keep the Empire alive; however, these were considered very effective in the modern Turkish Republic. Gökalp's program on Turkism was embraced by many authors and political practitioners in the Turkish society. The Republican authorities organized several public ceremonies[1] in all over Turkey when Gökalp died in 1924.[2] In the anniversaries of the 25th or 50th years of Gökalp's death or the 100th year of his birth, leading statesmen of the time like İsmet İnönü, Cemal Gürsel, Süleyman Demirel, and Bülent Ecevit had given special speeches to praise his contributions to determine the sociopolitical pillars of the Turkish Republic.[3] Additionally, some famous authors and scholars like Ali Nüzhet Göksel, Şevket Beysanoğlu, and Fevziye Abdullah Tansel managed to revive and compile Gökalp's long-forgotten poems, articles, letters, course notes, and personal writings and re-published them in modern Turkish. Additionally, the Ministry of Culture completed publishing Ziya Gökalp's complete works under twenty-two volumes in 1981.[4] Besides his profound

---

[1] The funeral of Mehmet Akif (died 1936) however did not attracy any interest of the officials. Even his close friend Mithat Cemal was unable to recognize Akif's coffin at first when it was brought to the Beyazıt Mosque. The funeral ceremony was performed by the artisans and university students in Istanbul. For detailed information about Akif's last days and funeral, *see.* Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, *Mehmed Akif Ersoy (Hayatı ve Eserleri)*, 3rd Edition, Mehmet Akif Ersoy Fikir ve Sanat Vakfı, 1991, pp. 143-146, Mithat Cemal, *Mehmet Akif Ersoy*, Türkiye İş Bankası, Ankara, 1986, pp. 151-152.

[2] François Georgeon, *Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi 1900-1930 Seçilmiş Makaleler*, Ali Berktay (Trans.), Yapı Kredi, İstanbul, 2006, p. 101.

[3] Hikmet Tanyu, *Ziya Gökalp'in Kronolojisi*, Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1981, pp. 165-171.

[4] *Ibid*. p. 172.

influence to the constituent roots of *Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi* (Republican People's Party), Gökalp's Turkism ideology was put into practice in the political field as well; the political parties like *Cumhuriyetçi Köylü Millet Partisi* (Republican Peasant and Nation Party) of 1958, *Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi* (Nationalist Movement Party) of 1969 (re-organized in 1993), *Muhafazakar Parti* (Conservative Party) of 1983, *Milliyetçi Çalışma Partisi* (Nationalist Working Party) of 1985, *Büyük Birlik Partisi* (Great Unity Party) in 1993, and recent *İyi Parti* (Good Party) of 2017 attributed their political programs either to the basis of Ziya Gökalp's Turkism or they were inspired from it.[5] Additionally, to honor his name, just like 'Mehmet Akif', 'Ziya Gökalp' is also one of the most used names in naming and re-naming various schools, streets, neighborhoods, or libraries in Turkey. Moreover, transforming his house in Diyarbakır into a museum on 23 March 1956, establishing Ziya Gökalp Association and its periodical Ziya Gökalp Journal in 1972, and the declaration of 'the Year of Ziya Gökalp' in 1976 were some gestures to keep Gökalp's name alive.[6] Last but not least, as of the end of 2018, more than fifty graduate researches can be detected in the National Thesis Database of Council of Higher Education *(Ulusal Tez Merkezi-YÖK)* starting from 1977 which were penned to review and analyze Gökalp's teachings in various branches from literature to political sciences.

Ziya Gökalp's intellectual legacy was based on series of gradually improved steps. Since he was a young boy, Gökalp had expanded his intellectual horizon derived from the several works of various scholars, both from the West and the East. Throughout his life, it can be said that Gökalp was always in search of improving his ideas which were appeared in his mind at his early ages. In his relatively younger ages, Gökalp had met with the Turkish nationalism idea through the works of Ahmet Vefik Pasha and Süleyman Pasha while he resided in Diyarbakır;[7] however, his journey to Salonika where he fully embraced 'his' Turkishness identity could be named a milestone in this intellectual journey. Since then, he kept formulizing his ideas again and again, until he was satisfied. In his various works

---

[5] The tricky part in this issue is, although Mehmet Akif's thoughts were also influential on some political parties in the Turkish Republic just like Ziya Gökalp, which mentioned in the beginning of the previous chapter, Akif's contributions to the Turkish political life were generally subjected to a sensitive and delicate approach. In the duality of Turkish and Muslim characteristics of the modern intellectuals, the Turkists ignore his Islamist side and prefer to call Akif as 'the poet of the Independence March' *(İstiklal Marşı şairi)* while the Islamists prefer to address Akif as 'the Islamic poet' *(İslam şairi)*. (This emandation and comment credited to Dr. Bayram Sinkaya. His contributions are greatly appreciated).

[6] Şevket Beysanoğlu, "Ziya Gökalp'te Diyarbakır, Diyarbakır'da Ziya Gökalp", *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Sosyoloji Konferansları*, 1976, Vol. 14, pp. 17-24.

[7] Georgeon, *Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi…* p. 96.

written in different times, the residues of this quest for an improvement can be traced; his earlier works were incomplete, raw, and his formulations in these earlier works were not able to answer his questions in all aspects. However, in time, by reading, analyzing, and also participating in several arguments, and also by his interest in sociology, his formulation on Turkishness was completed. Therefore, with his *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (Principles of Turkism) book, he left a sociopolitical program to follow for Turkish nationalists. Since Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp had witnessed the same sociopolitical environment, it would be beneficial to apply the similar method used in the previous chapter and review Gökalp's life, his thoughts, his contributions to the Turkish political history, and more importantly his Turkism view along with his thoughts on education, science, culture and civilization.

3. 1. Ziya Gökalp's Biography

Ziya Gökalp was born in 1876 in Diyarbakır with the name of Mehmet Ziya.[8] He started his education in a regular primary school named *Mercimek Örtmesi*, and continued with *Askeri Rüştiye* (military intermediate school) in Diyarbakır.[9] When he was fifteen, his father died, and he had to continue his education in *İdadiye* (public secondary school) in his hometown Diyarbakır instead of attending a school in Istanbul which he desired, due to some financial problems he met. Then, he began to study French in school, and Arabic and Persian at home simultaneously with the help of his uncle, Hasip Efendi, who was a madrasah (traditional Islamic school) teacher that resided in Diyarbakır after his brother's death. His uncle introduced him the works of famous Islamic philosophers and mystics including al-Ghazali, Avicenna, Farabi, Ibn Rushd, Ibn Arabi, and Jalal ud-Din Rumi. The headmaster of Ziya's school, İsmail Hakkı, was promoting advance and progress in the society and politics, and was also known with his patriotic views. Influenced by him, and some other Ottoman intellectuals who were exiled to Diyarbakır for their criticisms against Sultan Abdul Hamid II –who were also friends with headmaster of Ziya's school, young Ziya became familiar with the articles and books of the Ottoman intellectuals including Namık Kemal, Ziya Pasha, and Ahmet Mithat Efendi. Due to an epidemic cholera case was seen in Diyarbakır in these times, Dr. Abdullah Cevdet, who was a well-known

---

[8] Some scholars claimed Gökalp's exact birth date was *27 Safar 1293* in the Islamic calendar, which is equal to 23 March 1876. Uriel Heyd, *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp*, Luzac & Company Ltd. & The Harvill Press Ltd., London, 1950, p. 19.

[9] Ali Nüzhet Göksel (Ed.), *Ölümünün 25. Yıldönümü Münasebetiyle Ziya Gökalp Hayatı-Eserleri*, Ahmet Halit, İstanbul, 1949, p. 7.

revolutionary and one of the founders of CUP, came to Diyarbakır; Ziya befriended with him, and Cevdet introduced him the Western scholars and their studies, French sociology in particular.[10] After Ziya graduated from *İdadiye*, his mind was full of controversial thoughts: Western-oriented philosophical lineages, Islamic values, oriental philosophy, liberty, patriotism, etc. He wanted to continue his education in İstanbul; yet, his uncle was insisting him to reside in Diyarbakır and marry with his daughter.[11] With all these inner and outer problems he had faced, during the summer of 1895, young Ziya became depressed and tried to commit suicide, shot his head with a pistol. His friend Cevdet and a Russian surgeant performed an operation and saved Ziya. Nonetheless, the bullet was stuck between his two cerebral lobes and could not be removed.[12] Gökalp lived with that remained bullet in his skull until his death.

In 1896, Ziya Gökalp travelled to İstanbul. Similar to Akif's life, he enrolled in the Veterinary College *(Mülkiye Baytar Mekteb-i Alisi)* which was the only institution providing a free higher education. In early times of his education in this college, Ziya built close relations with the secret organization of the Society of Union and Progress through his friend Cevdet, and met its leaders including İbrahim Temo and İshak Sukuti. After declaring his allegiance to this society -which became a committee soon- Ziya participated in its meetings. With these meetings he became acquainted with some other intellectuals including the famous Pan-Turkist thinker and activist Hüseyinzade Ali. The influence of these intellectuals directed Ziya's studies on Turkishness. He read Turkish history and the origins of the Turkish language, and compared these with the information he gathered from Léon Cahun's work.[13] Soon, Ziya was dismissed from the college and he was imprisoned for ten months for involving in 'illegal' political activities against Sultan Abdul Hamid II and the monarchy; then, he was exiled to Diyarbakır.[14] After returning his hometown as an exile, his uncle was already dead; and Ziya got married with his cousin Cevriye to comply his uncle's previous wish which was also repeated in his will.[15] As Taha Parla stated, during his five years long exile in Diyarbakır, Ziya read "hundreds of books" on natural

---

[10] Heyd, pp. 23-24.

[11] *Ibid*. pp. 25-26.

[12] Şevket Beysanoğlu, *Doğumunun 80. Yıldönümü Münasebetiyle Ziya Gökalp'in İlk Yazı Hayatı:1894-1909*, Diyarbakır'ı Tanıtma Derneği, İstanbul, 1956, p. 11.

[13] Léon Cahun was a famous French orientalists. The book mentioned here was *Introduction à l'histoire de L'Asie: Turcs et Mongols des origines à 1405* (Introduction to the History of Asia: Turkish and Mongol Origins to 1896).

[14] Taha Parla, *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp: 1876-1924*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1985, p. 12.

[15] Heyd, p. 29.

sciences, philosophy, sociology, pedagogy, psychology, books in French on the 'new sciences', writings on Islamic philosophy, mysticism, and Sufism.[16] Soon after the reinstatement of the constitution in 1908,[17] Ziya established the Diyarbakır branch of CUP.[18] In 1910, Ziya became a member of the Central Committee of CUP and went to Salonika, and kept that position until 1918 –the date when the committee dissolved itself after the defeat in WWI. Soon after the Balkan Wars outbroke, the party moved its headquarters from Salonika to Istanbul in 1912. In Istanbul, although he had no academic degree or a university diploma, Gökalp was appointed as the 'professor of sociology' in Istanbul University in 1914.[19]

With the occupation of Istanbul on 13 November 1918, Gökalp and many other 'political' members of CUP were arrested in the early days of 1919 and a few months later the Military Court sentenced him and some of his friends to be exiled.[20] In summer 1919, they were transferred to Malta with a British ship. In 1921, Gökalp and his friends were freed and they returned to Turkey.[21] With the arrival to Turkey, due to the Ankara Government was planning to rule out the members of former CUP governments completely,[22] Gökalp was not given back his chair as a professor in Istanbul or any other official position in Ankara. He stayed in his hometown, Diyarbakır, and published his articles via several newspapers and journals. In 1922, he was invited to Ankara to direct the publication and translation department of Ministry of Education in the new Ankara Government. Soon, in 1923, he was 'selected' to serve as deputy of Diyarbakır in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. On 25 October 1924, he died in Istanbul.[23]

---

[16] Parla, pp. 12-13.
[17] According to the documents Aykut Kansu reached, the 1908 Revolution was welcomed with an ecstatical surprise in Diyarbakır and soon the locals requested to discharge the governor who was hesitant in accepting the new political situation. Except for some monarchists and bribers, all the locals of Diyarbakır were sincerely supporting the declaration of the new Constitutional Era. Aykut Kansu, *1908 Devrimi*, Ayda Erbal (Trans.), İletişim, İstanbul, 1995, p. 150.
[18] Beysanoğlu, *Doğumunun…* pp. 14-15.
[19] Parla, pp. 13-14.
[20] The arrested ones were accused of taking part in the anti-Armenian agitation and Armenian massacres while Gökalp alone was accused of giving permission to these incidents along with the same charges the CUP members had faced. During the trials, Gökalp rigorously denied the Armenian massacre claims and asserted that these incidents were two-sided combats (or collateral casualties) where both Turks and Armenians lost their lives *(Türkiye'de bir Ermeni katliâmı değil, bir Türk-Ermeni mukatelesi vardır. Bizi arkadan vurdular, biz de vurduk)*. Göksel, *Ölümünün…*p. 35.
[21] Heyd, pp. 36-37.
[22] M. Orhan Okay, "Gökalp, Ziya" in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 14, TDV, İstanbul, 1996, pp. 124-128.
[23] Parla, pp. 16-17.

3. 1. 1. Ziya Gökalp on Education and Science

With a simple scan of his written works, it can be asserted that the education issue was the first and the most important strategy for Gökalp while introducing his ideas to the masses.[24] His active participations in the education system as an educator can be traced back to his exile times, when Gökalp took an examination in *Askeri Rüştiye* (military intermediate school) in Diyarbakır to teach Persian, and succeeded; yet, after he lectured Persian in that school for some time, he was informed by the spies of the government and he got fired.[25] Later, in 1908, he lectured in the local branches of CUP. After he became a board member of CUP, Gökalp taught sociology at the party school, became a popular lecturer, and directed the youth department of the party.[26] According to Heyd, this time (1911-1912 to be exact) "was the first time that the sociology[27] was introduced into the curriculum of any Turkish school".[28]

After CUP relocated its headquarters to Istanbul, Ziya Gökalp had found a suitable ground for himself to materialize his long-ingrained ideas on education. Soon after CUP took

---

[24] Since his early days, Gökalp had always a keen interest on education. The origin of this motivation for Gökalp can be traced back to his prison times in Istanbul for about ten months in 1900, when he met with a veteran revolutionary named Naim Bey. According to the long anecdote-type article Gökalp had penned in *Küçük Mecmua* (Little Review) journal titled *Pirimin Vasiyeti* (The Testament of My Spiritual Guide), this veteran he met had some strong beliefs that the Ottoman Constitution would be restored one day. However, in order to secure the achievements and gains the Constitution would provide, it was necessary for the Constitution to be comprehended by all layers of the society. Thus, the 'Spiritual Guide' requested Gökalp (and all the intellectuals and penmen he met in prison) to introduce the Constitution to the masses of the society, enlighten them, and educate them to embrace the constitutional monarchy. The English translated version of this article can be found in Niyazi Berkes, *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization: Selected Essays of Ziya Gökalp*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1959, pp. 39-42. As a comment on Gökalp's efforts on educating the masses, Uriel Heyd stated: "When Gökalp wrote his memoirs in 1922, he could with justifiable satisfaction assert that he had fulfilled the demands of his old teacher". Heyd, p. 29.

[25] Göksel, *Ölümünün…* p. 21.

[26] Parla, p. 13.

[27] During his Salonika years, Gökalp developed an interest on French sociologists including Gabriel Tarde and Gustave Le Bon who were known with their theories on imitation and mass psychology, and also an idealist and solidarist French philosopher Alfred Fouillée. Later, he met with the works of Émile Durkheim, a French sociologist, and embraced his sociological method for the rest of his life. Parla, p. 13. The thing Gökalp enjoyed in Durkheim's sociology was Durkheim's ability to classify events and use a gradual approach while explaining the facts, which were the roots of his famous work *Les Règles de la Méthode Socilogique* (The Rules of Sociological Method). Durkheim aimed to define the sociology under a significant method and tried to make it an independent scientific discipline, with a strong belief of the sociology would eventually fuse with the history in one day. This approach showed similarities with Gökalp's attitude towards the sociology. Gökalp had also spent some time to bring out the sociology as an independent discipline in Turkish academy, and he did it. In 1915, under the organizational body of Istanbul University, Gökalp established Institute of Sociology *(İçtimaiyat Darülmesaisi)*. This was the second chair of sociology branch in the world after the one which was built in Sorbonne by Émile Durkheim in 1913. Enes Kabakçı, "Durkheim ve Gökalp: Tarih, İdeoloji vs Sosyolojinin Özerkliği Meselesi" in Korkut Tuna & İsmail Coşkun (Ed.), *Ziya Gökalp (1875-1924)*, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, Ankara, 2011, pp. 205-217.

[28] Heyd, p. 32.

control of the government, Gökalp presented a report to Ministry of Education *(Maarif Nazırlığı)* and organized a lobby among politicians to implement a reform in Istanbul University *(Darülfünun)*. With his detailed report and hardworking lobby activities, the suggestion was accepted. His suggestion on this reform issue was implementing an education system which the courses could be harmonized with and mounted on each other. According to Gökalp, the education issue looked like a pyramid; the stronger the foundation was, the more weigh the building could carry. Yet, this university reform did not satisfy Gökalp and he wanted to expand the covering area of this educational reform into all levels of education, from primary schools to high schools. Eventually, all the courses, books, and programs became harmonized and interconnected with each other in every step of the education. Additionally, Gökalp suggested a specialization within the branches of the Faculty of Literature in *Darülfünun* and expanded the faculty through history, geography, philosophy, literature, and sociology departments. Several young nationalist intellectuals who were trained in Europe including Mustafa Şekip [Tunç], Yahya Kemal [Beyatlı], Ahmed Agayev (Ağaoğlu) were assigned as professors within the Faculty of Literature by Gökalp.[29]

Ziya Gökalp was also very active during his exile times in Malta. Several former deputies, and famous professors, authors, high-ranking officers, members of CUP and intellectuals of the late Ottoman times were also exiled to Malta alongside with Gökalp.[30] In Malta, Gökalp had opened a course on philosophy for the exiles; additionally, he was also performing a distance learning system alike for his own children, and educating them via the letters he wrote.[31] Gökalp's class in Malta was so successful that in almost all of the biographies written on Gökalp, he was named "one-man university". His 'students' who were trained in Malta joined the national resistance forces under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal after they were released, and participated in the shaping process of the new Turkish state after the victory in Turkish War of Independence was secured.[32]

After the end of his Malta exile, Ziya Gökalp resided in Diyarbakır. He established an institution named *Gençlik Derneği* (Association of Youth) and started lecturing sociology

---

[29] Göksel, *Ölümünün…* p. 27.
[30] Muhammed Fazıl Baş, "Ziya Gökalp'in Malta Konferansları" in Tuna & Coşkun (Ed.), pp. 151-167.
[31] Göksel, *Ölümünün…* pp. 37-40.
[32] Parla, pp. 14-15.

in conferences and night courses.[33] Additionally, Heyd claimed, Gökalp had given a seminar on psychology and literature to local teachers and also taught the same disciplines in some secondary schools.[34] At the end of 1922, Gökalp was appointed as the director of *Telif ve Tercüme Heyeti* (Committee of Writings and Translations) and travelled to Ankara.[35] As the director of that committee, Gökalp invited several authors who were capable in foreign languages to translate the classics. After his efforts, all the curriculum of the high schools was edited, and new textbooks were written by experts. Gökalp was assigned to write the textbook about Turkish civilization; yet, he only could complete one volume of this work. According to Ali Nüzhet Göksel, who was both an enthusiastic follower of Gökalp and his son-in-law, people would have known Gökalp with this work more than anything else if he could have completed the volumes.[36]

Apart from his active participations in the education system, his thoughts on this issue should be reviewed. The devotion that Gökalp carried in his life on making positive reforms in the education system started to be developed in his relatively early ages. During his exile times in Diyarbakır, in a newspaper named *Peyman* (Oath), Gökalp had written an article with a title of *Medreseler* (Madrasahs). In this article, he had pointed out the problems of the education system and offered a solution for every single problem. Although this article was biased more of an Islamic perspective rather than his famous nation-sided ideology, the solutions he proposed became the origin of his future reforms in education later. In this article, he proposed the governor of Diyarbakır to unite the madrasahs, to divide the education system into departments, to employ teachers amongst the specialized ones, and to use the documents and books which overlap each other gradually for each course.[37]

---

[33] Göksel, *Ölümünün…* p. 48.

[34] Heyd, p. 38.

[35] Parla, p. 16.

[36] Göksel, *Ölümünün…* pp. 48-49. This book was planned to be published in several volumes; yet, Gökalp could only complete the first one. The book titled *Türk Medeniyeti Tarihi* (History of Turkish Civilization) was published in *Matbaâ-i Âmire* (Government Printing Office) in Istanbul in 1925 after his death to fulfill the testament of Gökalp in his deathbed. In 1976, İsmail Aka and Kâzım Yaşar Kopraman transliterated and published the book in modern Turkish alphabet. For detailed information, *see.* Ziya Gökalp, *Türk Medeniyeti Tarihi*, İsmail Aka & Kâzım Yaşar Kopraman (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, İstanbul, 1976, pp. 12-16.

[37] This article was published in the 6th issue (pp. 2-3) of *Peyman* newspaper on 3 August 1909, anonymously. Yet, according to Şevket Beysanoğlu (who transcripted the remaining original papers of the newspaper – some parts were eaten by rats– from Ottoman Turkish to modern Turkish) this article belonged to Ziya Gökalp. For the transcripted version of the original article *see.* Beysanoğlu, *Doğumunun…* pp. 115-117.

In his famous book *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (Turkification, Islamicization, and Modernization) which was published in 1918, a chapter titled *Terbiye* (Education) clearly explained Gökalp's thoughts on the education system, and included a proposal to advance the education to a respectable level and to remain at this level. According to him, the educational institutions in his time aimed to complete a student's training by following three steps: First, teaching the Turkish language and Turkish history; second, teaching Arabic language, Islamic history, and Islamic values, and finally teaching the Western-oriented courses like mathematics, natural sciences, Western languages, and physical education. With this explanation, Gökalp justified his emphasis on being Turkish, being Muslim, and being modern were already three parts of Ottoman traditional education system; it had just not named yet. According to him, these three ways of education were both the supporters and complementaries to each other. It was vital to keep that harmony among them if an efficient education was sought. If one outweighed the others, it was possible to consider the other elements as enemies, which would eventually cause the collapse of the whole educational system.[38]

In his presumably the most famous book titled *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (Principles of Turkism) which was published in 1923, Gökalp compiled his former ideas as a program to follow while claiming the education problem which Turkey had suffered for a very long time was actually a part of civilization problem that Turkey had also some struggles to adapt itself. According to Gökalp, Turkey had three types of social layers, and each of these layers were different from another, which were uneducated common people, the people trained in madrasahs, and the people trained in [modern] schools. In his perspective, this situation was like the ages of the history; one layer of the society was living in the first ages, another one was living in Middle Ages whereas some were living in the contemporary ages. Gökalp resembled this situation like a 'three-faced society' and claimed a nation could not fulfill its goals as long as it carries this kind of society within. In order to unite these social elements, it was important to unite the education system first. By uniting these three layers of the society with the help of education, the modernization would 'automatically' be implemented to the society. Gökalp concluded his thoughts on uniting the education system in Turkey by following the exact order with his famous

---

[38] Ziya Gökalp, "Terbiye" in Ziya Gökalp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, Mustafa Özsarı (Ed.), 5th Edition, Ötüken, İstanbul, 2018, pp. 48-51.

motto: "I am a member of the Turkish nation, the Islamic community, and Western civilization".[39]

3. 1. 2. Ziya Gökalp on Literature and Publishing

Ziya Gökalp was a prolific intellectual. He had written several poems, articles, letters, and books throughout his life. In his writings, Gökalp had shown some didactical tendencies and tried to train and educate masses with his writings. It would not be completely wrong to label the works he had written as didactical. His approach on using literature as a tool to enlighten and educate the society showed some similarities with some other well-known men of letters such as Mehmet Akif and Namık Kemal, even their ultimate goals differ from each other.[40] Additionally, in the preface part of his famous poetry book *Yeni Hayat* (New Life) Gökalp accepted and defended this kind of approach with the following words:

> […] We see this situation in the life of children as well. There are gaming breaks between class hours. Also some courses are lectured as games while training the children. Similar to this, would it be bad to present some ideas in the guise of poetry prosody in educating the folk?[41]

In his early years, Ziya Gökalp had written several poems which were published in some local newspapers including *Diyarbekir* and *Peyman,* and some of his works were re-published in *Dicle* which were originally published in other periodicals first.[42] In these works, Gökalp used his name alone as Ziya or he preferred Ziyaeddin, Tevfik Sedad, Hüseyin Vedad, Mehmed Mehdi, and Mehmed Nail pen-names, or simply three asterisks (*) instead of mentioning a name.[43] In his early poems, it can be clearly seen that Gökalp had preferred a more archaic Ottoman language; his poems included some long verses with several Arabic-Ottoman style noun phrases, and he preferred to write in couplets with *aruz* prosody. Moreover, in his early poems written in his student times, Gökalp focused on some concepts which were regarded as 'illegal' by the Ottoman monarchy, and titled his poems with the same 'illegal' concepts such as *Hürriyet Marşı* (March of Freedom), *İhtilal*

---

[39] *"Türk milletindenim, İslâm ümmetindenim, Garp medeniyetindenim."* Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, 7th Edition, Varlık, İstanbul, 1968, pp. 60-61. The English version written above taken from Ziya Gökalp, *The Principles of Turkism*, Robert Devereux (Trans.), E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1968, p. 48.

[40] Yılmaz Daşcıoğlu, "Edebiyat Üzerinden Ulus İnşası: Ziya Gökalp'in Şairliği" in Tuna & Coşkun (Ed), pp. 57-65.

[41] *"[...] Bu hâli çocukların hayatında da görürüz. Ders saatleri arasında oyun fâsılaları var. Aynı zamanda çocuk terbiyesinde birtakım dersler oyun tarzında veriliyor. Bunun gibi, halk terbiyesinde bazı fikirlerin vezin kisvesinde arz edilmesi fena mı olur?"* Ziya Gökalp, *Yeni Hayat*, Evkâf-ı İslâmiye, İstanbul, 1918, p. 6.

[42] Beysanoğlu, *Doğumunun...* pp. 137-139.

[43] Most of these names refer to his stillborn children.

Şarkısı (Song of Revolution), and *Mektepte Cumhuriyet İlanı* (Declaration of the Republic in School). In some of his early poems, Gökalp had also focused on some religious issues, by either explaining or glorifying them, and he titled them with the Islamic terms like *Oruç* (Fasting), *Ezan* (Call to Prayer), *Namaz* (Prayer), *Zekat* (Obligatory Alms), and *Bayram* (Religious Festival). Gökalp was not writing poems alone in his early literature ages but he was also writing some short essay-type articles which were mainly based on his observations during his short trips to countryside regions. These articles varied, from pastoral essays like *Dicle Vadisi* (Dicle Vale) to an essay where he analyzed the outcomes of cattle plague on farmers like *Tarla Kenarında* (at the Edge of the Cropland). Additionally, during his early penmanship, Gökalp had also written several articles which can be taken as his early intellectual works like an article on art titled *Etfal-i Memleket ve Bir Bedi'a-i San'at* (Children of Country and A Fine Art), on economics titled *Musahabe-i İktisadiyye: Dişden Artmaz İşden Artar* (Conversation on Economics: [Saving More Money by Spending Less]), on trading titled *Ticaret ve Yeni Ticaret Odası* (Trade and New Chamber of Commerce).[44]

In Salonika, Ziya Gökalp was mostly busy with studying on sociology. Yet, he wrote several philosophical articles and also poems which were published in *Genç Kalemler Mecmuası* (The Journal of Young Pens). This journal had an important place in the transformation of Gökalp's ideal on 'purifying the Turkish language'. As Heyd pointed out, "*Genç Kalemler* fought for the elimination from the Ottoman language of the foreign elements which were not understood by the masses of the people".[45] This being the case, it was not surprising that the journal was directed and edited by Ali Canib [Yöntem] and

---

[44] Apart from his early works mentioned above Gökalp had written his famous long poem named *Şaki İbrahim Destanı* (Epic of Ibrahim the Bandit) -which was written in Diyarbakır in 1908. This poem alone deserves a special emphasis. During the time this poem was penned, İbrahim Pasha, who was the leader of a Kurdish tribe in Diyarbakır, was pillaging the villages and killing the ones who opposed him. This tribal leader was under the protection of Sultan Abdul Hamid II. Ziya Gökalp stood against the brutality of Ibrahim Pasha and organized the people, secretly. At some point, under the leadership of Gökalp, the locals occupied the telegraph office. Gökalp sent several telegrams to Istanbul for eleven nights, and expressed the cruelty of İbrahim to capital. In these days, Diyarbakır telegraph office was at the key point for Europe to establish communications with India, China, and Oceania. Beysanoğlu, *Doğumunun...* p. 75, Footnote 32. Finally, due to the heavy pressure of European states, sultan accepted their demands for a punishment and declared an exile order for İbrahim Pasha. Göksel, *Ölümünün...* pp. 21-22. This long poem was indeed a precious source to consult in order to see the final days of Sultan Abdul Hamid II reign right before the 1908 Revolution, the adverse conditions of rural areas of the Empire, and the hope of public for freedom from the eyes of Gökalp. To read the mentioned poem, *see.* Fevziye Abdullah Tansel (Ed.), *Ziya Gökalp Külliyatı – I Şiirler ve Halk Masalları*, 3rd Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1989, pp. 299-311.
[45] Heyd, p. 33.

Ömer Seyfettin, two notable authors known by their impacts on the Turkish linguistic.[46] During his Salonika times, Gökalp had also published his works in a journal called *Yeni Felsefe Mecmuası* (New Philosophy Journal) under the pen-names of Ziya, Demirtaş, Sedat Tevfik, and Gökalp. After 1911, he embraced 'Gökalp' name permanently and never abandoned it.[47]

During his times in Istanbul after CUP relocated its headquarters in 1912, Ziya Gökalp was intellectually very active. He became a member of Turkist club *Türk Ocağı* (Turkish Hearth), and soon elected to the editorial staff of its publishing organ *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Fatherland) which was edited by his friend, Yusuf Akçura, the famous nationalist intellectual. In this journal, Gökalp started to publish a series of articles under the title of *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (Turkification, Islamicization, Modernization) which he published these articles as a single book under the very same name in 1918. Gökalp had also published several writings in various Istanbul periodicals including *Halka Doğru* (Towards the Public – 1913-1914), *İslam Mecmuası* (Journal of Islam), *Milli Tetebbûlar Mecmuası* (Journal of National Researchers – 1915), *İçtimaiyat Mecmuası* (Journal of Sociology – 1917), and *Yeni Mecmua* (New Journal – 1917-1918).[48] His two famous poetry books *Kızıl Elma* (Red Apple – 1914) and *Yeni Hayat* (New Life – 1918) were also published during his İstanbul times. As a good comment on how influential Ziya Gökalp was in the intellectual publishing environment during the WWI times, Parla claimed that Gökalp's contributions alone to the weekly *Yeni Mecmua* had enormous impact on popularizing that journal.[49]

In June 1922, after his return from Malta exile, Ziya Gökalp had published his very own weekly journal called *Küçük Mecmua* (Little Journal) in Diyarbakır. Most of the articles in this journal were written by Gökalp himself. Gökalp's articles were so influential that even the periodicals in Istanbul and Ankara were continuously re-printing them in their own papers. In order to stress out how influential Gökalp's pen was, in 1926, Falih Rıfkı [Atay], who was a famous author known with his memoirs of Atatürk, wrote: "We have to admit

---

[46] Parla, p. 13.
[47] Göksel, *Ölümünün…* p. 25.
[48] Heyd, pp. 34-35. Additionally, Gökalp had contributed to several other journals with his writings including *Muallim* (Teacher – 1916-1917) which was re-edited and re-published in 1972 under the name of *Milli Terbiye ve Maarif Meselesi* (The Question of National Education and Training) and *İktisadiyat Mecmuası* (Journal of Economics – 1915).
[49] Parla, p. 14.

that through his *Küçük Mecmua*, Gökalp from Diyarbakır directs the trends of thought in Istanbul".[50] After some time, Gökalp was invited to Ankara in the late 1922; he published two books, *Türk Töresi* (Turkish Traditions) and his masterpiece which compiled all his ideas on Turkism, *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (Principles of Turkism). Gökalp had also written a political pamphlet named *Doğru Yol* (The Right Way) in 1923 which was aimed to explain the nine political principles introduced by *Halk Fırkası* (People's Party) to the Turkish nation in details.[51]

3. 1. 3. Ziya Gökalp, Civilization and the West

Throughout his works, even in his earlier works, Ziya Gökalp paid the utmost importance on the civilization concept. This being the case, in his various works written within a large timeline, Gökalp had defined the civilization in several ways. For instance, in an article he had written in May-June 1915, Gökalp defined the civilization as the sum of various institutions derived from different nations.[52] In another article, Gökalp claimed the civilization was the sum of 'things' which were done with the knowledge and will alone.[53] In another article Gökalp had penned in *İçtimaiyat Mecmuası* (Sociology Journal) in 1917, he defined the civilization as the sum of universal institutions which each nation of the humanity contribute to it.[54] On 17 May 1923, in an article he penned in *Yeni Gün* (New Day) newspaper, Gökalp defined the civilization as a product of the individual consciousness which could also be reformed by the same consciousness.[55] From these different definitions of the civilization, it can be said that Gökalp had an [almost] clear definition of the civilization in his mind with its core elements. However, he added some other minor elements to clarify his definition. According to this approach, the definition of the civilization for Gökalp had two features: It should be a sum of collective items of the humanity, and it should be based on the preference of the humans. However, after having a general knowledge on Gökalp's teachings, most importantly his emphasis on the nationalism, it seems this argument on the civilization is incomplete and does not fit well with the basic discourse of Gökalp. Because, in his definition, there was not any particular emphasis on the nation alone; he stressed out a collective accumulation of several nations

[50] Heyd, p. 38.
[51] Parla, p. 16.
[52] Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler III*, M. Orhan Durusoy (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1977, p. 13.
[53] Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler IV*, Ferit Ragıp Tuncor (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1977, p. 39.
[54] Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler VIII*, Ferit Ragıp Tuncor (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1981, p. 141.
[55] Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler IX*, Şevket Baysanoğlu (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, İstanbul, 1980, p. 40.

in his definition on the civilization which does not seem to be able to get along well with his Turkism formulation. It seems there had to be some other words for Gökalp to say about the civilization of a single nation, or a single identity. Indeed, Gökalp came up with another concept to separate the multi-national (universal in some cases) civilization from the national civilization: Culture *(hars)*.

Ziya Gökalp had defined culture and civilization through the traditions *(anane)* and customs *(örf)*. According to him, the tradition was the sum of cognition styles and practices which were imbued to the individuals by their respective social communities. The tradition had some sub-sections like religious, moral, linguistic, aesthetic, and economic. Therefore, the sum of ancient traditions which was related with and bound to each other constituted the civilization.[56] On the other hand, he defined the concept of custom as the social conscience of 'a nation' which was specific to itself alone and dominant in judging the values. Additionally, the social conscience of a nation could only be manifested through the national institutions. Thus, the sum of all the national institutions constituted the culture.[57] From these two definitions, it can be said that Gökalp used some sociological terms to define these two concepts. According to him, both culture and civilization refer to a social community. However, there were some significant differences between these two: The culture was national, based on inspiration, and showed itself as senses whereas the civilization was universal, based on the method, and showed itself as concepts.[58] This differentiation between culture and civilization concepts made Gökalp's job easy on adapting the Westernization process into his teachings.

It is hard to claim Ziya Gökalp was a pious man like Mehmet Akif, and equally hard to expect him to put Islam in the center of his teachings; however, he had adequate knowledge on the teachings of Islam, he was competent in Arabic, and also he believed that Islam was one of the constitutive elements of the Turkish society. Therefore, Gökalp's thoughts on the Islamic civilization had some considerably positive manners. He claimed that the Islamic civilization started in the form of a religious ummah first, and it included several single and particular nations within its embodiment. His claim on this issue was considering the nations as empty vessels, with the respect to the principle of the communicating vessels in physics, the liquid –Islam in this case– set itself to an equal level

---

[56] Gökalp, *Makaleler VIII*, p. 110.
[57] *Ibid.* p. 111.
[58] Gökalp, *Makaleler IV*, pp. 39- 43.

in these vessels with the help of Islam.[59] Additionally, according to Gökalp, the nations under the umbrella of the Islamic civilization had contributed to the humanity a lot. These nations introduced the civilization to the 'barbarians of Europe'; therefore, the Islamic civilization had many efforts in the foundation of the Western civilization, and also had a great share in this contribution.[60] Thus, Gökalp claimed:

> Islam is a social religion; it does not only guarantee the salvation of the afterlife but also the happiness in [this] world. The history which is the memory of the humanity testifies this premise with the precious pages reserved to the Islamic civilization. Islam found the Arabs in the desert tents, the Persians [on the morally ill benches of the wine houses], and the Turks in the lands of the steppes. With its wind, which showed them the true path, Islam had exalted these nations from the deeps of the ignorance to the peaks of the virtue. With its lead to these people, Islam transformed the lands of the East into a radiant civilization which still dazzles the eyes of Europe.[61]

This statement is indeed has some positive attitudes towards the Islamic civilization. However, the 'lands of the East' term in this statement brings another argument: Does the Eastern civilization concept correspond the same meaning with the Islamic one?

The answer of this question from the eyes of Ziya Gökalp varies; in his early writings, Gökalp used the East and Islam words on a similar line while defining the civilization. For instance, in his article named *Medreseler* (Madrasahs) on 2 August 1909, Gökalp claimed the source of the Eastern wisdom was Islam, and also the reference points of the Eastern civilization were the thoughts and feelings of the religion. Additionally, the most glorious times of the Eastern civilization were the ages when the madrasahs operated functionally.[62] However, in time, Gökalp preferred to distinguish the Eastern civilization and the Islamic civilization. The exact time of this tendency can be dated back to early days of WWI; in the articles he had written during this time, Gökalp had separated these two civilizations from each other. For instance, in one of his articles, he stated:

---

[59] *Ibid.* pp. 62-63.
[60] Gökalp, *Makaleler IX*, p. 41.
[61] *"Dîn-i İslâm, içtimaî bir dindir, yalnız selâmet-i âhireyi değil, saâdet-i dünyeviyyeyi de kâfildir. Bu kaziyyenin sıdkına hâfıza-i insaniyyet olan tarih, medeniyyet-i İslâmiyyeye muhassas olan sahâif-i murassasıyla şehadet eder. Dîn-i İslâm, Arapları bâdiye çadırlarında, Acemleri fesâd-ı ahlâk mastabalarında, Türkleri bozkır yurtlarında buldu. Bir nefha-i irşad ile bu kavimleri hazîz-i cehaletten, evc-i fazilete is'âd etti. Sâha-i şarkı, bekayâ-yı indirâsiyle hâlâ Avrupa'nın gözlerini kamaştıran bir medeniyet-i lâmiaya tulu'gâh eyledi".* Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler I*, Şevket Baysanoğlu (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, İstanbul, 1976, p. 113.
[62] *Ibid.* pp. 79-82.

The Eastern civilization is not the Islamic civilization but the Eastern European Civilization whereas the Western civilization is actually the Western European Civilization. […] Due to it was taken from the Byzantium; it was named the Eastern civilization.[63]

This attitude of distinguishing the Eastern and Islamic civilizations continued for some time in the works of Ziya Gökalp. In 1923, in an article he had penned, Gökalp improved his thoughts on these two civilizations once again and added another concept to the debate:

The Ottoman civilization is the Eastern civilization. The Eastern civilization is also not the Islamic civilization but a continuation of the Eastern Roman Civilization. Similarly, the Western civilization is the continuation of the Western Roman Civilization.[64]

Gökalp's remark on the Ottoman civilization here actually was not a new one. He had used the Ottoman civilization term in his various works. However, during WWI, Gökalp's thoughts on the Ottoman civilization were changed completely. According to Gökalp, the Ottoman civilization was a common product of the Arabs, the Persians, and the Turks. However, due to the civilization and culture were living together, the duality in the institutions of the Ottoman civilization caused several challenges. Additionally, with the introduction of the Western civilization to the Ottoman society in the *Tanzimat* period, the duality in the society became a three-sided figure. Thus, the culture had to fight in two fronts from this time on.[65] This comment above found its ultimate version in Gökalp's book, *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. In this manifesto book, he defined the Ottoman civilization with the following words:

Ottoman civilization is an amalgam of institutions stemming from Turkish, Persian, and Arab cultures, from Islam, and from Eastern and, more recently, Western civilizations. These institutions never merged and blended and, therefore, never produced a harmonious system.[66]

Earlier, Ziya Gökalp mentioned that the emergence of the Islamic civilization was sprouted from an ummah formation first. Indeed; this approach of Gökalp shows itself for other religions as well. According to Gökalp, there were only three nation formations which were able to join both the community and the civilization of the same religion: Christian

---

[63] *"Şark medeniyeti İslâm medeniyeti değil, Şarkî Avrupa Medeniyeti; garp medeniyeti de, Garbî Avrupa Medeniyetidir. […] Bizans'tan alındığı için ona Şark Medeniyeti denmiştir"*. Gökalp, *Makaleler IV*, p. 42.

[64] *"Osmanlı medeniyeti Şark medeniyetidir. Şark medeniyeti de İslâm medeniyeti değil, Şarkî Roma medeniyetinin devamıdır. Nasıl ki Garp medeniyeti de Garbî Roma medeniyetinin devamından ibarettir"*. Gökalp, *Makaleler IX*, p. 39.

[65] Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler V*, Rıza Kardaş (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1981, pp. 32-33.

[66] Gökalp, *The Principles...* p. 31.

nations, Muslim nations, Buddhist nations. The Christian nations followed a sociological path to reach the Christian civilization; they were tribes first, developed into large nations second, transformed into Christian nations and simultaneously became the members of the Christian civilization third. However, according to Gökalp, a new and fourth stage had occurred with the *Renaissance* and *Reform* movements, which was secularizing the civilization. With this stage, the ummah formation of the Christian civilization transformed into something else; it was called the Western civilization. Additionally, from Şinasi to Tevfik Fikret, some Ottoman authors managed to adapt the products of this new civilization into the Turkish literature smoothly; therefore, these could be some good examples to understand the importance of adapting the other elements of the Western civilization into other institutions of the Ottoman civilization.[67] From this statement, it can be seen that Gökalp's discourse on the Western civilization was based on adapting the fruits of this civilization to the Turkish society; which can be named modernizaton.

Even in his relatively younger times, Gökalp was promoting the importance of modernization. For example, on 30 August 1909, in an article he had written in the *Peyman* newspaper, Gökalp claimed the importance of securing the liberty of the society granted with the 1908 Revolution was a huge step towards the modernization. He stated: "Because the liberty is nothing but a vehicle; on the other hand, the target is the advance and nation's progress".[68] According to Gökalp, the advance and progress the nation needed to claim were based on the European civilization. With his words, "[…] the contemporary science constitutes the core of the contemporary civilization, which is the European civilization".[69] Therefore, the required advance and progress shall be taken from the European civilization. Moreover, according to Gökalp, "[…] the concept of modernization means to earn a superior position within the modern civilized society which progressively evolves, by keeping up with other nations in science and technique".[70] On the other hand, in his another article, Gökalp claimed the European civilization was based on the rotten, ill, rancid fundamentals, and it was bound to deplete and collapse in one day.[71] From these

---

[67] Gökalp, *Makaleler V*, pp. 173-177.

[68] *"Çünkü hürriyyet, ancak bir vasıtadır, hedef ise te'âlî ve terakkî-i millettir"*. Gökalp, *Makaleler I*, pp. 103-106.

[69] *"[…] asrî fenniyat, asrî medeniyetin, yani Avrupa medeniyetinin esasını teşkil ediyor"*. Gökalp, *Makaleler V*, p. 59.

[70] *"[…] muasırlaşmak tabirinin mânâsı, asrî olan medeniyet zümresinin gittikçe tekemmül eden ilim ve marifette hiçbir milletten geri kalmayacak surette faik bir mevki ihraz etmektir"*. Gökalp, *Türkleşmek…* p. 38.

[71] Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler II*, Süleyman Hayri Bolay (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1982, p. 46.

two conflicting approaches of Gökalp on the Western civilization, it is possible to get confused. However, these statements were placed right before his proposals on how to reconcile the Western civilization and the Turkish culture. In this case, it can be said that Gökalp had already had a plan to accommodate these two concepts.

In a similar way, Gökalp had already had a definition for the concept of civilization in his mind even in his relatively younger times; but, with the emergence of Turkism ideology, he had to alter this definition and had to strengthen his idea with analyzing some long-ingrained concepts including the traditions, the values, and the culture. The sociological tendency he had acquired from some Eastern and Western scholars improved his approach on the civilization concept. First, Gökalp unpacked the civilization box and discovered a unique culture concept in it. The remarkable part on this issue was the division between the civilization and the culture concepts was not originated from the sociology scholars which inspired Gökalp intellectually. For instance, Émile Durkheim[72] used the culture to define

_____

[72] Since Durkheim's sociological approach influenced Ziya Gökalp a lot, it would be beneficial to briefly review Durkheim's understanding in sociology and the sociological methods he had introduced which were influential on Gökalp's Turkishness formulation in order to make a comparison between Gökalp and Durkheim before having some general information about Gökalp's Turkism program which will be reviewed in the following pages as well as the next chapter. Durkheim (1858-1917) was a French sociologist. His sociological approach was originated by seeking answers to two main questions: "What is the mechanism that makes the individuals to live and remain together by establishing a supra-individual structure?" and "How could the existence of the social values which tie the individuals be explained?". During his sociological journey, while trying to find answers to these questions, Durkheim came up with several new approaches that made him famous. These approaches could be simply reviewed under four categories: Ethics, religion, order, and solidarity. In the beginning, Durkheim rejected the long-accepted close relationship between the human behaviour and social structure. Moving from this rejection, he claimed that the ethics was not a 'natural' output of humanity; instead, it was a social intensifier object 'beyond' human's capabilities. This is why reviewing the functions and structures of the societies would be beneficial to understand the 'secret roots' of the societies about ethics. Additionally, according to Durkheim, the human behaviour was based on the social patterns; therefore, the religion could also not be separated from these patterns and needed to be reviewed thoroughly. However, the impact of the religion on the societies was not based on the divine regulations but some specific rituals. He claimed the teachings of the religions shall be ignored whereas the first and foremost place to consult while reviewing the religion's impact to the society was the religious rituals. In rituals, it could be witnessed that the societies did not worship their gods; instead, they worship the social participation and communion which refreshed the social bonds of the community in every ritual, continuously. After explaining the religion as a social ritual alone, Durkheim claimed the social order had some similar origin with the religion, more or less. According to him, the social order was based on two claims: First, since the humans shared the similar concepts, they understood these concepts similarly. Second, the style of a social structure showed similarities with the philosophy of the same society. With the help of these two claims, he asserted that the common beliefs and opinions constituted the collective conscience of the society. This was why the solidarism was and shall be valued in any society to advance and progress. "Durkheim, Émile" in _Türk ve Dünya Ünlüleri Ansiklopedisi_, Vol. 34, Anadolu, İstanbul, 1983, pp. 1864-1866, Alan Swingewood, _A Short History of Sociological Thought_, Macmillan, 1984, pp. 97-128, Alex Callinicos, _Toplum Kuramı Tarihsel Bir Bakış_, 6th Edition, Yasemin Tezgiden (Trans.), İletişim, İstanbul, 2013, pp. 193-225, Philippe Corcuff, _Bireycilik Sorunu Stirner Marx Durkheim Proudhon_, Aziz Ufuk Kılıç (Trans.), Versus, İstanbul, 2009, pp. 13-36. Although Durkheim reviewed the society concept, Gökalp borrowed these reviews and inserted them into his nation concept. The social values, ethics, religious rituals, the philosophy of a society, social participation and sharing, and solidarism were some cornerstones of

the 'society' alone and neither Durkheim nor Gustave Le Bon (both scholars had huge impacts on Gökalp's sociology) distinguished civilization from culture; these two concepts were rather materialized under the civilization.[73] After discovering the culture, Gökalp focused on to determine the elements of this concept, and found the "value" element within. He attached these values to the culture, which he argued it was national, and he precisely defined the culture as the fatherland. At this point, it can be seen that he was against importing the culture in order to reach the civilization. Indeed, Gökalp clearly mentioned the 'things' that should be imported from the Europe. For example, according to him, the language will not be imported but the linguistic sciences will be imported, the ethics will not be imported but the research methods on the ethics will be imported, and the religion will not be imported but the theology will be imported.[74] As it can be seen here, all these elements which shall not be imported were based on the culture whereas the elements which shall be imported belong to the civilization from Gökalp's perspective. Hence, the elements that shall be imported were named 'rules' in Gökalp's teaching. Thus, a harmony between the values and the rules were necessary. Finally, Gökalp had to secure the formulation he had done to last forever. At this point, Gökalp came up with the social cooperation concept. According to this, by establishing a national solidarity in social and professional areas, the Western civilization where 'the Turkish nation belonged' could be adapted to the Turkish culture and this would last forever. This was a 'program' to adapt to the Turkish nation in order to participate in the Western civilization which Gökalp named it "New Life" *(Yeni Hayat)*.

While defining New Life, Ziya Gökalp claimed the Turks had participated in several civilization 'circles'. In the beginning, they were the members of the Taoism civilization. Later, they had shifted their allegiance to the Islamic civilization. Finally, they became the

---

Gökalp's Turkism formulation. Additionally, Durkheim's approach on social ethics which he explained in a gradual way (Emile Durkheim, *Ahlak Eğitimi*, Oğuz Adanır (Trans.), Dokuz Eylül, İzmir, 2004) and professional ethics (Emile Durkheim, *Meslek Ahlâkı*, 3rd Edition, Mehmet Karasan (Trans.), Milli Eğitim, İstanbul, 1986) show some exact similarities with Gökalp's national ethics understanding. Lastly, the third chapter of Gökalp's *Türkçülüğün Esasları* book which was explaining the ethics and moral principles of Turkism under several categories (Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün…* pp. 135-155) is almost an exact summary of Durkheim's personal course notes he used in the universities like Bordeaux (1904) and Sorbonne (1912) which focused on the varieties of ethics and morals. Emile Durkheim, *Sosyoloji Dersleri*, Ali Berktay (Trans.), İletişim, İstanbul, 2006. With the help of the information above, it can be said that Durkheim's explanations on the 'society' were used by Gökalp to explain the 'nation'; or the Turkish nation particularly.

[73] Rıza Kardaş, "Ziya Gökalp'in 'Eğitim Anlayışı'na Toplu Bir Bakış" in Gökalp, *Makaleler V*, pp. 1-26.

[74] Gökalp, *Makaleler IX*, p. 41.

members of the European civilization.[75] Therefore, it can be claimed that the Turks can easily change their civilizations. Indeed, M. Fuad Köprülü justified this statement. According to him, Turks were capable of changing their civilization easily; what was 'worse', while the common folks were in favor of preserving the values inherited from the previous civilization, the 'high-classes' were in favor of dumping all their 'national' values when they abandon a civilization.[76] This might be the reason Gökalp had come with his dress metaphor. According to this metaphor, the civilization was a dress, where the body (the culture in this case) could easily change it without having any substantial harm to the body. By naming the Western civilization as a dress and asserting there would be no harm in changing the dress, the formulation Gökalp had proposed to describe his fidelity to Turkish nation as nationality, Muslim ummah as religion, and the European community as the civilization was completed.[77] However, Gökalp's New Life program and also his dress metaphor were also criticized by other intellectuals and authors as well. For instance, a socialist sociologist, Abidin Nesimi [Fatinoğlu] argued that Gökalp was an eclectic scholar, and he had constituted his civilization and culture concepts upon this attitude. For instance, Gökalp was accepting the social benefits of the 'boy scout organizations' which was imported from the West; but he was absolutely against the young boys to wear shorts.[78] Another scholar, Ahmed Ağaoğlu, who was also championing the Turkism movement during the Second Constitutional Era, rejected 'Gökalp-style' eclectic approach on the civilization matter. According to him, the Western civilization was a whole; the Europeans managed to dominate the world by their unique civilization alone, with its 'rights' and 'wrongs'. Therefore, before anything else, it was needed to be sure that picking the positive ones while rejecting the negatives would not have any [similar or] positive effects on the advance and progress.[79]

3. 2. Nationalism and Turkism in the Late Ottoman Period

Nationalism in Turkish politics developed relatively slow; it was projected as a practical medicine to heal the deep wounds of the Empire first, and had experienced several

[75] Gökalp, *Makaleler VIII*, p. 141.
[76] W. Barthold and M. Fuad Köprülü, *İslâm Medeniyeti Tarihi*, 6th Edition, Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı, Ankara, 1984, p. 186.
[77] Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler VII*, M. Abdülhalûk Çay (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1982, p. 60, Gökalp, *Türkleşmek...* p. 20, Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün...* p. 61.
[78] Abidin Nesimi, *Türkiye'nin Tekâmül Hamlesinde Ziya Gökalp*, Sebat, İstanbul, 1940, pp. 26-31.
[79] Ahmet Ağaoğlu, *Üç Medeniyet*, 3rd Edition, Doğu, İstanbul, 2013, p. 24.

intellectual fights until it was fully embraced as a political reality. From the late 19th century as a result of the increasing defeats at wars, territory losses, and the interventions of foreign states into internal affairs of the Empire, there was only one question in the minds of the existing intellectuals of the Empire: How to make this state survive? Yusuf Akçura argued that some intellectuals and statesmen were in favor of Islamism, some were in favor of Ottomanism, and some were in favor of Turkish nationalism to find an answer to this question.[80] Young Ottomans, Young Turks, and finally CUP hosted supporters from all these three perspectives during their respective times. "Fatherland" term which was first used by Namık Kemal[81] had started a spiritual fire in national consciousness. Later, that national fire flared up, nationalism found itself a place in the political field with the pen of Akçura, and finally became a political ideology with Ziya Gökalp. According to Zürcher, Tekin Alp, Yusuf Akçura, Hüseyinzade Ali [Turan], Ahmet Ağaoğlu, Ziya Gökalp, and Mehmet Emin [Yurdakul] were considered to be the fathers of Turkish nationalism. He pointed out that none of them was 'originally' Turk in their ethnicities; they were coming from different ethnic origins.[82] This assessment reflected the two main origins in the genesis of the Turkish nationalism, one type inside the Empire and another within Russia. Both origins used the same tool; but aimed different goals: In the late 19th century, the Turkish nationalism which sprouted in the Empire was focusing on to find another opportunity to develop a policy, whereas the Russo-Turks were using the same nationalism tool in order to build an identity to prove their existence.[83]

In order to track the phases of Turkish nationalism briefly, it would be easier to start the journey with Yusuf Akçura. In his famous groundbreaking article of 1904 titled *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Three Ways of Politics), Akçura put Turkish nationalism into politics once and for all. According to him, the nationalism concept had already existed among the intellectuals in his own times; yet, it was questioned and examined as an academic matter alone, and was not able to become a part in politics.[84] In this article, Akçura explained all three possible policies of the Empire to save the state as Ottomanism, [Pan-]Islamism, and Turkish nationalism; and he favored Turkish nationalism. However, Akçura's nationalism

---

[80] Yusuf Akçura, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*, TTK, Ankara, 1976, pp. 19-23.
[81] Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought*, Syracuse University, 2000, p. 283.
[82] Erik Jan Zürcher, "Genç Türkler: Hudut Boylarının Çocukları?", İlknur Türe (Trans.), *Muhafazakâr Düşünce*, No. 16-17, Spring-Summer 2008, pp. 231-242.
[83] Mehmet Karakaş, "Türkçülük ve Türk Milliyetçiliği", *Doğu Batı*, No. 38, August, September, October 2006, pp. 57-76.
[84] Akçura, *Üç Tarz-ı...* p. 23.

approach was closer to pan-nationalism. The nationalism he offered was based on race, and his Turkish union idea was based on uniting all the Turkish people from Europe to Asia.[85] On the other hand, another Turkish nationalist, Hüseyinzade Ali [Turan] did not promote any kind of "pan" movements. In his criticizing letter towards Akçura's arguments which was published in *Türk* newspaper in 1904, Ali preferred a 'natural' Turkism model, and argued that no matter where they resided, all Turks were united in both religion and ethnicity; thus, there was no need to invent artificial concepts such as Pan-Turkism (and he also added Pan-Islamism).[86]

However, it would not be an easy comment to say the pan-nationalism concept introduced by Akçura and its enthusiasm within the Turkish nationalism history had disappeared completely; but it wore off in time. With Ziya Gökalp's influence on Turkish nationalism, the Pan-Turkism understanding shifted from being an actual political agenda to a desired but far political ideal. Gökalp described Turkish nationalism as a cultural nationalism;[87] constituted a program for Turkish nationalism, re-described the Pan-Turkism as *Turan* and positioned it as a far ideal to reach while determining the way of actions to reach that ideal. Georgeon justified this comment. According to him, Akçura and Gökalp were born in two far and completely different sides of the large Turkic community of the world; therefore, their philosophies were shaped accordingly. Although both of them were educated similarly, more or less, Akçura was in favor of approaching the Turkishness concept through the history and economics whereas Gökalp was using a sociological method on this issue. Eventually, they had contributed the intellectual and ideological basis of the modern Turkish Republic a lot.[88]

3. 3. Ziya Gökalp and Turkism

Turkism was used interchangeably with Turkish nationalism from time to time. Although it would be safe to say there was no substantial harm to the actual meaning by using both terms interchangeably, for the sake of understanding Ziya Gökalp's nationalism discourse, it would be better to use the Turkism word instead of Turkish nationalism. As a brief definition, according to Gökalp, Turkism means "to exalt the Turkish nation".[89] Gökalp's

---

[85] *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34.
[86] Yusuf Akçura, "Hüseyinzade Ali Bey", *Türk Yurdu*, No. 82, 23 Nisan 1331, pp. 2566-2570.
[87] Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün…* pp. 15-21.
[88] Georgeon, *Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi…* pp. 91-101.
[89] Gökalp, *The Principles of…* p. 12.

definition of Turkish nationalism addressed to a more inner and non-materialistic goal rather than a materialistic one. All materialistic components of nation including the race, the ethnicity, the geography, the citizenship, and additionally the sense of individual preference were ranked as secondary or perhaps lower in Gökalp's Turkism.[90] Instead of these materialistic elements, Gökalp preferred to use subjective attachments like national consciousness, national solidarity, and national culture, etc. while brewing his definition of Turkism. According to him, a community with common consciousness, common ideal, common language, and common culture could transform itself into a nationality; and, sooner or later, that nationality with national consciousness could gain its independence; could become an independent political entity.[91]

Gökalp defined national solidarity over the *vatan* (fatherland) concept, with bringing a new description for it. According to him, fatherland means 'national culture', and the soil that people resided on was just a physical appearance of that culture. Additionally, he did not limit the borders of solidarity with fatherland alone, and added the civilization and its 'obligations' to his equation. The culture derived from the fatherland brought a patriotic morality to the individuals of the nationality which would accompany the civic morality at the same time. Thus, the unity of these two moralities would eventually introduce both the national solidarity and the love of entire nation to the society. Gökalp described the values of each moral periphery with circles, overlapping each other in terms of moral priorities and the ones people should love; he offered a hierarchical ranking system on 'who to love first'. Accordingly, with the help of national solidarity, the individuals should love their countrymen first, their co-religionists second, their civilization partners third, and as fourth they should love all the mankind.[92]

Considering Gökalp's nation and nationalism definitions were the compositions of culture; according to him, there were two types of culture: National culture and universal culture. The national culture belonged to a single nation whereas the universal culture was the sum of all national cultures, which was called civilization. According to him, the civilization was like a long dinner table in a festival, where national cultures serve their best-cooked food. Any national culture could taste from any other food; this would not damage their national taste but would enrich their delight over the civilization. By defining his

---

[90] Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları…* pp. 15-19.
[91] *Ibid.* p. 74.
[92] *Ibid.* pp. 80-84.

nationalism concept through the cultural elements instead of materialistic ones, and by describing Turkish nationalism could taste the fruits of other nations without any harm, Gökalp insisted that Turkism was nowhere near chauvinism or fanaticism and there was no incompatibility between Turkism and universal civilization.[93]

Not surprisingly Ziya Gökalp and Turkism were frequently mentioned together. As 'the founding father of Turkish nationalism' title was favoured for him,[94] Gökalp indeed constituted the program of Turkism. In this program, there were eight chapters to follow in order to complete the program: Linguistic Turkism, Aesthetic Turkism, Ethical Turkism, Legal Turkism, Religious Turkism, Economic Turkism, Political Turkism, and Philosophic Turkism. These chapters were formed as the steps to follow in the exact order to reach the ultimate level of Turkism. Since Gökalp was a prolific penman and he had written almost everything about 'his' Turkism ideology, it would be easier to track his footsteps in order to understand what kind of Turkism he proposed.

To begin with, according to Ziya Gökalp, there was a necessity on purifying the Turkish language. In his famous poem *Sanat* (Art) Gökalp penned:

> *'Leyl'* is yours, *'şeb'* is yours, *'gece'* is ours,
> One meaning is not in need of three names.[95]

These two lines can alone explain Gökalp's all teachings on purification of the Turkish language. *Leyl* (Arabic), *şeb* (Persian), and *gece* (Turkish) have all the same meaning, 'the night'. In this poem, Gökalp argued there was no need to have too many words for a single meaning, one word would be enough. Indeed, in his program on Turkish language, Gökalp argued the purification on language (or it can also be said simplifying the language) could not be made by adding words to the language or simply removing some. According to him, the language was a living entity; it was sustaining its life with the help of its own people. Thus, if a word could not find itself a place in the public's tongue, it would automatically leave the language.[96] Also, if the public enjoyed a foreign word and benefited from its

---

[93] *Ibid*. pp. 93-98.
[94] Nergis Canefe and Tanıl Bora, "The Intellectual Roots of Anti-European Sentiments in Turkish Politics: The Case of Radical Turkish Nationalism", *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 127-148.
[95] *"Leyl sizin, şeb sizin, gece bizimdir / Değildir bir ma'nâ üç ada muhtac."* in Tansel, *Şiirler…* pp. 111-112.
[96] Mehmet Akif had also agreed these assesments about the language. According to him, importing some linguistic rules directly from the West would eventually damage the dignity of the language:
> If we directly import the linguistic of British,
> Or French, what will happen to our speech?
> The language had to carry a national dignity,

practices, that particular word would remain within the language. Applying the public's daily language would always be more beneficial than fabricating a new linguistic rule or inventing a new word for the language. There was no need to intervene to the language mathematically or import some grammar rules. In such cases, the language could transform into something very different than the original one; it might become an artificial Turkish, like an "Ottoman *Esperanto*" which the Turkish literature experienced for some time with *divan*[97] literature.[98]

In his aesthetics chapter of Turkism program, Gökalp argued every single nation had its own understanding of beauty; the pleasure of different people could get from the same art piece would not be same based on their nationalities. He claimed Turks had a high aesthetic taste; yet, some 'unnatural' forms of art braches were not accepted by the public. For instance, according to Gökalp, the national prosody of the ancient Turks was *hece ölçüsü* (syllabic meter). This prosody could be understood by the public easily, and the public could enjoy it. However, other prosodies in poems like *aruz* did not find a place in public's heart;[99] they were odd. Additionally, Turkish nation possessed various types of literature pieces which were still used in both verbally or as written, including folk-tales, anecdotes, legends, epics, myths, proverbs, riddles, ballads, adventures, stories and war epics of famous Turkish heroes, and living literary works like *Karagöz* and *Nasreddin Hoca*. If the Turkish authors could keep these works alive and were educated in the Western-oriented literature types, the synthesis of these two currents would have a great impact on the future of Turkish literature. Furthermore, there were three types of music in Turkish nation: Eastern music which was borrowed by al-Farabi from Byzantium, Western music which was a result of an 'experience' by adding quarter tones to the ancient Greek music, and the folk melodies which was the living continuation of ancient Turkish music.

Without this, it is not easy to advance.
[…]
Our language will become degenerated, broken.
The nation's fashion is ridiculous today,
The language would become the same! […]

Mehmed Âkif Ersoy, Safahat, 9th Edition, M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (Ed.), Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, Ankara, 2013, pp. 208-209. *(Tasarrufâtını aynen alırsak İngilizin, / Fransızın, ne olur hâli, sonra, şîvemizin? / Lisânın olmalıdır bir vakar-ı millîsi, / O olmadıkça müyesser değil teâlîsi. [...] İler, tuar yeri kalmaz, lisânımız bozulur. / Bugün ne maskara olmuşsa milletin kılığı; / Lisan da öyle olur! [...]).*

[97] The famous literature style in the classical times of the Empire performed with archaic Ottoman language.

[98] Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün…* pp. 101-124.

[99] This assesment contradicts with Mehmet Akif's poetry style. Akif was using *aruz* prosody in his poems; by using a simple language rather than an archaic one, his poems were appreciated by both the artists and common folk. In this regard, it can be said that the challenge here was not the type of prosody but the preference of the language type as simple or archaic.

According to Gökalp, the Eastern music had completed its duty and it was outdated. The national Turkish music would emerge by harmonizing traditional Turkish melodies with the contemporary Western music. Lastly, he claimed the manufacturing-based national economics were harmed since the *Tanzimat* period, and as a result of this, several national artisanship forms including carpentry, architecture, calligraphy, iron-working, carpet and rug making, and dyeing had all degenerated since then. Turkism took that as a duty to revive all these manufacturing forms. Gökalp claimed a combination of ancient aesthetics in Turkish artisanship and Western modern techniques could work wonders in the near future.[100]

Gökalp argued every great nation had superiority over other nations in some particular areas of civilization. Ancient Greeks were superior in aesthetics, the Romans were superior in law, Israelites and Arabs were superior in religion, Anglo-Saxons were superior in economics, and he claimed Turks were superior in the moral virtues. After claiming this 'superiority' of Turks, Gökalp preferred to categorize the moral ideals under five chapters: Patriotic, professional, family (sexual), civic (personal), and universal. According to his approach, these five moral chapters were like circles; every single Turk was a subject to all these circles, and when a circle intersected another, the hierarchical ranking of these chapters should be taken into consideration. As a brief explanation to these chapters, patriotic morals referred to the love of the fatherland. In professional morality, Gökalp named the members of the same profession as *yoldaşlar* (comrades). They were able to check and balance each other, as inherited from the ancient *ahi* and tradesmen guilds tradition. However, establishing a modern secretariat for each and every single of profession, uniting them under a federation first, and uniting these federations under a confederation would provide a power of sanction, which would eventually be beneficial to improve professional morality. In family morality, Gökalp claimed there was great respect in families during the times of ancient Turks. Both the man and woman in a single family were equals, and they were deciding with a consensus in a family-related issue. The men could not be married more than one woman at the same time, and women were respected as the main pillars of the families. He gave evidence to the royal orders of the ancient Turks in this matter. According to him, any royal order or edict should be started with "*Hakan* (King) and *Hatun* (Queen) command that…" otherwise it could not be accepted as

---

[100] *Ibid.*, pp. 127-134.

a valid command. Additionally, Gökalp grounded his civic (personal) morality on Durkheim's approach. According to Durkheim, the subjects of moral duties were the communities, not the individuals. Thus, regardless of their nation, everyone was responsible with the morality of the civilization in general. If the individuals could keep their civic moralities intact, this would lead their nations to have same kind of civic morality. Beyond that, Gökalp claimed every nation had a historic and civic mission on earth to perform. The mission of Turkish nation was to materialize the moral virtues as genuine entities, and to prove that the most impossible heroic acts and sacrifices[101] could be done when they were needed for the sake of an intact morality.[102]

The goal of legal Turkism was to establish a modern law in Turkey. Gökalp argued that the theocracy and clericalism should be erased from all aspects of national and universal law. These law methods were nothing but the residues of the medieval ages, and these residues must be purged from any nation in order to be called as a 'modern nation'. [103] Nonetheless, another aim of legal Turkism was to establish inner rules for every area of expertise, a combination of professional Turkism and legal Turkism. Establishing modern laws for every profession would be essential for national economy to improve. As a third aim, legal

---

[101] Mehmet Akif's understanding of the morals have some different characteristics than Gökalp's. Instead of loading the society with some charges like 'sacrifices' or 'heroic acts', Akif's tendency on this issue was mostly based on exalting the Islamic moral values, and worrying about losing those values. This tendency can be seen in one of his unnamed poem written on 17 September 1914:

> We are the most ignorant nation of the world now!
> Once that faith was the greatest protector of the fine morals…
> Which virtues do we have now? We are the lowest viles.
> I see, only Islam's title left within the Muslims;
> This is the reason of the recent national disappointment. Ersoy 2013, p. 276.

(Ne câhil kavmiyiz biz müslümanlar, şimdi, dünyânın! / O îman hüsn-i hulkun en büyük hâmîsi olmuşken… / Nemiz vardır fezâilden, nemiz eksik rezâilden? / Demek: İslâmın ancak nâmı kalmış müslümanlarda; / Bu yüzdenmiş, demek, hüsrân-ı millî son zamanlarda).

[102] Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün…* pp. 135-155.

[103] Although Mehmet Akif believed in the absolute power of the law as quoted below, it is hard to claim Akif was promoting a modern law system like Gökalp since in the previous chapter Akif's Islamism understanding derived from Said Halim Pasha's Islamification program was offering to apply Shari'a into all aspects and the institutions of the society. Hence, it is not easy to expect from Akif to agree with this kind of law system as Gökalp proposed:

> Is it right for the powerful to seize whomever he caught?
> We, Asım, do not need the fist of this or that;
> We only need the claw of one: The law.
> Transfer all the might to the law so the unity can advance…
> Otherwise we [cannot be] a nation but a dispersed herd... Ersoy 2013, p. 396.

(Kuvvetin hakkı mıdır enselemek bulduğunu? / Bize, Âsım, ne şunun yumruğu lâzım, ne bunun; / Birinin pençesi ister yalnız: Kanunun. / Ver bütün kudreti kanuna ki vahdet yürüsün… / Yoksa millet değil ancak dağınık bir sürüsün…).

Turkism offered equality between men and women in family matters;[104] especially in marriage, divorce, inheritance, political rights, and more.[105]

Ziya Gökalp was carrying such an attitude towards the religion concept that in order to understand what a/any religion proposed it was vital to read and hear its proposals in native language. According to Gökalp, religious books, sermons, and prayers should be presented in Turkish.[106] He gave evidence to Abu Hanifa's words that according to this highly respected Muslim scholar, there was no inconvenience in using the native tongue during prayers, even in *namaz* (salah, ritual prayer). Additionally, Gökalp argued that the Turks enjoyed the prayers and sermons which were performed in Turkish language including the personal prayers at the end of every salah in mosques, the sermons performed during Ramadan month, and mawlud-u sharif (a long traditional prayer that is a combination of Turkish poetry, music, and Islamic discourses and stories). In short, Gökalp offered that except for chanting Quran personally, it would be more productive to prefer Turkish language in every religious activity which was performed socially.[107]

Ziya Gökalp tried to find the best economical approach for Turkism in his economic Turkism program. According to him, the ancient Turks were living in prosperity; they were rich and enjoyed sharing their wealth with others. After compiling numerous examples on the wealth of the ancient Turks, Gökalp wrote about communism. According to Gökalp, communism was not suitable for Turkish nation;[108] because, the Turks had always valued

---

[104] Mehmet Akif had also same attitude with Gökalp towards protecting the persistence of the family as well as appreciating the women's status within the society. Yet, his proposals were originated from Shari'a more than anything else. In *Köse İmam* (Beardless Prayer) poem, he stated:
> Three layers of the society, tear my heart out!
> Oldies, women, and the children
> These should be treated with mercy, with tolerance;
> Otherwise, how could a man comprehend his humanity? Ersoy 2013, p. 114.

(Üç sınıf halka içim parçalanır, hem ne kadar! / İhtiyarlar, karılar, bir de küçükler; bunlar / Merhamet görmeli, yüz görmeli insanlardan; / Yoksa, insanlığı bilmem nasıl anlar insan?").

[105] Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün…* pp. 156-157.

[106] As it was previously explained in detail, Akif had decided to burn his Quran translation instead of submitting to the government of the Republic in 1932. With this decision, two rumours had aroused: Some researchers claimed Akif had decided this after he sensed some transformation 'possibilities' in the language of Islam with the new regime whereas some claimed he did not want to submit it due to the interpretation of Quran was not going to be published and Akif claimed the translation would not be sufficient without the interpretation. With the help of these two rumors, no matter which side to be picked, and also considering his rejection to submit the translation of Quran -which he held dear in all his life, it would be irrational to expect Akif to agree with Gökalp's opinion on this matter.

[107] Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün…* pp. 158-159.

[108] Since socialism, communism, Bolshevism, Marxism, etc. aroused interest of late Ottoman intellectuals during the Second Constitutional Era, especially after the Russian Revolution of 1917, Mehmet Akif had also expressed his opinions on this matter. For instance, on 20 May 1921, a reader of *Sebilürreşad* named Ahmed

their freedom and independence. On the other hand, due to their favor on solidarity, Turks could not be individualists. Gökalp concluded his search for the best economic approach for Turkism with solidarism. He claimed solidarism would perfectly fit with the Turkish culture. Thus, the economic ideal of Turkism should focus on preserving social wealth without abolishing the private ownership and using this social wealth for the sake of public's interest. In order to materialize this ideal, the Turkish economists should observe the realities of Turkish economy first, and then prepare a scientific and essential program for the national economy. Once this program had been formulated, the individuals of the Turkish nation should work accordingly to create a large industry for Turkey.[109]

Although Turkism sounded like it was already a political ideology or movement, actually Gökalp formulated it as a Turkish-style path to follow which was built for the Turks, a life-style for Turks. This might be the reason Gökalp reserved a separate chapter for 'Political Turkism' in his complete version of Turkism program. According to Gökalp, "Turkism is not a political party but a scientific, philosophic and aesthetic school of thought";[110] and it was also a path towards the cultural efforts and renovation. Turkism was a modern movement; therefore, it could only get on well with modern movements and ideals. Gökalp claimed that due to these mentioned characteristics Turkism carried within, it could only support the 'rightful' political parties. During the times of this manifesto was penned, that rightful political party was *Halk Fırkası* (People's Party) for Gökalp. *Halk Fırkası* had given the sovereignty to Turkish people, named the country Turkey and labelled the people Turkish nation. Nonetheless, Gökalp asserted *Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti* (The Society for the Defense of Rights) which was the mother of *Halk Fırkası* saved Turkish nation from a terrible fate by following the Turkism program in the times when there was not any exact written program at all. Moving from this point, Gökalp strongly believed that Turkism and

---

Hilmi from Trabzon sent a letter to Akif to ask whether Bolshevism and Islam were the same. According to him, he was told that if these two concepts were taken similar, a great progress could have happened in the Muslim world. In his reply, Akif clearly rejected this similarity, and claimed this ideology shall be taken into consideration with its own constitutive elements as follows:

> […] Because there are several vital, social, economical, political, agricultural, industrial, and many other reasons and causes to constitute this [movement] in Russia which do not exist in the Muslim countries. Secondly, even if these exist in Muslim lands, it cannot be imagined for Muslims to accept the principles of Bolshevism while [we have Quran and hadith].

("[…] Çünki bu mezhebi Rusya'da vücûda getiren hayatî, ictimaî, iktisâdî, siyâsî, zirâî, sınâî el hâsıl daha birçok esbâb ve avâmil var ki hiç biri Müslüman memleketlerinde yok. Saniyen bunların vücûdu farz-ı muhal olarak kabul edilse bile Kur'an ile Hadis meydana dururken Bolşevikliğin esasat-ı hâzırasını kabule Müslümanlar için imkân tasavvur olunamaz"). Mehmed Akif, "Bolşeviklik Müslümanlığın Aynı mıdır?", *Sebilürreşad*, 21 Mayıs 1337/12 Ramazan 1339 (20 May 1921), Vol. 19, No. 481, p. 131.

[109] Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün…* pp. 160-164.

[110] Gökalp, *The Principles…* p. 125.

populism would stick together in the future as well. Every Turkism follower would remain as populist in the political field whereas every populist would be a Turkist in the cultural field. Gökalp penned down his motto on this issue with the following words: "Our doctrine in politics is populism and in culture Turkism".[111]

The final chapter of Ziya Gökalp's Turkism program was named philosophic Turkism. According to Gökalp, philosophy had to consider three conditions about science before performing: Philosophy could not prove what science rejected, philosophy could not abolish what science proved, and finally philosophy did not have to be universal like science, it can be national as well. From this point, Gökalp argued that Turks could follow the Turkism course in philosophy just like they do in morals, aesthetics, and economics. He claimed Turks were only weak on advanced philosophy; they were in a respected, even higher level in the philosophy that belonged to the folks, compared to other nations. Gökalp exemplified his proposal that it was essential to know the philosophy of an army next to its firepower in order to estimate whether it could win or lose in a battle. According to him, the philosophy of that army was a natural product of the philosophy of its own folk. Turks have proven countless times that they had better philosophy in their armies; thus, at a stage of where Turks had the equal contemporary firepower with the Western nations,[112] Turks would dominate the world again as they did once.[113]

Before concluding Ziya Gökalp's thoughts on Turkism, it would be enlightening to touch upon two often wrongly used and misevaluated concepts, *Turan* and *Turancılık* (Turanism), and their values on Ziya Gökalp's teaching. According to Gökalp, in order to understand the difference between Turkism and Turanism, it was essential to define the borders of both Turkish and Turanian communities. 'Turk' was a name of a nation, and a nation was a type of community which had its very own culture; thus, a Turk could only carry a single language and a single culture. On the other hand, there were several other types of Turkish nations; Tatar, Kirghiz, Uzbek, Turkmens in some non-Turkic countries,

---

[111] *"Siyasette mesleğimiz halkçılık, ve harsta mesleğimiz Türkçülüktür."* Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün…* pp. 165-166. The last quote taken from Gökalp, *The Principles…* p. 126.
[112] Gökalp's romantic approach to the philosophies of the armies show some parallelism with Mehmet Akif. The Turkish Independence March was dedicated to *'his'* heroic army *(Kahraman Ordumuza)*. Additionally, in the same march, when two sides faced each other in the battlefield, Akif preferred to put the Islamic faith against the steel-made technological advences of the West:

> If the horizons of the West were covered with walls of steel,
> I have guarded borders like my faithful chest.

(Garb'ın âfâkını sarmışsa çelik zırhlı duvar; / Benim iman dolu göğsüm gibi serhaddim var).
[113] Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün…* pp. 167-169.

and also Yakuts, Altai Turks, etc. *Turan* was a land where all these ancient Turkish nations lived within once; its etymological meaning was *Turlar* (*Tur*s) which means descendant of *Tur*, or 'Turks' in short. Therefore, Turanism was an ideal which sought to gather all Turks in *Turan*.[114] This approach showed itself in the famous lines of Gökalp's poem with the same name, *Turan*, as it follows:

> Fatherland is neither Turkey, for Turks, nor Turkistan,
> Fatherland is a great and eternal country named Turan.[115]

According to Ziya Gökalp, Turanism was an ideal which had to complete former steps before achieving the *Turan*. In his approach, Gökalp claimed it would be wiser to divide the path to *Turan* into stages; every former path would mount on the next one to fulfill the desired ideal's prerequisites. These three stages were Turkey-ism, Oghuz-ism (or Turkmenism), and finally Turanism. For his time, the only reality the Turks achieved was Turkey-ism. After completing the necessary requirements for Turkey-ism, which was actually the completion of the Turkism program he had proposed, it would be possible to shift into next phase by uniting the closer Turkic nations in the Near Asia culturally. By uniting all the Turkic nations within the same fatherland eventually, the *Turan* ideal would be completed. In short, Gökalp claimed *Turan* was a great fatherland of all Turks once; it was a reality in the past, and it had a chance to be same once again in the future. It was a *Kızıl Elma* (Red Apple, the ultimate and also far ideal the Turks should focus on to make it real) for Turks, an ideal which was firmly waiting to be achieved. Turanian people were only and purely consisted of Turkic-speaking nations. Finally, Gökalp stated that Turanism was the greatest rapture for Turkists, which aimed to unite hundreds of Turks in a sole nation.[116]

3. 4. Conclusion

After reviewing the proposals of the five 'effective' intellectual movements during the Second Constitutional Era which were discussed in the first chapter, one can notice that all these movements were in need of explaining themselves through some systematic methods while claiming their proposals were indeed 'scientific' *(ilmî)*. For instance, the Westernists asserted the 1908 Revolution could only be completed by a social revolution which could

---

[114] *Ibid.*, pp. 22-25.
[115] *"Vatan ne Türkiye'dir Türklere ne Türkistan, / Vatan, büyük ve müebbet bir ülkedir: Turan."* in Tansel, *Şiirler…* p. 5.
[116] Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün…* pp. 25-26.

only guaranteed by a 'scientific' method, which was nothing else but their trend alone.[117] The *Meslekçi* (liberal) movement and Prince Sabahaddin derived their proposals from Le Play's *ilmî içtima* (social science) doctrine to become 'scientific'.[118] The Socialists followed the socialism path due to its 'scientific' proposals like dialectic and historical materialism.[119] Islamists had also claimed their movement was scientific; however, their approaches on the science matter were 'the Islamic sciences', which they claimed Islam had already included these within.[120] Similarly, Ziya Gökalp had claimed his formulation of Turkism was also scientific and stated this claim in his several works. Gökalp's reference point in this 'scientific' debate was his tendency towards sociology. This was the reason Gökalp's thoughts on particular issues did not have some precise formulations in the beginning; contrary to this, they developed rather slowly, gradually. In order to ground his thoughts upon sociological methods, Gökalp had reviewed several sociologists and tried to apply their formulations to his thoughts; when he had seen a method was not successful on formulizing his thoughts, he put that aside and looked for another method. However, once he met with Durkheim's method in 1913, he had never abandoned this.[121]

In the introduction part of his book about Yusuf Akçura, Georgeon asserted that the studies about the influential figures of the Turkism movement were mostly biased to review Ziya Gökalp's life among other figures due to his vivid characteristic.[122] It is very possible to agree with Georgeon on this matter; yet, simplifying Gökalp's contributions to the Turkish nationalism with his colorful characteristic alone would not be righteous. Indeed, Gökalp was often labelled 'the founding father of Turkish nationalism'; however, favouring someone a grand title like this and often ignoring other contributors of Turkism as Georgeon asserted have to include a strong motive within. This strong motive could be found in two tendencies: First, Gökalp had managed to compile his thoughts with some sociological methods he had acquired from various scholars. Therefore, this type of

---

[117] Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri*, Yedigün, İstanbul, 1960, p. 78.

[118] *Ibid*. p. 92.

[119] Murat Belge, "Türkiye'de Sosyalizm Tarihinin Ana Çizgileri" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce – Sol*, 2nd Edition, Vol. 8, İletişim, İstanbul, 2008, pp. 19-48.

[120] For an article written about this 'Islamic science' matter, *see*. İskilipli Mehmed Âtıf's article (February/March 1922) titled *"İctihad ve İlmî Seviyenin Düşüşü"* (the Ijtihad and the Decline of the Scientific Level) in İsmail Kara (Ed.), *Türkiye'de İslâmcılık Düşüncesi 1 Metinler Kişiler*, 3rd Edition, Dergâh, İstanbul, 2017, pp. 315-317.

[121] Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*, 3rd Edition, Ülken, İstanbul, 1992, p. 179.

[122] François Georgeon, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri Yusuf Akçura (1976-1935)*, Alev Er (Trans.) Yurt, Ankara, 1986, p. 7.

formulation provided the followers of Turkism to easily claim that their movement was 'scientific', similar to Murat Belge's claim on the early Ottoman Marxists. Second, although Gökalp grounded Turkism upon cultural and non-materialistic elements, since the Turkism movement was originally a nationalist approach which includes some discriminative contexts in it by its nature, it is possible to claim that a discriminative tendency was performed towards the Russo-Turkish fathers of the early Turkism. For instance, the early Turkists like Yusuf Akçura, İsmail Gaspıralı, Ahmed Ağaoğlu, and Hüseyinzade Ali were taken as 'their' Turks with addressing the Russo-Turks. This approach could be elaborated by adding their birthplaces were former Russian provinces like Baku or Kazan and also their 'original' names were 'alien' like Gasprinski or Agayev. On the other hand, the Turkism followers in Turkey had Ziya Gökalp; he was born in Turkey, he was 'their own' Turk, and also he had picked his own 'pure' Turkish name long ago.[123] This tendency can also be seen in the utmost respect towards Mehmed Emin Yurdakul, who was often labelled 'national poet' *(milli şair)* and 'Turkish poet' *(Türk şairi)*. Because, both of them were born in Turkey, they did not carry 'alien names' from the beginning, they were the children of the fatherland, Turkey. This argument could be justified with two different facts: First, when Gökalp placed the Pan-Turkism ideology inside the *Turan* concept and labelled the concept a far ideal; the remaining residue of the Pan-Turkism ideology was nothing but a nationalism type limited within the fatherland alone, which was also the first stage of his Turanism program: Turkey-ism. Second, due to the origins of the Turkish nationalism movement had two sides with two different agendas during the late Ottoman period, and Turkism movement in the Empire had managed to convert its proposals into realities by influencing the founding characteristics of the new regime, which was also the successor of the former regime, it can be said that Gökalp was taken as 'more' Turk than the Russo-Turk fathers of Turkish nationalism.

---

[123] Throughout his life, even after his death, Ziya Gökalp was accused of 'not being a Turk' several times. For instance, during Gökalp's exile times in Malta, Ali Kemal had written an article in a French newspaper by asserting that Gökalp was not a Turkish man but a Kurdish. In response to this attack, Gökalp had penned a poem titled *Ali Kemal'e* (to Ali Kemal) and it was published in Açıkgöz newspaper of Kastamonu on 21 April 1921. In this poem, Gökalp indeed accepted he was not a Turk; but he had worked for Turkishness just because he believed that only the Turkish nation could save the Muslims in the world. Additionally, he claimed anyone who labelled the 'servant of the Turkishness' not Turk, was nothing but a 'bastard' even he was ethnically Turk by his ancestors:

> *Türklük hâdimine Türk değil diyen*
> *Soyca Türk olsa da, piçtir, Türk değil!*

This poem alone could explain Gökalp's grounding of Turkism upon culture. In order to read the mentioned poem, *see.* Tansel, *Şiirler…* pp. 277-278.

CHAPTER 4

AKİF'S AND GÖKALP'S UNDERSTANDINGS OF NATION

Since the conceptual framework of nation was already discussed in the introduction part of the thesis, considering the fact that both Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp lived in the same period, and they experienced almost every particular intellectual and political changes in the Ottoman Empire during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it can be said that they also experienced the different usages of the *millet* word. Indeed, they have both witnessed its different usages, and they also attributed different meanings to the *millet* word. In order to comprehend Akif's and Gökalp's conceptualizations of nation, two different intellectuals representing two different sociopolitical movements in the Second Constitutional Era, Islamism and Turkism; it would be beneficial to start with reviewing the changes on their understandings of the *millet* word first.

4. 1. Mehmet Akif and Nation

Mehmet Akif preferred to write down his thoughts on political issues as poems rather than articles mostly; his articles were rather focusing on literature. Additionally, his speeches in the mosques during the war times, both during the Balkan Wars and the Turkish War of Independence, had some clear statements to show his approach on the nation term. Therefore, it would be easier to track the changes of the *millet* word through his poems, articles, and speeches.

The importance of the religion in Mehmet Akif's life, Islam, was placed on top. Analyzing anything related with Akif, the nation concept in this case, should be evaluated with this information in the first place. Therefore, one can foresee that Akif's nation conceptualization had some tendencies towards the religion, Islam. This assesment is indeed authentic; yet, after reviewing his works chronologically, it can be said that, Akif had used the *millet* word in three different meanings throughout his life, parallel with three

different stages of the political situations Turkey had experienced. The first stage covered the period starting from the early writings of Akif to the beginning of the Balkan Wars where he used the *millet* word to correspond the *İttihad-ı İslam* (Unity of Muslims) approach by stressing out the Muslim society. The second stage started from the end of the first stage and ended with the Battle of Gallipoli *(Çanakkale Savaşı)* in 1915. In this time, Akif used the *millet* word as inclusive as possible, mostly by mentioning 'the Ottomans' rather than Muslims, by refusing all the ethnic diversities in order to mobilize more people to the war and secure the state's future. The third stage can be taken as a period began with the Turkish War of Independence, when the Muslim societies retreated to Anatolia and concluded with Akif's self-exile times in Egypt.

4. 1. 1. Stage One: *Millet* as Ummah, Ummah as *Millet*

The first published poem of Akif was *Kur'an'a Hitap* (Addressing the Quran) which was published in 1895 in the *Mektep* (School) journal. Between 1897 and 1898, several other poems of Akif were published in the *Resimli Gazete* (Illustrated Newspaper).[1] Considering these years were covering the early stage of his penmanship life, and the same years were also the absolute monarchy times of Sultan Abdul Hamid II who was censoring the publications, it would not be realistic to expect Akif to write his published poems on political issues. Indeed, these early published poems of Akif were mostly about religious issues or they were focusing on some vivid descriptions of random figures among the society. Therefore, there was no reference to nation among his early poems. This situation continued until the declaration of the Second Constitutional Era. In 1911, the first chapter of his famous poem book *Safahat* was published. Although some of the poems in that book were written before the 1908 Revolution, it can be clearly seen in this chapter that after the revolution Akif began writing politically. In this chapter, consisted of fourty-four poems, Akif used the *millet* word in different poems. In his *Mezarlık* (Graveyard) poem Akif stated:

> From the tears of the nation which glow from their pure soul!
> You are a glorious history; the history of the nation is within you.[2]

In *Acem Şahı* (Shah of Iran):

---

[1] Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, *Mehmed Akif Ersoy (Hayatı ve Eserleri)*, 3rd Edition, Mehmet Akif Ersoy Fikir ve Sanat Vakfı, 1991, pp. 14-15.

[2] *"Rûh-i pâkinden coşan göz yaşlarından milletin! / Şanlı bir târîhsin: Mâzi-i millet sendedir"*. Mehmed Âkif Ersoy, *Safahat*, 9th Edition, M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (Ed.), Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, Ankara, 2013, p. 37.

Who did you win against? Think once, is that the nation?
[…]
How can you pay no attention to the cry of the nation?[3]

In *İstibdad* (Despotism):

From a few people of the tents, to a world conqueror state
Was established whose nation once shook the world.[4]

These poems clearly state that in Akif's approach, a common element was sought to address with the *millet* word: Islam. Similar to Sultan Abdul Hamid II's foreign policy, considering Akif and his fellow members of the Islamism trend were carrying a unity of Muslims ideal under the leadership of the Empire, it can be seen that Akif's addressee for the *millet* word was the Muslim community in his early poetry days; regardless of they were dead or they resided in Iran or in the Empire. This tendency of addressing any Muslim society as *millet* showed itself in another poem. Within the first chapter of his book, in the *Mahalle Kahvesi* (Neighborhood Café) poem, Akif gave some clues on this tendency with:

Ottomans know what the "Neighborhood Café" means.
[…]
This wound sucks the working spirit of the nation
[…]
Poor pitiful ummah was buried before dying.[5]

In the twenty-two lines of this poem, Mehmet Akif used Ottomans, *millet*, and ummah words in the same meaning. The tricky part here is, while addressing the Ottomans as *millet* or ummah, Akif's actual intention was referring the Muslim elements of the Ottomans. Indeed, in one of his early articles published in *Sırat-ı Müstakim* journal in 1910, Akif stated: "[…] The only salvation of this country is to combine the non-Muslim ethnies by tying them with the fatherland-link, and the Muslim elements, which have the majority of the people, by tying them with the Islamic-link […]"[6] In this statement,

---

[3] *"Zafer-yâb olduğun kimdir? Düşün bir kerre, millet mi? […] Nasıl aldırmıyorsun yükselen feryâda milletten?" Ibid.* p. 71.
[4] *"O birkaç hayme halkından cihangîrâne bir devlet / Çıkarmış, bir zaman dünyâyı lerzân eylemiş millet." Ibid.* p. 73.
[5] *"Mahalle Kahvesi!" Osmanlılar bilir ne demek? […] Bu karha milletin emmekte rûhi gayretini […] Zavallı ümmet-i merhûme ölmeden gömülür." Ibid.* p. 101.
[6] *"[…] Zira bu memleketin selâmeti ekseriyet-i mutlakayı teşkil eden Müslim unsurları rabıta-i İslam ile birbirine sımsıkı bağladıktan sonra gayr-ı Müslim akvâmı da rabıta-i vataniye ile o ekseriyete ilhak*

Mehmet Akif clearly distinguished the non-Muslim elements within the Empire by addressing them with *kavim* (plural is *akvâm*) word, which is originally Arabic and means 'tribe' in the strict sense and 'ethnie' in the broad sense. Therefore, it can be asserted that in this first period, the *millet* word for Akif was addressing the Muslim elements of any society, especially the Muslim elements of the Empire.

In *Süleymaniye Kürsüsünde*, the second chapter of *Safahat* - 1912, Mehmet Akif used the *millet* word several times along with the ummah and the *kavim* words. His approach on the difference or the similarity of these three words was clear in this 1002-verses-long poem. Here, Akif described the Muslims in Istanbul from the eyes of the narrator of the poem, who was a Muslim voyager.[7] He used the ummah word three times to address the Ottoman Muslim society:

> I came to Istanbul once,
> However, after looking the future of the ummah,
> I felt in a deep sorrow and travelled to Russia again.
> [...]
> After looking at the situation of the ummah, hearts were wounded
> Neither one has a job to earn money nor has the money for food.
> [...]
> There cannot be a right to live for this miserable ummah,
> The song of liberation we hear is its last breath.[8]

These verses were describing the Ottoman society in two phases: Long before the 1908 Revolution, and the first week of the revolution. Here, Akif's intention was to show the miserable situation of the Ottoman society, and he called the society ummah. However, addressing the Muslim elements of the Ottoman society with ummah alone, which originally should refer to the Mohammedan people all over the world since the declaration of Islam,[9] attracts some confusion. Therefore, reviewing other parts of the poem might be

---

etmektedir [...]" Mehmed Akif, "Açık Mektub Ebuzziya Tevfik Efendi'ye", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 21 Safer 1328/18 Şubat 1325 (3 March 1910), Vol. 3, No. 78, pp. 409-410.

[7] Although Akif preferred to speak through his words, this voyager was not an imaginary character but it was Abdürreşid İbrahim, an Uzbek Muslim scholar. During his life, İbrahim travelled a lot; from Italy to Japan, including all the Levant area, North Africa, Germany, Arabia, as well as the Balkans and Russia. He took the lead in building a mosque in Tokyo in 1937, his efforts caused Islam to be officially recognized in Japan in 1939, and he died on 17 August 1944 in Tokyo. For detailed information about his journeys, *see.* Mustafa Uzun, "Abdürreşid İbrahim" in *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 1, TDV, İstanbul, 1988, pp. 295-297.

[8] *"Bir zamanlar yine İstanbul'a gelmiştim ben / Hale baktıkça fakat, ümmetin atisinden, / Pek derin ye'se düşüp Rusya'ya geçtim tekrar. [...] Ümmetin haline baktım ki: Yürekler yarası! / Ne bir ekmek yedirir iş; ne de ekmek parası. [...] Olamaz böyle sefil bir ümmet için hakk-ı hayat. / Duyulan nağme-i hürriyet onun son nefesi!"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, pp. 145-146, 159.

[9] Halil İbrahim Bulut, "Ümmet", *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 42, TDV, İstanbul, 2012, pp. 308-309.

helpful to clarify this issue. In the same poem, Akif described the Muslim world through the eyes of the same Muslim voyager who narrated the poem, and addressed the ummah with calling it as *millet* in several verses within the same poem:

> With saying: Alas! The 'late Islam nation'[10]
> I got on board to sail to Russia.
> […]
> Why there is no name of the science within this great nation today?
> Because the public opinion is completely against it.[11]

As it can be seen from these two continuous passages of Akif's same poem above, the ummah word in the first passage and the *millet* word in the second passage have the same meaning: The Muslim elements of the Empire. Therefore, it can be asserted that, in this stage of his life, Akif used these two words interchangeably. The main purpose of this action was to hold the Muslim societies together under the leadership of the Empire. While the Balkan Wars was not on the agenda, before October 1912, the main problem of the Empire was the internal political divisions among the Ottoman society. The 1908 Revolution brought freedom of speech, and almost every political idea started to be represented within the Ottoman society through various periodicals. First the ideas started to fight, and then the publications fired these fights up. Akif struggled to tie the Muslim elements of the Empire together in order to avoid a possible political or intellectual conflict among each other. Considering the sole indispensable value for Akif was religion, he had picked the religious ummah word and used it to address the Ottoman Muslims and also used the *millet* word for the same society. Indeed, in his speech at the Şehzadebaşı Club, Akif referred his tendency on using ummah and *millet* words interchangeably by quoting the words of Prophet Mohammad:

> If –God forbid!– you forget this, please yourselves, and divide apart, know that, other nations will enslave you; you will be crushed under their domination and cruelty, you will be ruined. The Islam religion will also get harmed by the misery of yours.[12]

---

[10] Originally, the 'late Islam nation' description here is written as *'millet-i merhume'* which literally means 'long-dead nation which may receive the God's mercy in afterlife' in Turkish, and in the poem it was used to describe the Muslims. In his several poems, Akif preferred to describe the Ottoman and Muslim societies as the dead entities with this idiom in order to stress out their laziness and hopelessness. Describing ummah with a *millet* word or using *millet-i merhume* instead of ummah can be regarded as another example of *millet*-ummah similarity in Akif's works. For more information on *millet-i merhume* idiom in Akif's works, *see*. Ramazan Gülendam, "Mehmet Âkif'e Göre Müslümanlardaki Ümitsizlik İlleti", *SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, No. 20, December 2009, pp. 121-134.

[11] *"Yazık ey millet-i merhume! Dedikten sonra; / Atladım Rusya'ya gitmekte olan bir vapura. […] Niye ilmin adı yok koskoca millette bugün? / Çünkü efkâr-ı umumiyye aleyhinde bütün;"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 147, 149, and 166.

This statement alone can be interpreted in two perspectives: First, his nation understanding was larger than the nation meaning in the modern sense but smaller than his *ittihad-ı İslam* understanding; or ummah in short. This is why, with this knowledge, his *millet* and ummah usages show some strong similarities with each other. Second, this statement can justify that Akif's conceptualization of nation had shown a social characteristic. When the Empire's agenda was nothing but internal political disputes, both CUP and the oppositions were in favor of dominating the Ottoman politics. Additionally, by witnessing an 'embarrassing' incident like Election of/through Clubs *(Sopalı Seçimler)* which was conducted for the sake of dominance in politics in the early 1912, Akif aimed to remind the Muslim part of the Ottoman society that they were brothers by religion while addressing them as nation. Although the origin of the challenge Akif had faced in this period was political, actually his efforts were 'social'. This is why it can be claimed that Akif's conceptualization of *millet* was addressing a social unity, even he used ummah word to correspond *millet* from time to time; which can be taken as not whole but a 'small' ummah addressing the Ottoman Muslims.

4. 1. 2. Stage Two: A Quest for Unity

The outbreak of the Balkan Wars in the late 1912 had a deep impact on the Ottoman politics. The nationalism ideology among its subjects became a huge problem for the Ottoman diplomacy. The national revolts of the former Ottoman subjects resided in the Balkans shifted into actual battles in several fronts, and the sum of these battles in various fronts were titled as the Balkan Wars. The sociopolitical integrity of the Empire was about to be re-identified soon; therefore, the *millet* concept would require a new definition for the Empire. During this period, Mehmet Akif was stressing out that the Empire was the last stronghold of the Muslim world. In order to guarantee the Empire's survival, and therefore Islam from his perspective, the divisions among the Ottoman Muslim society should be eradicated. In December 1912, during the second month of the Balkan Wars, in one of his articles, Akif stressed out the last Islam country was the Empire with the following words:

> O, Muslim community! Do you see the bloody disasters surrounding this last Islam country? These all were happened because of us, yes, us but no one else, just because

---

[12] *"Eğer –maazallah– bunu unutur, hevanıza uyar, tefrikaya düşerseniz, biliniz ki başka milletler sizi esarete alır, onların zulmü altında ezilir, mahvolursunuz. Sizin bu perişanlığınızdan din-i İslam da zarar görür."* Mehmed Akif, "Mevaiz-i Diniyyeden: İttihad Yaşatır, Yükseltir Tefrika Yakar, Öldürür", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 22 Zilkade 1328/11 Teşrinisani 1326 (25 November 1910), Vol. 5, No. 116, pp. 205-207.

of us. […] For God's sake, let's stop being in a fight with each other from now on. […] Not the power of our enemies ruined us […] but the division they had penetrated into our lands –years– before their armies.[13]

The 'division' word Akif used above could be a key point in understanding his *millet* conceptualization in this period. Considering the audience was the Ottoman Muslim society here and Akif preferred to use "our lands" description, it can be asserted that Akif's unity of Muslims ideal was shrinking geographically. By adding the Caliphate concept into the quote above which he stressed in a poem written in the same period, it can be claimed that his *millet* agenda in this time was political. In *Fatih Kürsüsünde*, Akif stated that the only institution that kept the Muslim society together was the Caliphate:

> If the poor Islam world is not embracing the cross yet
> It is because the Caliphate is holding your arms.
> Without the Caliphate, the world will become Christianized.[14]

During the Balkan Wars, Mehmet Akif had also delivered three speeches in three great mosques of Istanbul, which were published in *Sebilürreşad* as well. The speeches were advising the Muslim societies of the Empire to stay strong, hold firm as united, and to defend the government of the last Islam state as one and sole *millet*:

> The government, the nation, the army [...] They expect many sacrifices from us. We will present this sacrifice in order to preserve our religion, our fatherland, and ourselves. […] Because this government, the Caliphate's government, as the last hope of Islam, is about to say farewell to the life. The enemy is deployed five or six hours ahead of the center of the Caliphate.[15]

In the third chapter of his *Safahat* titled *Hakkın Sesleri* which was published during the Balkan Wars, Akif had combined the power of Quran verses and hadith with his penmanship and titled his poems in this chapter with some pieces of these. In these poems, it can be seen that due to the former subjects in the Balkans were gaining their

---

[13] *"Ey cemaat-i Müslimin! Şu son İslam yurdunu çepçevre kuşatan kanlı felaketler yok mu? İşte onlar hep bizim kendi yüzümüzden, evet, hiç kimsenin değil, hep bizim kendi yüzümüzden meydana geldi. [...] Artık Allah için olsun birbirimizle uğraşmaktan vazgeçelim. [...] Bizi düşmanlarımızın kuvve-i külliyesi perişan etmedi [...] ordularından –senelerce– evvel hududumuzun dâhiline soktukları tefrika idi."* Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal", *Sebilürreşad*, 26 Zilhicce 1330/22 Teşrinisani 1328 (6 December 1912), Vol. 9-2, No. 221, pp. 232-233.

[14] *"Zavallı Alem-i İslam eğer Salib'e henüz / Sarılmıyorsa, kolundan çeken: Hilafetiniz. / Hilafet olmasa: Dünya tanassur eyleyecek..."* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, pp. 245-246.

[15] *"Hükümet, millet, ordu [...] Bizden birçok fedakârlıklar bekliyor. Biz bu fedakârlığı dinimizi, vatanımızı, kendimizi muhafaza için ihtiyar edeceğiz. [...] Çünkü Müslümanlığın son ümidi olan bu hükümet, bu hükümet-i hilafet, artık hayata veda etmek üzere. Düşman merkez-i hilafetten beş-altı saat ötede duruyor."* Mehmed Akif, "Üstad-ı Muhterem Mehmed Akif Beyefendi Tarafından Bayezid Kürsüsünde", *Sebilürreşad*, 29 Safer 1331/24 Kanunisani 1328 (7 February 1913), Vol. 9-2, No. 230-48, pp. 373-376.

independence from the Empire one by one, Akif accepted that the Empire was experiencing a dissolution period. While naming both the Ottoman Muslims and former Ottoman subjects as *millet*s in these poems, Akif was trying to instill hope to the Muslims. Although his approach here on naming other societies than Muslims as *millet*s seems conflicting with his Islamic characteristic, the actual agenda of Akif was pointing out the newly emerged [ethnic] nation and nationalism concepts within the Empire. During these times, Mehmet Akif had criticized these concepts harshly, and he preferred to use Prophet Mohammad's words and advices as evidence in his poems to curse the ethnic movements within the Empire. According to Akif, instead of dividing themselves into several ethnic groups which he named *kavim*, the *millet* shall remember that their actual nationality was Islam; Prophet Mohammad had also condemned any type of race and ethnicity based movements:

> Your nationality was Islam… What is ethnicism!
> Why didn't you embrace your nationality tightly?
> What does 'Albanian' mean? Does it have a place in Shari'a?
> It would be blasphemy, nothing more, to introduce your ethnie.
> Arab to Turk; Laz to Circassian or Kurd,
> Is Persian superior over Chinese? No!
> Does Islam have [ethnic elements] within? No!
> The Prophet condemned ethnicism idea
> The spirituality of our Prophet is the greatest enemy of division
> Shame on whoever introduced that to Islam.[16]

Although this 'second stage' nation understanding of Mehmet Akif showed some similarities with the first one, the blurry nuance between them can be purged with the help of a hard-to-notice remark. The first definition of the nation concept for Akif was determined to remind the Ottoman Muslim society which were divided into several political factions as a result of the emergence of different political movements. The supporters of CUP, the followers of opposition parties, and the loyalists of several intellectual movements were undermining the unity of the Ottoman Muslim society. Therefore, Akif was busy with reminding them to be united. However, in the 'second stage', the social challenge for the Empire was the ethnic separatist movements whereas the political challenge was the dissolution of the Empire due to the ethnic revolts; there

---

[16] *"Hani milliyyetin İslam idi… Kavmiyyet ne! / Sarılıp sımsıkı dursaydın a milliyyetine. / 'Arnavutluk' ne demek? Var mı Şeriat'te yeri? / Küfr olur, başka değil, kavmini sürmek ileri. / Arabın Türke; Lazın Çerkese, yahud Kürde; / Acemin Çinliye rüchanı mı varmış? Nerde! / Müslümanlık'ta 'anasır' mı olurmuş? Ne gezer! / Fikr-i kavmiyyeti tel'in ediyor Peygamber. / En büyük düşmanıdır ruh-i Nebi tefrikanın; / Adı batsın onu İslam'a sokan kaltabanın!"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, pp. 183-184.

was an 'actual' threat to the existence of the state. According to Akif, the Turk, the Albanian, the Arab, the Laz, the Circassian were all Muslims; hence, their 'nationality' had to be Islam, nothing else. Thereby, it can be said that, in this period Akif altered his *millet* conceptualization; he put Islam at one side of the spectrum, and ethnie to another. The main characteristic of this period was Akif's hatred towards the *kavim* concept. In his quest on eradicating this concept from the Muslim societies of the Empire, the verses from Quran and also hadith had helped Akif a lot.

As it was stated earlier, during this period, Akif preferred to use a verse from the Quran or a hadith as the headline for his poems. Additionally, with the introduction of a new section to his journal, *Sebilürreşad*, Akif had also started to explain some verses of Quran in detail. These columns were indeed explaining the verses deeply; however, the 'selected verses' were quite mostly about the unity of the Muslims and the objection to the ethnic claims. Considering the top agenda for the Empire was the ethnic movements in the Balkans, Akif vastly benefited from this new section of *Sebilürreşad* as a tool to promote the Islamic unity in the Empire. For example, in an article in this newly introduced column, Akif stated: "If you embrace your identities as Arabian, Albanian, Turkish, or Kurdish and leave the brotherhood of the religion which bonded you with the strongest link, God forbid, a guaranteed disappointment for us all is certain".[17] In another article of the same column, Akif stated:

> While Islam is the only link to bond the people under a single nationality who are completely stranger with each other in ethnicity, color, language, region, and climate; and even there is no salvation for us, the Ottomans, other than to embrace this link fully in this world; it is impossible not to surprise these ethnicism and asabiyyah noises we had introduced recently! […] O Muslim community, pull yourselves together; leave the ethnicism efforts aside. If you neglect the religion's link a bit more, know this, you will be perished.[18]

---

[17] *"Şayed kiminiz Araplığına, kiminiz Arnavutluğuna, kiminiz Türklüğüne, kiminiz Kürdlüğüne sarılacak, sizi rabıtaların en metini ile birleştirmiş olan din kardeşliğini bir tarafa bırakacak iseniz, neûzübillâh, hepimiz için hüsran-ı mübin muhakkaktır."* Mehmed Akif, "Tefsir-i Şerif", *Sebilürreşad*, 5 Recep 1330/7 Haziran 1328 (20 June 1912), Vol. 8-1, No. 198-16, pp. 293-294.

[18] *"Müslümanlık ırk, renk, lisan, muhit, iklim itibarıyla birbirine büsbütün yabancı unsurları aynı milliyet altında cem eden yegâne rabıta iken, hele biz Osmanlılar için dünyada bu rabıtaya dört el ile sarılmaktan başka selamet yolu yokken şu son senelerde meydana çıkardığımız kavmiyet, asabiyet gürültülerine şaşmamak elden gelmez! […] Ey cemaat-i Müslimin, aklınızı başınıza alınız; gayret-i kavmiyeyi bir tarafa bırakınız. Rabıta-i dini biraz daha ihmal edecek olursanız, iyi biliniz ki, tarumar olur gidersiniz."* Mehmed Akif, "Tefsir-i Şerif", *Sebilürreşad*, 15 Şevval 1330/13 Eylül 1328 (27 September 1912), Vol. 89-2, No. 212-30, pp. 61-63.

This quote alone could summarize all the efforts of Akif in this period. According to Akif, the only nationality was Islam; therefore, the only nation could be the Muslims. However, since the addressee was the Ottoman Muslims and the 'opponent' was the ethnicity claims within the same addressee, leaving the original proposals of the Islamic teachings would eventually harm Akif's ideal about unity of the Muslims. This is why Akif stressed out the 'wrong' course the Ottoman Muslims was in favor of following in another article of the same column by clearly conceptualizing nation as Islam: "O Muslim community, you are neither Arab, nor Albanian, nor Kurdish, nor Laz, nor Circassian! You are the individuals of such a nation that, that great nation is nothing but Islam. You cannot champion your ethnicity claims unless you say farewell to Islam".[19]

In a nutshell, the *millet* word Akif preferred to use in this stage was indeed showing some similarities with the previous stage; they both were referring the sum of Muslim individuals of the society. However, the second period was more political than the previous one. Indeed, it can be said that Akif became more of a political poet, or voice –with respect of his other interested areas of literature, than anything else in this period.[20] During this stage, Akif found the solution in the unity of all the Ottoman Muslim elements under the single Ottoman flag, which was waving with the Islamic winds. However, some researchers argued that this unity in Islam ideal of Akif soon disappeared and faded away by the defeat of the Empire at the end of WWI,[21] whereas some claimed Akif had merged his Islamic unity idea with Turkism movement after the victory of Gallipoli.[22] Although the second claim can be taken as biased, the first claim here is indeed valuable and it could be a reference point to grasp.

By this reference, it can also be asserted that, in the first period, Akif's *millet* understanding was not only addressing the Muslim elements of the Empire alone but a great Islamic unity which he could warmly welcome even, say, a Chinese to his *millet* as long as he was Muslim. Therefore, it can be claimed that Akif's conceptualization of

---

[19] *"Ey cemaat-i Müslimin, siz ne Arabsınız, ne Türksünüz, ne Arnavutsunuz, ne Kürtsünüz, ne Lazsınız, ne Çerkessiniz! Siz ancak bir milletin efradısınız ki o millet-i muazzama da İslamdır. Müslümanlığa veda etmedikçe kavmiyet davasında bulunamazsınız."* Mehmed Akif, "Tefsir-i Şerif", *Sebilürreşad*, 29 Şevval 1330/27 Eylül 1328 (11 October 1912), Vol. 9-2, No. 214-32, pp. 101-102.

[20] Mehmet Emin Erişirgil, *İslamcı Bir Şairin Romanı Mehmet Akif*, 3rd Edition, Aykut Kazancıgil & Cem Alpar (Ed.), Nobel, Ankara, 2006, pp. 106-109.

[21] Şükran Kurdakul, "Tevfik Fikret ile Mehmet Akif, İslam Birliği Umudu Paramparça Olur -3-", *Cumhuriyet*, 22 January 1986.

[22] Mustafa Özbalcı, "Batılılaşma Gayretlerimiz ve Mehmet Akif Ersoy", *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 190-221.

nation in the first period was more social than political. About the second period on the other hand, R. İhsan Eliaçık argued that in this period Akif was against the racial and ethnic claims while carrying some 'national' inspirations along with an ummah-biased *millet* concept. Thus, Akif's *millet* concept used in various poems was addressing the sole Muslim ummah as a single body. He had no tendency towards the 'nation-state' concept in his *millet* understanding. Alongside with other Islamist intellectuals at the same time like Said Halim Pasha, Mehmet Akif was also in search of establishing an Islamic unity.[23] This argument was indeed acceptable that Akif was against the ethnic movements and he was an Islamic nationalist. However, the Islamic unity quest Akif sought was actually stronger in the first period; in the second period, his unity ideal 'shrank' to the lands of the Empire. Therefore, not many references could be tracked in his written accounts on the Muslims which reside 'in the far sides of the world'. Nonetheless, it was clear that Akif had accepted the one sole protector of Islam was the Ottoman Muslim society alone. The loss of northern Africa, the Arab uprisings in Hejaz, the population exchanges between the Balkans and the Anatolia, and fighting against the Muslim Indian soldiers in Gallipoli caused Akif to change his mind. From this time on, Mehmet Akif would consider his options, and would eventually realize there was no other society left than the Muslims in Anatolia to protect Islam against the West.

4. 1. 3. Stage Three: The Last Guardians of Islam

In pursuit of finding the exact time of Mehmet Akif's disappointment on the failure of the unity of Islam he promoted through the Ottoman Muslim society in his poems, articles, and speeches, the fifth chapter of his *Safahat* book named *Hatıralar* (Reminiscences) could be helpful. In a poem titled *Berlin Hatıraları* (Berlin Reminiscences) in this chapter, which was written on 18 March 1915, Akif narrated how the British were seeing the Muslims to a German lady in a dialogue through the words of an unnamed British man:

> You know: Egypt for the Islam world
> Is like the head on the skinny body.
> India is its sensitive heart in its chest.
> And your people (Ottomans), the arms that seek to move.[24]

---

[23] R. İhsan Eliaçık, *Çağa İz Bırakan Müslüman Önderler Mehmet Akif Ersoy*, İlke, İstanbul, 2004, pp. 84-88.
[24] *"Bilirsiniz ki: Mısır, kainat-ı İslamın / O sıska gövdesi üzerinde adeta kafası; / Diyar-ı Hind ise, göğsünde kalb-i hassası; / Sizinkiler de, kımıldanmak isteyen koludur."* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 303.

With this poem, Mehmet Akif described Islam as a body and the Muslim nations as its organs. According to the unnamed British man, therefore Akif, the body should be whole in order to function properly. However, the following lines of the same poem indicate that according to Akif, Britain did not want the arm to move, which was the Empire in that case, and introduced ethnicism ideology *(fikr-i kavmiyyet)* to the other societies of Islam with the purpose of weakening the Empire. Therefore, after separating Arab from Turk, Laz from Circassian, etc. it would be easier to attack the East first, and that attack would follow the future attacks on Gallipoli and eventually Istanbul.[25] Indeed, the desperation of Akif after the collapse of his Islamic unity ideal can be tracked in these lines. After leaving the German lady alone, Akif started to describe the Battle of Gallipoli. He prayed the God that *Mehmetçik* (literally means 'Little Mohammad', referring the Muslim soldiers) would be successful on holding the strait. In his description within the same poem, *Berlin Hatıraları*, the last remaining land of Islam was Anatolia, and its survival was essential for the future of 350 millions of Muslims:

> The greatest sons of the army of the Caliphate,
> Whose pure foreheads are the last stronghold for the Islam.
> For God's sake, O, honorable warriors!
> Be persisted, because, you are the only hope;
> If you withdraw, the religion will perish forever,
> […]
> That place you are holding for the life of Islam
> Is the one sole crucial point […]
> […]
> For the remaining 350 millions of lives.[26]

The poem concluded itself with the reply of *Mehmetçik*, as stated:

> […] - Don't be afraid!
> Even the hell comes; we can put it out on our chests;
> This is the path of the God, we do not withdraw, we do walk!
> […]
> The fighting people of Circassian, Laz, Turk,
> Arab and Kurd united eternally today;
> The beating hearts in the chests are one, undaunted!
> Even the world falls, be sure of that, this front does not fall![27]

---

[25] *Ibid.* The following lines.
[26] *"Halife ordusunun en muazzam evladı / Ki pak alınları İslam için son istihkâm. / Huda rızası için ey mücahidin-i kiram! / Sebatı kesmeyiniz, çünkü, sade sizde ümid; / Dönerseniz ebediyyen söner gider Tevhid, […] O elde tuttuğunuz yer hayat-ı İslam'ın / Yegâne ukdesidir […] Ümidi sizde kalan üç yüz elli milyon can" Ibid.* p. 304.

Since the purpose here is to determine the exact time of Akif's disappointment on his great Islamic unity, these lines above could be helpful on this issue. In the second period of Akif's conceptualization of nation from the perspective of this thesis, when the Balkan Wars were on the agenda, Akif was claiming the lands of the Empire were the last stronghold of Islam. Here, that 'last stronghold' was limited with the foreheads of the Muslim soldiers. Considering the fact that Akif was accepted as an eloquent preacher and a gifted poet who was able to rhyme his poems in three different languages and also in French, and considering the possibility that he could have easily used another description for this 'last stronghold', there had to be a reason for him to limit the last remaining lands of his Muslim unity ideal with the foreheads of Muslims in Anatolia alone. Soner Çağaptay's assesments could be helpful to explain this reason. According to him, the Balkan Wars had changed the attitude towards the non-Turkish elements of the Empire. The demographic changes in the last decade through deportations, mutual exchanges, and also the ethnic uprisings made Anatolia and also Thrace more 'Turkish-Muslim' than ever.[28] This assesment indeed offers a good vantage point, and it could be an answer to Ziya Gökalp's profound influence on the establishment of the new regime in Turkey alone; yet, from the eyes of Akif, this argument could also be read simply 'more Muslim than ever' by ignoring the 'Turkish' ethnic element within the statement. Therefore, it can be claimed that as long as it was full of Muslims, Anatolia alone could serve Akif's Islamic unity ideal.

Mehmet Akif had started to write his famous poem, *Asım*, in 1919. Years later, in 1924, he published the sixth chapter of his book with the same name of this poem, *Asım*. In this 2292 verses-long poem, Akif reserved an exclusive place for the Victory of Gallipoli. In his famous *Çanakkale Şehitlerine* (to the Martyrs of Gallipoli) poem, Akif consoled himself and also the ummah which was forced to retreat to the Anatolia, by addressing to the *Mehmetçik*:

> Shot from his pure forehead, lying down
> For the sake of a crescent, O God, many suns set!
> O, fallen soldier died for the sake of these lands!

---

[27] *"[…] - Korkma! / Cehennem olsa gelen, göğsümüzde söndürürüz; / Bu yol ki Hak yoludur, dönme bilmeyiz, yürürüz! […] Değil mi cenge koşan Çerkes'in, Laz'ın, Türk'ün, / Arab'la, Kürd ile bakidir ittihadı bugün; / Değil mi sinede birdir vuran yürek… Yılmaz! / Cihan yıkılsa, emin ol, bu cebhe sarsılmaz!" Ibid.* pp. 305-306.

[28] Soner Çağaptay, *Islam, Secularism, and Nationalism in Modern Turkey: Who is a Turk?*, Routledge, London & New York, 2006, pp. 4-15.

Worth to kiss that pure forehead if the ancestors came down from the sky
You are so almighty that your blood saves the religion...[29]

From this perspective, it was clear that the 'pure foreheads' of the Muslim soldiers completed the task, saved Islam, and from the the following parts of the poem it can be said that they made Akif proud. Hence, considering his most precious value, Islam, survived by the help of the Muslim soldiers, it was Akif's round to devote himself to the Muslim society stuck within Anatolia. Indeed, he had done that.

Fevziye Abdullah Tansel argued that until his self-exile in Egypt after 1926, except for his some particular articles on literature, every single work Akif penned was promoting the Islamic unity. According to her, Akif was an idealist and his ideals had changed in time. In his early writings, Akif was promoting an absolute Islamic unity; however, in time, Akif had combined his Islamic unity ideal with patriotism.[30] This argument looks strong; however, the patriotism in Akif's ideal needs to be explained. In the earlier part of his famous poem *Asım*, Akif pictured the Ottoman Muslim society starting from the Balkan Wars period. According to him, this society was lack of joy, hope, health, ethics, and it was poor. That Muslim generation of the Empire failed in keeping the society intact and failed in exalting the Muslim community. However, by reading the following parts of the poem, one can see that the younger Muslim generation Akif described which he pinned all his faith upon, was successful at protecting the honor of Islam in Gallipoli. Furthermore, this victorious young (*Asım*'s) generation, was preparing to fight against the invaders of the last remaining lands of Islam, Anatolia. After Akif had heard this, he travelled to Ankara with the cliché of *Sebilürreşad* in order to fight for the last remaining lands of Islam alongside with *Asım*'s generation in the Turkish War of Independence.[31] It was time to re-define his Islamic unity ideal and re-conceptualize *millet* once more again.

During the Turkish War of Independence, Mehmet Akif delivered several speeches in various mosques in Anatolia. Although it is known that Akif had a negative attitude towards the ethnicism; in these speeches, Akif softened his voice on this concept gradually. He used the *millet* word several times in his speeches either to define the other Muslim

---

[29] *"Vurulup tertemiz alnından, uzanmış yatıyor, / Bir Hilal uğruna, ya Rab, ne güneşler batıyor! / Ey, bu topraklar için toprağa düşmüş, asker! / Gökten ecdad inerek öpse o pak alnı değer. / Ne büyüksün ki kanın kurtarıyor Tevhid'i..."* Ersoy, *Safahat*, p. 386.
[30] Tansel, *Mehmed Akif...* pp. 188-191.
[31] Mithat Cemal, *Mehmet Akif*, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür, Ankara, 1986, p. 115.

ethnicities within the ummah or to define the Muslim elements as one within Anatolia. At first, he promoted the unity among the Muslim people and to fight for the fatherland, and he declared that joining the 'national' war was the top religious duty. He stated:

> As long as working alone has no value, we have to unite and work altogether. […] If Muslims want to live, they shall hesitate from even the slightest hypocrisy, division, resentment, and insincere actions among their community. […] The unity is all we need for both this world and afterlife. […] Partisanship and ethnicism […] shall be silent now. We have to defend our fatherland together now. […] Do not forget for a single moment that standing against this vile attack is the irreplaceable religious duty for every individual [which shall only be performed by themselves] […] women, men, children, old and young.[32]

This quote above has three particular characteristics to stress. First, by shrinking his Islamic unity ideal with 'fatherland' alone, it is clear that the last stronghold for the Muslims was Anatolia for Akif. Second, by stating the partisanship (the characteristics of the first period) and the ethnicism (the characteristic of the second period) should be silent, it can be seen that in the third period the addressing of the nation was not a social or a political but a sociopolitical one. Third, by assigning the Muslims alone to save the fatherland and claiming it was a religious duty, reading Çağaptay's statement above from the 'eyes of Akif' as 'a more Muslim than ever fatherland' can be justified.

In his second speech in Kastamonu, in less than nine months after the one above, Akif differentiated the religion and *millet* concepts for the first time. While describing the examples of the British colonies, specifically India, Akif called the Indians as *millet* and also he stressed out other Muslim 'nations' within the ummah:

> The humanity has awakened. The enslaved nations realized how great powers they were under the command of the dominating nations. […] Additionally, a [Muslim] unity can provide great benefits to the Muslim nations who were stuck between north, south, east, and west until now. […] There is only one [high school] for the eighty millions Indian Muslims.[33]

---

[32] *"Mademki tek başına sarf olunan mesainin kıymeti yoktur, biz de aramızda vahdeti temin ederek topluca çalışmaya koyulmalıyız. […] Eğer Müslümanlar yaşamak istiyorlarsa, cemaat arasında nifaka, şikaka, dargınlığa, küskünlüğe, ayrılığa, gayrılığa meydan açabilecek en ufak sözlerden, en ehemmiyetsiz görünen hareketlerden bile çekinmelidirler. […] Evet vahdet lazımdır; dünya için de, ahret için de. […] Fırkacılık, kavmiyetçilik […] Bunlar artık susmalı. El birliğiyle bugün vatanı müdafaa etmeli. […] Bu namerd taarruza karşı koymak kadın erkek, çoluk çocuk, genç ihtiyar […] her ferd için farz-ı ayn olduğu bir lahza hatırdan çıkarılmamalıdır."* Mehmed Akif, "Meviza: Üstad-ı Muhterem Mehmed Akif Beyefendi'nin Karesi'de Zağnos Paşa Cami-i Şerifi'nde İrad Buyurdukları Mevizanın Hülasası", *Sebilürreşad*, 21 Cemaziyelevvel 1338/12 Şubat 1336 (11 February 1920), Vol. 18, No. 458, pp. 183-186.

[33] *"Beşeriyetin gözü açıldı. Mahkûm milletler kendilerinin hâkim milletler elinde ne büyük bir kuvvet olduğunu bu sefer gözleriyle gördüler. […] Buna mukabil şimdiye kadar şimalden, cenuptan, şarktan,*

This statement of Akif above is confusing. One can easily assert that Akif had decided to accept the ethnicity claims and divide his ummah understanding into pieces by attributing the ethnic elements within. Actually, in his *İslamlaşmak* (Islamification) translation of 1918 from Said Halim Pasha, which was summarized previously, Akif was introduced with this kind of approach which was named *aile-i İslâmiye* (Family of Muslims) by Tunaya in the first chapter.[34] Hence, Akif was already aware of this kind of formulation which was proposing to 'enrich' the culture of ummah by uniting the Muslim nations as Turkish Muslims, Indian Muslims, Arab Muslims, etc. individually. With the help of previous periods of his nation conceptualization, it is known that Akif was addressing *millet* as a sole religious political entity earlier while using the *millet* word interchangeably with the religious ummah word towards his Islamic unity ideal. However, in this speech alone, Akif changed his mind in uniting all the Muslim nations as a sole ummah, and he started to build his discourse on stressing the ethnic nationalities in the Muslim world by addressing the Indian Muslims. This is why; his previous usages of the *millet* word could easily be translated as ummah. However, at this time, after witnessing the Muslim societies in the world could not help each other and establish a great ummah with a name of *ittihad-ı İslam*, Akif started to limit his Muslim unity ideal with Anatolia alone.

Akif's conceptualization of *millet* in his speech in the Grand National Assembly in Ankara on 8 February 1921 could be another reference to review. According to the parliamentary records, a telegraph draft was prepared to wire to Istanbul about the Conference of London; however, Mehmet Akif, as a deputy, did not like the 'soft' language of the draft. Therefore, he had prepared another one, and asked permission to read his own draft:

> […] We do not approve to speak on the reasons that forced Istanbul to accept the Treaty of Sevres which is nothing but an execution sentence of the nation. However, the independence of the nation cannot be guaranteed by modifying and changing a few articles of that treaty but with removing it completely; thereby, it is natural that the ones who accepted that treaty do not have the required dignity to influence the conference today.[35]

---

garptan mahsuriyet içinde kalan Müslüman milletlere de böyle bir ittifakın vereceği faideler inkâr olunamaz. […] Seksen milyon Müslüman Hindli için tek bir sultaniye mektebi vardır." Mehmed Akif, "Nasrullah Kürsüsü'nde Üstad-ı Muhterem Mehmed Akif Beyefendi'nin Kastamonu'da Nasrullah Cami-i Şerifi'nde İrad Buyurdukları Mevizaların Hülasasıdır", *Sebilürreşad*, 15 Rebiülevvel 1339/25 Teşrinisani 1336 (27 November 1920), Vol. 18, No. 464, pp. 249-259.

[34] Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *İslâmcılık Akımı*, 2nd Edition, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, İstanbul, 2007, pp. 80-81.

[35] *"[…] Milletin beratı idamından başka bir şey olmayan Sevr muahedenamesini İstanbul'a kabul ettiren esbabın burada mevzubahsedilmesini münasip görmüyoruz. Ancak milletin istiklali o muahedenamenin birkaç maddesinin tadil ve tebdiliyle temin olunamayıp, büsbütün ortadan kalkmasına mütevekkıf*

With this quote, it is clear that Akif's tendency on conceptualization of nation in the third period was still addressing the Muslim elements within the Anatolia who fought in the Turkish War of Independence. Additionally, his previous 'confusing' statement above can be justified that his *millet* addressing was limited with geographically. Moreover, another feature can be tracked in this quote. Since the Treaty of Sevres was aiming to divide Anatolia into pieces and granting these pieces to the members of the Allied Powers one by one, it is comprehensible that Akif likened this treaty to the execution sentence for the nation which resided in the last 'stronghold' of Islam. Therefore, his intention to re-write the telegram was nothing but his last efforts to secure the lands of Anatolia for his 'shrank' Islamic unity ideal.

In his deputy times in Ankara, Akif focused on uniting the Anatolian Muslims with the help of Islam. It would be irrational to claim his conceptualizations of nation and nationalism addressed a 'pure' ethnic nation alone without any religious elements; yet, his conceptualization of *millet* was able to separate itself from the ummah. Less than a month and a half after his speech in the National Assembly of Ankara, on 12 March 1921, the Turkish national anthem written by Akif, *İstiklal Marşı* (Independence March) was accepted by the majority of the deputies.[36] In this march, Akif used the *millet* word for four times. The march was written more than two and a half year earlier than the establishment of the Turkish Republic and the 'Turkish nation' term was not mentioned in the Constitution yet.[37] However, in the first article of the 1921 Constitution *(Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunu)* of the Ankara government, which was valid between 20 January 1921 and 20 April 1924, it was stated "the sovereignty rests unconditionally with the nation".[38] In a time where the Constitution had given the sovereignty rights to the nation, which was taken from the sultan, Akif had written a national march by conceptualizing the Muslim society in Anatolia as nation. Additionally, during his life, Akif never allowed the Turkish Independence March to be put inside the book of his complete works in poetry, *Safahat*.[39]

---

bulunmasına nazaran vaktiyle o muahedenameyi kabul edenlerin bugün konferansta lazım gelen vak-ü tesiri haiz olamayacakları pek tabiidir." *Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Gizli Celse Zabıtları*, Term No. 1, Vol. 1, Session Year No. 1, Session No. 147, 8 Şubat 1337 Salı (8 February 1921 Tuesday), pp. 410-411.

[36] *Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi*, Term No. 1, Vol. 9, Session Year No. 2, Session No. 6, Sitting No. 2, 12 Mart 1337 Cumartesi (12 March 1921 Saturday), pp. 84-90.

[37] In the 1921 Constitution, although the fatherland was named *'Türkiye'* (Turkey), the nation of the fatherland was addressed with *'millet'* (nation) alone. However, in 1924 Constitution, both *Türkiye* and *'Türk Milleti'* (Turkish Nation) terms were used.

[38] *"Hakimiyet bilâ kayd-ü şart milletindir"*.

[39] Erişirgil, *İslamcı…* pp. 316-317.

According to him, the march was belonged to the nation; because it was written for the nation, by the nation.[40] This statement could grow a tendency that Mehmet Akif became a nationalist. At this point, Ahmet Kabaklı's comments could be helpful to distinguish what kind of nation and nationalism understanding Akif had followed throughout his life. According to Kabaklı, Mehmet Akif was indeed a nationalist. However, he was an Islamic nationalist and he had started the history of the *millet* from the Mohammedan Era.[41] Similarly, the famous Turkist author Ömer Seyfettin described Akif as a nationalist that supported the Islamic unity ideal through his works.[42] From these perspectives and with regard to Akif dedicated the march to the nation, it can be said that Akif clearly distinguished the *millet* word from *kavim*, and conceptualized *millet* through the Anatolian folks by considering Islam within in the third period.

It is clear that Akif had seen Anatolia was 'secured' for his co-religionists with the victory of Turkish War of Independence that *Asım*'s generation gained, his Islamic unity ideal was limited with Anatolia alone completely and conceptualized as *millet*; yet, it is unclear where his actual *ittihad-ı İslam* ideal which conceptualized with ummah and *millet* earlier was placed. As an answer to this question, in the *Leyla* (the name of the female figure of an ancient Arabic love story) poem he had written on April 1922,[43] Mehmet Akif 'regretfully' claimed that it was time to leave the Islamic unity ideal. With this poem, Akif resembled the Muslims as *Mecnun* (chasers) and named the Islamic unity ideal as *Leyla* (future dream).[44] Therefore, Akif claimed that the Muslims shall embrace the Islamic unity as a far ideal more than its actual desired formation as a political entity.

The poems he had written right before his travel to Egypt and during his self-exile times in Egypt provide some good references to track the changes and regrets of Akif's ideal on unity of Muslims. For instance, in a poem he had written on 5 January 1925 titled *Gece*

---

[40] Nurullah Çetin, "İstiklal Marşımızı Anlamak", *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Türkoloji Dergisi*, Vol. 2, No. 21, 2014, pp. 25-92.
[41] Cemil Meriç, *Sosyoloji Notları ve Konferanslar*, Ümit Meriç (Ed.), 15th Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2013, pp. 380-381.
[42] Tansel, *Mehmed Akif…* p. 191.
[43] Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, pp. 431-432.
[44] *Mecnun*'s real name was *Kays*. He was the lover of *Leyla* since he met her in his young ages. When *Leyla*'s parents did not want her to meet him, *Kays* went to the desert. He roamed around the desert while searching her and eventually lost his mind; people started to call him crazy *(Mecnun)*. He began seeing *Leyla* in every creature and everything that at some point he had forgotten what *Leyla* looked like. For *Mecnun*, the love of *Leyla* became greater than *Leyla*. Hence, once *Leyla* found him in the desert, *Mecnun* did not recognize her. *Leyla* died of her grief; and once he heard this, *Mecnun* went to her grave, prayed the God to end his life, and he died. Summarized from Fuzuli, *Leylâ ve Mecnun*, Nevzat Yesirgil (Ed.), Yeditepe, İstanbul, 1958.

(Night),[45] Akif complained the God that he was regretful and requested the God to shake the world for the sake of his prayers. Additionally, he devoted himself completely to the love of God and resembled himself *Mecnun* while addressing the God as *Leyla* which he worshipped. Moreover, with his poem he had written in the following week, on 12 January 1925 titled *Vahdet* (Unity),[46] Akif had given some examples on the former achievements of the ummah which were originated from the Islamic unity once. This poem had two parts; although Akif's narrates in the first part were as vivid as his earlier poems that the audience was familiar, there was unexpectedly less room for Islamic unity in the second part which started by praising the former 'glorious' days of the Islamic civilization. After a few verses, the second part was stopped instantly with an Arabic prayer[47] means "the power and endurance could only be provided by the help of God" which was traditionally used by the Muslims when they witness a deadlocked situation or a dilemma. This 'instant' stop with a prayer which he begged the God to grant him endurance does not fit with Akif's poetry style.[48] After reviewing these two poems written in the same week, it can be asserted that Akif was indeed regretful that his efforts were failed and he was seeking the God's help. Soon, the reason of this unfamiliar poetry style in *Vahdet* was asked to Akif by one of his friends. In a letter he wrote to his friend from Egypt, Akif self-criticized himself over the poem; also he had mentioned that he did not want to write anything more on the Islamic unity and that was the reason he left the second part in *Vahdet* poem incredibly short.[49]

4. 2. Ziya Gökalp and Nation

İbrahim Alaettin Gövsa claimed Mehmet Akif was more of a religious man than anything else; hence, anything about any concept for Akif was related with Islam, in one way or another.[50] Indeed, it can be claimed that Akif tried to identify his identity upon Islam. Defining a self-identity however, was not about religion but about a fidelity to a nation for Ziya Gökalp. The nation concept had always been the top priority for Gökalp; even in his younger times, it can be clearly seen that Gökalp used the *millet* word to express his fidelity to a specific political community. As a picturesque example, the day young Ziya

---

[45] Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, pp. 443-444.
[46] *Ibid.* pp. 441-442.
[47] The poem was instantly concluded with "La hawla wa la quwwata illa billah' prayer.
[48] For the analysis on Akif's poetry style, *see.* the paragraph which corresponds Chapter 2, Footnote 38.
[49] Tansel, *Mehmed Akif...* pp. 104-108.
[50] İbrahim Alaettin Gövsa, *Elli Türk Büyüğü*, Yedigün, İstanbul, 1943, p. 90.

had shouted as "Long live my nation!" in the high school instead of the usual cheering as "Long live my Sultan!" when he was eighteen,[51] he had already decided in which political community his identity shall be loyal: The fidelity to a *millet*, which was the Ottoman nation in that time. That fidelity to the Ottoman nation, on the other hand, had changed later in his relatively short forty-eight years-long life, which was the Turkish nation. From this perspective, it would be easier to analyze Gökalp's understanding of nation under two phases: Ziya as an advocate of the Ottoman nation, and Gökalp as an advocate of the Turkish nation.

However, the exact time to draw the line on separating these two nation concepts is essential. In his education times in Veterinary College in 1895-1896, Gökalp met Hüseyinzade Ali and he was introduced with the Turkism ideal by him. At the very same time, he started reading Leon Cahun's works[52] to learn the origins of the Turks. Although these introductions with the 'Turk' identity did not affect Gökalp's definition on the nation concept instantly, Gökalp kept on researching. In some time throughout his intellectual and actual journeys, he met several ideas and intellectuals that enlarged his vision on the 'Turkishness'. After the 1908 Revolution, his nation understanding which Gökalp was going to be loyal until his death had sprung. Thereupon, the year 1909, when he moved in Salonika, where the headquarters of CUP resided, would be a precise cut to divide Ziya Gökalp's conceptualization of nation word into two periods.

4. 2. 1. Ziya: An Ottoman Nationalist

While studying on Ziya Gökalp, at first glance, one can realize two things about him: Gökalp defined his identity with nation during his life, and he tried to explain every single concept related with his identity through his works. Therefore, a brief look on his early works could be beneficial to track the changes of Gökalp's understanding on the nation term throughout his life. In these works, it can be seen that Gökalp was an Ottoman nationalist.[53] In a few months after he shouted as "Long live my nation!" in 1895, Gökalp

---

[51] During his early education years in *Mülkiye İdadisi*, a tradition which was about gathering all the students in the yard at the end of last class hour and making them to chant *"Padişahım çok yaşa!"* (Long live my sultan!) was being performed daily. One day the governor of Diyarbakır visited the school, and Ziya shouted *"Milletim çok yaşa!"* (Long live my nation!) instead of the regular slogan. Gökalp had taken into custody and questioned for days; finally with the help of the governor and the school staff, his words were changed to "Long live my sultan, with your nation!" and he was released. Ali Nüzhet Göksel (Ed.), *Ölümünün 25. Yıldönümü Münasebetiyle Ziya Gökalp Hayatı-Eserleri*, Ahmet Halit, İstanbul, 1949, p. 12.

[52] *see.* Chapter 3, Footnote 13.

[53] Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*, 3rd Edition, Ülken, İstanbul, 1992, pp. 304-305.

had written his first poem named *İhtilal Şarkısı* (Song of Revolution). In this poem, he stated:

> Brothers! Let's save the nation,
> Certainly our God will help us.[54]

Paying attention to the name of the poem, the *millet* word, and seeking help from the God, it can be deduced that Gökalp was building his identity with a blend of Ottoman, Muslim, and revolutionary identities. Here, Gökalp wanted to end the oppression of Sultan Abdul Hamid II, he identified himself as an Ottoman who belonged to the Ottoman nation by calling others as brothers, and his Muslim identity forced him to seek the help of the God. Considering the positive sciences he was being taught in the high school had opened a relatively different kind of a path in front of him, for some researchers, this blend caused him to experience an identity crisis and made Gökalp depressed, and that was the reason he attempted to suicide.[55] Indeed, Ziya Gökalp accepted this argument that his identity crisis was the only reason of his suicide attempt.[56] This crisis can also be tracked in his other early poems. For instance, in *Hürriyet Marşı* (March of Independence), Gökalp penned:

> The individuals of a nation became desperate,
> Became either a prisoner, or an evil, or a spy,
> Sultan became a nightmare for the nation,
> His body became ominous for the fatherland…
> Rally brothers, let's raise the banners,
> Let's open fire on [the palace]![57]

This poem had a revolutionary side and was addressing Sultan Abdul Hamid II. However, between the lines, it can be seen that Gökalp counted himself within the Ottoman society by addressing the 'individuals of the nation' and 'brothers'. Therefore, as an individual of the same nation, Gökalp defined his identity with the Ottoman nation by seeking a revolutionary remedy to ease the pain of the Ottomans, which was sultan according to him. Additionally, the same tendency on using different identities during the quest for finding

---

[54] *"Kardeşlerim! Halas edelim haydi milleti, / Elbet bize muavenet eyler Allah'ımız."* in Fevziye Abdullah Tansel (Ed.), *Ziya Gökalp Külliyatı – I Şiirler ve Halk Masalları*, 3rd Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1989, pp. 235-236.

[55] Hikmet Tanyu, *Ziya Gökalp'in Kronolojisi*, Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1981, pp. 13-14, Mehmet Emin Erişirgil, *Bir Fikir Adamının Romanı Ziya Gökalp*, 2nd Edition, Aykut Kazancıgil & Cem Alpar (Ed.), Remzi, İstanbul, 1984, p. 34.

[56] Göksel, *Ölümünün 25inci…* pp. 13-15.

[57] *"Bir millet efradı hep me'yus oldu, / Ya mahbus, ya menfî, ya casus oldu, / Padişah, millete bir kâbus oldu, / Vücudu vatana çok menhus oldu… / Toplanın kardeşler, bayrak açalım, / Yıldız'ın üstüne ateş saçalım!"* Tansel, *Ziya Gökalp – I…* p. 240.

the actual identity showed itself on another early poem named *Mektepte Cumhuriyet İlanı* (Declaration of Republic in the School):

> You grabbed everything what the nation has,
> You destroyed homes to build palaces;
> You forgot the God, worshipped the devil.
> We do not love you, step aside,
> Sovereign is the nation, not the ruler![58]

In this poem Ziya Gökalp addressed Sultan Abdul Hamid II again, and this poem had the same characteristics with the previous one: A revolutionary poem which addressed the sultan who seized the nation's claims. However, in this poem Gökalp used some Islamic terms by accusing sultan like forgetting the God and worshipping the devil. Therefore, in his relatively younger ages, Gökalp had defined his identity through three particular identities: He was a revolutionary who wanted to change the political system, he was a Muslim who prayed to the God for help, and his fidelity was to the Ottoman nation.

Before the 1908 Revolution, between 1904 and 1908 to be exact, Ziya Gökalp had written several articles and poems in the local *Diyarbekir* newspaper. Although his articles were mostly about describing the natural beauties he had witnessed during his travels and also some articles on economics, his poems showed some potential that Gökalp's identity crisis which dragged him to suicide earlier started to become more moderate. In his poems he had written in this newspaper, it can be clearly seen that his revolutionary ideas were gone; at this point, Gökalp was defining himself as Ottoman and Muslim alone. In his *Zekat* (Obligatory Alms) poem, Gökalp made the definition of nation for the first time:

> What is nation? Think it as a cooperation company,
> Every individual has effort and vote in this company.
> The poor has the share in the rich's wealth.[59]

Taking account of the fact that Ziya Gökalp was working as a clerk in Diyarbakır Chamber of Commerce in these years,[60] it is understandable that he preferred to define the nation concept through some economic terms. In July 1905 after the occupation incident of the

---

[58] *"Milletin elinde ne varsa kaptın, / Evleri yıkarak saraylar yaptın; / Allah'ı unuttun, şeytana taptın. / Sevmiyoruz seni, ortadan çekil, / Hükümran millettir, hükümdar değil!"* Tansel, *Ziya Gökalp – I...* p. 241.

[59] *"Millet nedir? Düşünülse bir teavün şirketi, / Bu şirkette her bir ferdin emeği var, reyi var. / Zenginlerin servetinde yoksulların payı var."* Tansel, *Ziya Gökalp – I...* p. 244.

[60] Ali Nüzhet Göksel, *Ziya Gökalp'in Neşredilmemiş Yedi Eseri ve Aile Mektupları*, Diyarbakır'ı Tanıtma Derneği, İstanbul, 1956, p. 74.

telegraph office and in April 1908 for the second time of the same incident,[61] Gökalp had written his famous poem named *Şaki İbrahim Destanı* (Epic of İbrahim the Bandit)[62] where he used the *millet* and ummah concepts similarly:

> The veins of this nation are not over yet,
> Every individual has still honor and effort, not over yet,
> Aren't you afraid of the grudge of this ummah
> You aren't afraid of the government's punishment
> You aren't afraid of the God of this ummah
> Have you abandoned the Islam religion?[63]

The lines above indicate that Gökalp counted himself among the Ottoman nation and Muslim ummah. However, this poem is a very long one; in the parts which were not placed here, Gökalp praised the Young Ottomans (Glorious martyrs like Midhat and Kemal),[64] counted himself part of the Ottoman nation (Ottomans do not endure this ferocity […] The nation will take its revenge today),[65] and claimed he was loyal to the Ottoman government (We are subjects to the government's law/ The government will take our revenge).[66] From this point, it can be said that among different identities he had faced a few years earlier, Gökalp had completely abandoned the revolutionary one and he had chosen the Ottoman nation and Islam alone to define his identity. Although Ziya Gökalp had used the *millet* and ummah words in the same meaning in this poem, in another poem of 1908 named *Uhuvvet Şarkısı* (Song of Brotherhood) Gökalp was a typical Ottoman nationalist. Towards this tendency on building his identity through the Ottoman nation, Gökalp had decided to separate the *millet* concept from Islam:

> We are Ottomans our brotherhood law is ancient
> We are a single nation since *Mihal-Gazi* [67] joined our army
> Not seeking the religious differences is the purpose for us all

---

[61] Tanyu, pp. 25-27.

[62] For detailed information about this poem, *see.* Chapter 3, Footnote 44.

[63] *"Bu milletde daha damar bitmedi / Namus, gayret her ferdde var, bitmedi / Korkmaz mısın bu ümmetin kininden / Hükümetin cezasından korkmazsın / Bu ümmetin Hudasından korkmazsın / Çıkmış mısın İslamiyyet dininden?"* Tansel, *Ziya Gökalp – I...* pp. 299-311.

[64] *"Midhat, Kemâl gibi şanlı şehidler"*.

[65] *"Osmanlılar bu vahşete dayanmaz […] Bugün millet alacakdır intikaam"*.

[66] *"Hükûmetin kanununa bağlıyız / Hükûmettir öcümüzü alacak"*.

[67] *Mihal Gazi* (or *Köse Mihal*) was a Byzantine military commander who befriended with Sultan Osman I, became a Muslim, and joined the Ottoman military forces during the rise of the Empire in the 14th century. For detailed information, *see.* Ahmet Şimşirgil, "Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluşunda Hizmeti Geçen Alpler ve Gaziler" in Güler Eren (Ed.), *Türkler*, Vol. IX, Yeni Türkiye, pp. 99-106. On the other hand, some contemporary chroniclers claimed that *Köse Mihal* figure was nothing but a myth, and he never existed. For a detailed comparison between the actual and imaginary history on *Köse Mihal*, *see.* Orlin Sabev, "The Legend of Köse Mihal Additional Notes", *Turcica*, No. 34, 2002, pp. 241-252.

We are the sons of the fatherland, cults do not separate us

[…]

Religion is different, fatherland is different, realize this.[68]

By separating Islam and *millet*, Ziya Gökalp solved his identity crisis and counted himself within the Ottoman nation alone. With the 1908 Revolution, Gökalp started to write poems and articles in the *Peyman* (Oath) newspaper. The writings in this newspaper could be regarded as a turning-point for Gökalp's definition of nation. Although the economical approach he used to prefer while defining nation showed itself in his early writings in *Peyman* newspaper, Gökalp's first systematic definitions as well as his sociological approaches on the concept of nation could be found in these writings. Indeed, Gökalp had found his 'true' identity and pledged his fidelity to the Ottoman nation; however, before reaching a conclusion on defining the concept of nation, he clarified his earlier dilemmas. In the first issue of the newspaper, in his article named *İlm-i İctima'* (Science of Society – Sociology) written on 28 June 1909, Gökalp had defined the Ottoman nation first:

> The Ottoman nation is a compound of multiple components. […] Due to the Ottoman nation is consisted of [heterogeneous components], […] it does not have a natural order. […] I wonder if it is possible to blend and liken the ethnies of the Ottomans completely. Will an Ottoman nation which has one language and one direction by uniting the various [ethnic] components within be came into existence sincerely?[69]

Although Gökalp did not answer the question above, from this perspective, with his realization that the Ottoman nation had various ethnic elements within, it can be said that the Turkishness seed that was planted by Hüseyinzade Ali when Gökalp was in the college started to grow. However, it cannot be asserted that Gökalp grew tendency on Turkishness; it was merely a realization. With the help of the teachings he had by his self-trained sociology, Gökalp started to interpret his understanding of nation. Therefore, he started to divide the concept of nation into two in his mind: A large Ottoman nation, and the elements within that nation, ethnies. Considering the fact that Turkish ethnicity was also an element within the Ottoman nation, Gökalp had decided to define the Turkish ethnicity first. In the following week, on 5 July 1909, he had written another article named *Türklük*

---

[68] *"Osmanlı'yız kardeşlikdir kanunumuz ezeli / Bir milletiz Mihal-Gazi ordumuza gireli / Din farkı aramamak hepimizin emeli / Bir vatanın evlâdıyız, mezheb bizi ayırmaz [...] Din başkadır, vatan başka bunu ayırd etmeli"* Tansel, *Ziya Gökalp – I...* p. 311.

[69] *"Osmanlı milleti, anâsır-ı müteaddideden mürekkeptir. [...] Çünki Osmanlı milleti, gayr-i mümteziç anâsırdan mürekkep olduğu için, bir intizâm-ı tabiiye [...] mâlik değildir. [...] Acaba akvâm-ı Osmâniyyenin tamamiyle temzîc ve tecnîsi kabil midir? İhtiva ettiği anâsır-ı muhtelifenin ittihâd-ı samimisiyle yek-dil ve tek-cihet bir Osmanlı milleti husûle gelebilecek midir?"* Mehmed Mehdi, "İlm-i İçtima" in Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler I*, Şevket Baysanoğlu (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, İstanbul, 1976, pp. 48-49.

ve Osmanlılık (Turkishness and being Ottoman). In this article, Gökalp had explained the ancient Turks, used the *Turan* word for the first time while defining the native country of Turks, analyzed the Ottoman society sociologically, and concluded his article with an idea that being Ottoman did not mean being Turk. After explaining the Ottoman education system on training children from different ethnicities like test subjects, Gökalp stated:

> The Ottoman specimen was completely different than the Turkish specimen. The ones who remained Turk were not able to become Ottoman. The ones who became Ottoman were not Turks anymore. […] The dominant element was not the Turks but the Ottomans. […] Ottomans neither called themselves Turks nor named their language Turkish. […] Due to it is the name of the most important [ethnic] element of the Ottoman nation-compose, the 'Turk' name is worth welcoming. However, it is certain that Ottoman does not mean Turk.[70]

From these two different articles he had penned within two weeks, it can be said that his arguments on being Ottoman and being Turkish were crystal clear. By his criticism on losing the ethnic identity through the Ottoman education system above, it can be said that Gökalp began to raise his awareness on his ethnicity, Turkishness; yet, he was not ready to abandon being Ottoman fully.

As witnessing Ziya Gökalp's efforts on building his nation understanding step by step, it is important to remember the *millet* word for him referred the Ottoman nation in this period of his life. In his another article where he analyzed the Young Ottomans written on 12 July 1909, Gökalp justified this statement as it follows:

> The 'Ottoman Union' is not a subjective feeling but a logical comprehension. No doubt the first emotion every individual feels within their sincere hearts is the love of their specific ethnicity where they imbibe the primitive education with the language and literature. Understanding the nationality is greater and more humane than the ethnicity is based on the independent comprehension of an absolute mind. […] The Turks belong to this safe group say 'we are Ottomans first, Turks second', Arabs 'we are Ottomans first, Arabs second', Armenians 'we are Ottomans first, Armenians second', Greeks 'we are Ottomans first, Greeks second'. All the other new generations of the Ottoman elements such as Kurdish, Albanian, Bulgarian, Laz, Jewish, Circassian exaltedly repeat this national principle.[71]

---

[70] *"Osmanlı enmûzeci, Türk enmûzecinden büsbütün başka idi. Türk kalanlar, Osmanlı olamamışlardı. Osmanlı olanlar, artık Türk değil idiler. […] Unsur-i hâkim, Türkler değil, Osmanlılardı. […] Osmanlılar, kendilerine Türk demedikleri gibi, lisanlarına da 'Türkçe' namını vermediler. […] 'Türk' namı, Osmanlı terkîb-i millisinin en mühim unsurunun ismi olduğu için şâyeste-i tevkirdir. Fakat bu da muhakkaktır ki Osmanlı demek Türk, demek değildir."* Mehmed Mehdi, "Türklük ve Osmanlılık" in *Makaleler I...* pp. 54-57.

[71] *"'Osmanlı İttihâdı', bir tahassüs-i vicdânî değil, bir ictihâd-ı mantıkîdir. Şüphe yok ki her ferdin samîm-i kalbinde duyduğu ilk his, lisan ve edebiyatıyla terbiye-i ibtidâiyyesini temessül ettiği kavmiyyet-i*

This analysis had some promising attitudes on Gökalp's future Turkism idea. From this article, it can be said that Gökalp had separated the nationality and ethnicity from each other, and explained the nation concept through an Ottoman umbrella which covered all the ethnic elements. Additionally, in the same article, Gökalp resembled the Ottoman nation and the American nation. According to him, every individual in the United States of America would call themselves Americans, regardless of their ethnicity. With this example, he offered that the same tendency should be sincerely valued within the Ottoman nation as well.

If his formulation on the ethnicity and nationality above would be applied to himself, it would be possible to say that Gökalp identified himself as Ottoman first and Turk second in this period. Therefore, with this article, Ziya Gökalp clarified his thoughts on ethnicity and nationality. Additionally, it is important to know that Gökalp had defined the nation term for several times throughout his life. Although it would be better to name it 'a description', his first definition was through economics; yet, for the first phase of his conceptualization journey among the different definitions of the nation term, there was one step left for Gökalp to conceptualize nation in his own thoughts: A clear definition of the *millet* word. On 19 July 1909, in an article named *Iyd-i Millî* (National Festival) Gökalp widely defined the nation:

> The nation is a group of collective people consisted of coadjutant individuals who lived together for centuries, endured the cruelty and disasters together, achieved the glory and the honor together, cried and rejoiced together, determined to triumph together in order to reach the common purpose in the future. The Ottoman nation is this type of nation that it is also certain with the testimony of our history.[72]

This article was about the official declaration of the 'Tenth of July Festival' by the Ottoman Parliament, which was set to honor the 1908 Revolution.[73] In the same article,

---

husûsiyyesine muhabbettir. Milliyetin kavmiyetten daha âli, daha insanî olduğunu anlamak bir akl-ı mücerredin ictihâd-ı ahrârânesine mütevakkıftır. [...] Bu zümre-i nâciyeye mensup Türkler 'biz evvel, Osmanlıyız, sonra Türküz', Arablar: 'biz evvel, Osmanlıyız, sonra Arabız', Ermeniler: 'biz evvel, Osmanlıyız, sonra Ermeniyiz', Rumlar: 'biz evvel, Osmanlıyız, sonra Rumuz' derler. Kürd, Arnavud, Bulgar, Lâz, Mûsevî, Çerkes gibi diğer Osmanlı unsurlarına mensup nesl-i cedîdin kâffesi bu düstûr-i millîyi tebcîl ile tekrar ederler." ____, "Yeni Osmanlılar" in *Makaleler I...* pp. 62-65.

[72] *"Millet, asırlarca beraber yaşamış, zulüm ve felâkete beraberce göğüs germiş, şan ve şerefî beraber istihsâl etmiş, beraber ağlayarak beraber sevinmiş, âtiyen de gaye-i müşterekeye vusûl için beraber muzaffer olmağa azmetmiş efrâd-ı müteâvinenin hey'et-i mecmûasıdır. Osmanlı Milleti, tarihimizin şehâdetiyle sâbittir ki böyle bir millettir."* ____, "Iyd-i Millî" in *Makaleler I...* pp. 69-71.

[73] This national festival was first set on 8 July 1909 and named *'Hürriyet Bayramı'* (Liberty Festival). Additionally, even after the establishment of the new regime in 1923, this festival was enthusiastically observed by both the governments and public for years. However, with a legislative proposal presented to the

Gökalp exalted the parliament's decision on this festival and he stated: "The power and greatness of being Ottoman will grow and get stronger as long as the common sorrow days and public joy festivals of the Ottomans increase and continue".[74] Here, Gökalp claimed that 'being Ottoman' was a great thing, and he counted himself within the Ottoman nation by defining nation through the sociological elements including the historical and emotional facts. Hence, in the first period of his quest on conceptualizing nation, Ziya Gökalp had a tendency towards the Ottoman nationalism and his definition of nation was benefited from this tendency.

4. 2. 2. Gökalp: A Turkish Nationalist

On 6 September 1909, Ziya Gökalp travelled to Salonika to participate in the CUP congress as a representative of Diyarbakır.[75] This journey was a turning-point in Gökalp's life. With the 1908 Revolution, Salonika became a popular destination for the Ottoman intellectuals; they even call Salonika "Kaaba of Liberty".[76] After becoming a well-known figure as soon as being elected as the member of the Central Council of CUP, within this atmosphere of liberty and surrounded by a cosmopolitan, Westernized, and intellectually flourished environment, Gökalp focused on training himself with the European sciences. After reading several works of different European intellectuals, he met with Émile Durkheim's works.[77] The Turkish consciousness that was introduced by Hüseyinzade Ali years ago blossomed completely after Gökalp met several Turkist intellectuals including Ömer Seyfettin, Ali Canip, and Mehmet Emin in Salonika. At the time he arrived to Salonika, Gökalp did not only bring his suitcases but also a sociologically explained nation concept with him as it was translated above. As a result of intense Turkist intellectual introductions he had experienced in Salonika, Gökalp's fidelity shifted from Ottoman nationality to Turkish nationality; not instantly but in time. Likewise, Gökalp's sociological approach on defining the concept of nation in previous phase became scientifically grounded with the influence of Durkheim's sociology, in time. Similar to the first phase, Gökalp followed a slow but steady route while formulizing his Turkism

---

parliament in 1935, this festival was officially abolished. For detailed information and also his comments on this issue, *see.* Aykut Kansu, *1908 Devrimi*, Ayda Erbal (Trans.), İletişim, İstanbul, 1995, pp. xii-xvii.

[74] *"Osmanlıların müşterek mâtem günleri, umumî meserret bayramları taaddüt ve tevâli ettikçe, Osmanlılığın kuvvet ve mehâbeti tezâyüd ve te'eyyüd edecektir".* _____, "Iyd-i Millî" in *Makaleler I...* pp. 69-71.

[75] Tanyu, p. 53.

[76] Erişirgil, *Bir Fikir Adamının...* p. 67.

[77] Uriel Heyd, *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp*, Luzac & Company Ltd. & The Harvill Press Ltd., London, 1950, pp. 31-32.

ideology by applying some sociological foundations. The first stop of this intellectual journey was re-conceptualization of nation.

Although his sociological training can be dated back to his Diyarbakır times and also it is well-known information about Gökalp that he was deeply influenced by Durkheim, Hilmi Ziya Ülken claimed Durkheim's absolute influence on Gökalp's teachings started with 1915; before that year, Gökalp was not a loyal follower of Durkheim.[78] Since this thesis follows a chronological order while analyzing the selected intellectuals, Ülken's detection of this date could be a good point to hold. Therefore, with this information, it is needed to seek another sociological master which was influential on Gökalp's new *millet* formulation.

In order to understand the psychology of Gökalp in that time, it would be beneficial to check the particles of his identity he had: Islam faith, Ottoman nationality, Turkish consciousness, and a Westernized intellectual environment. In order to find a new formulation of his previously conceptualized nation, he preferred to make a combination with these particles. With the introduction of Alfred Fouillée's works, who was an eclectic sociologist,[79] Gökalp successfully but incompletely merged these data, and started to write articles in *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Fatherland) journal with a column name of *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (Turkification, Islamicization, Modernization). Niyazi Berkes claimed that, this three-sided approach was formulated by Gökalp to make conciliation between the Pan-Islamists and the Westernists. According to Berkes, before he completely accepted Durkheim's sociology, Gökalp was well acquainted with other scholars including Ibn Khaldun, Darwin, Comte, Spencer, Worms, Le Bon, and Tarde along with Fouillée. Thus, Gökalp's earlier approach on reconciling the national, Islamic, and the Western values was based on a historical perspective (Berkes named it historical philosophy) more than anything else.[80] From this comment, it can be said that even the name of his column in *Türk Yurdu* journal was consisted of precisely selected intellectual issues. Hence, if Gökalp's approach on reconciling three conflicting ideas was based on an eclectic method, then his conceptualization of nation could show some similarities with this eclectic tendency as well.

---

[78] Ülken, 1992, pp. 312-313.
[79] *Ibid*. p. 310.
[80] Niyazi Berkes, "Sociology in Turkey", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 42, No. 2, September 1936, pp. 238-246.

Ziya Gökalp did not only borrowed eclecticism from Fouillée but also the concept of ideal which he would name *mefkure* later. In his translation from Harald Høffding which was published in *Genç Kalemler* (Young Pens), Gökalp described Fouillée's concept of ideal through the Høffding's work.[81] Soon after this, on 17 February 1911,[82] Gökalp had published his famous *Turan* poem; but in this poem, Gökalp described 'the Turkish race' instead of 'the Turkish nation'. Although another poem of Gökalp named *Meşhede Doğru* (Towards Martyrdom) which was published on 5 June 1911 had the same topic, *Turan* in short, Gökalp preferred to use the *millet* word this time to describe the Turkish nation.[83] On 16 December 1911, Ziya Gökalp published *Altın Destan* (Golden Saga) poem with the name of Gökalp which he continued to use as the surname for the rest of his life. The most important part of this poem was it was the first time that Gökalp used too many ancient Turkish words that he had to publish the poem with a glossary section in the *Genç Kalemler* journal. In this poem, Gökalp introduced a hierarchical order to categorize the concept of nation under *oymak*, *ulus*, and *budun* which he continued to describe these terms in his various works for the rest of his life. According to this hierarchy, *oymak* referred to the tribe whereas *ulus* referred to the social groups which were consisted of hundreds of *oymak*s that had sole government and country. *Budun* on the other hand, was the sum of all Turks in the world, which referred the Pan-Turkism in ancient Turkish language. The land where *budun* resided was called *Turan*, which was the great fatherland of Turks.[84]

In *Türk Yurdu* journal, before he introduced his famous column named *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, Ziya Gökalp had written several poems without any single word on nation concept. For instance, on 14 November 1912 a poem named *Kendine Doğru* (Towards Yourself) included many references to 'pure' Turkish nationalism - Turkism in short- but there was no reference given to any kind of nation concept in this poem.[85] Additionally, on 23 January 1913, Gökalp had published his famous *Kızıl Elma* (Red Apple) poem in the same journal.[86] In this poem however, Gökalp used *millet* word several times with a reference to Turkish nationalism. In less than a decade earlier, Gökalp

---

[81] Harald Höffding, "Alfred Fouillée'nin Tekâmülcü Felsefesi" in Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler II*, Süleyman Hayri Bolay (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1982, pp. 8-13.

[82] Tanyu, pp. 63-64.

[83] Demirtaş, "Meşhed'e Doğru" in *Makaleler II*, p. 21.

[84] Gökalp, "Altun Destan ve Açıklaması" in *Makaleler II*, pp. 51-59.

[85] Gökalp, "Kendine Doğru" in Murat Şefkatli (Ed.), *Türk Yurdu Cilt 2*, Tutibay, Ankara, 1999, p. 34.

[86] Gökalp, "Kızıl Elma", *Ibid*. pp. 115-120.

was championing the Ottoman nationality idea and he was writing articles and poems to exalt this nationality like praising the Ottoman festivals, glorifying being Ottoman, etc. However, after his arrival to Salonika, his identity on the Ottoman nationality seems to become weaker. His special emphasis on ancient Turkishness identity, his preferences on using archaic Turkish words to describe some concepts, even his invention (it can also be said adopting) of *ulus* word to cover the *millet* concept could indicate that his identity in nationality started to shift from being Ottoman to being Turk. However, he was not ready to name it yet. Additionally, witnessing these many changes as well as the fluctuations on his hesitation to make a clear description of the concept of nation since the day Gökalp arrived to Salonika, there could only be two reasons behind this hesitation: Either Gökalp was in need of a scientifically-supported basis to formulate his new definition of *millet*, or he was lost in another identity crisis. Whatever the reason was, on 20 March 1913, Ziya Gökalp finalized his theory and published the first article of *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* article-series under the very same name.

In this article, Gökalp explained the concept of nation by using the Empire as an example. According to that, the last nation that found the nationalism ideal was the Turks within the Empire. Just because the Turks had already both a state and also a name called 'Ottoman', the realization of their actual nationality happened much later than other subject-ethnicities of the Empire.[87] After writing several articles in this continuous series in *Türk Yurdu* on Turkish language, Turkism ideal, Turkish culture, and some other concepts which belonged to the Turkish nationalism, Gökalp precisely distinguished the nation concept from the *Turan* concept in his article on 2 April 1914.[88] According to this article, there were several nations of Turks like the Ottoman nation, the Kazak nation, the Uzbek nation, etc. These were called nations *(millet)*. However, with the unity of all these nations, a larger Turkish nation (he used *millet* again) would be emerged one day which would be called *Turan*.[89] Therefore, at this point, there were several nation concepts and one future far ideal nation concept for Turks. In his *Millet ve Vatan* (Nation and Fatherland) article published on 28 May 1914, Gökalp clarified the usage of *millet*, *devlet* (state), and ummah words over sociological terms. According to him, these three concepts had different

---

[87] Gökalp, "Türkleşmek, İslâmlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak 1", *Ibid*. pp. 184-186.
[88] It is needed to remind that Gökalp had not done that earlier; he just named the concept but did not go further in explanation.
[89] Gökalp, "İçtimaiyât: Türkleşmek, İslâmlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak 8 – Türk Milleti ve Turan" in Murat Şefkatli (Ed.), *Türk Yurdu Cilt 3*, Tutibay, Ankara, 1999, pp. 238-240.

meanings, they were conmpletely different concepts, and in some situations one could include another or all of them from time to time. The ummah included several nations under the same religion. The state could also include more than one nation within, just like the Ottoman Empire.[90]

Although he had described the characteristics of the nation along with its similarities and the contrasts numerous times, the last time Ziya Gökalp clearly defined the nation term was 1909. Indeed, he did not define nation yet; but he had tipped several clues on what nation should include. His attitude on this issue during the second period could be resembled to the children's game: Gökalp mentioned that it quacked, it had webbed feet, it could swim above the water but he was not ready to say 'duck'. So far, the nation corresponded to a close meaning with *ulus*, the state and ummah could include several nations within, and the Turks shall be taken as a nation. Additionally, throughout years, Gökalp tried to build his theory on Turkishness, Turkish culture, and Turkish nation and expressed them via *Genç Kalemler* and *Türk Yurdu* journals. However, between the lines, it can be seen that he was not satisfied with his formulation. He tried several sociological methods which belonged to several sociologists in order to formulate his theory 'scientifically'. In his poems and articles, he looked like he was travelling around the cornerstones of his theory; but he was unable to express what he thought clearly. He had tried different sociological approaches of different sociologists and philosophers including Muhyiddin Arabî, Alfred Fouillée, Gabriel Tarde, Friedrich Nietzsche, Auguste Comte, Jean-Marie Guyau, and Henri-Louis Bergson.[91] However, after 'fully' embracing the sociological model of Émile Durkheim in 1915, Gökalp found a lead to follow.

In his article named *Bir Kavmin Tedkikinde Takib Olunacak Usul* (The Method to Follow on Investigating a Ethnie/Society) which he published in May-June 1915 in *Milli Tetebbûlar Mecmuası* (National Researchers Journal), Gökalp applied Durkheim's sociological method on the concept of nation. In this article, unlike Mehmet Akif, Gökalp used the *kavim* word not in the meaning of 'ethnie' but 'society' and divided the society under two large groups as primitive societies and the nations. According to him, there were four types of nation: Theocratic nations like Abbasids, legislative nations like France and Italy, and the nations that lost their autonomy like Polish people. For the fourth nation type,

---

[90] Gökalp, "İçtimaiyât: Millet ve Vatan", *Ibid*. pp. 301-303.
[91] Ülken, 1992, pp. 308-310.

cultural nations, Gökalp paid a special emphasis on this one; but, he did not give any examples on which nations could be considered cultural nations. According to him, the primitive societies organized as families, the theocratic nations organized as ummah, the legislative nations organized as state, and the cultural nations organized as [1] a sum of families, [2] ummah, and [3] a state under the light of the culture. Additionally, the nations could cover two of these types at the same time such as the American or British nations which carried both the legislative and cultural characteristics of the nation types. Gökalp concluded his article with stating his desire to apply this method to find the exact category of Turks and by claiming through a footnote that he had directly taken this idea from Durkheim.[92]

After discovering the method he desired to apply while investigating the Turkish nation, Gökalp had published a very long article (81 pages in contemporary Turkish, 71 pages in Ottoman Turkish) in the same journal titled *Eski Türkler'de İçtimai Teşkilât ile Mantıkî Tasnifler Arasında Tenâzur* (A Look on the Ancient Turks between the Social Organization and Rational Rankings) in June-July 1915 which aimed to seek the origins, ancient culture, and the relationship with other nations of ancient Turks. In order to do that, Gökalp had explained the social rank system of the Australian and South American natives, and explained and compared the ancient Turkish and Chinese traditions, social ranks, and religious and cultural origins. As a conclusion, through the comparisons of the origins of numerous archaic Turkish words, Gökalp claimed that the ancient Turks influenced the South American, European, Asian, and African societies culturally.[93] These two articles were written by Gökalp in order to find a sociological basis for his future nation formulation. He wanted to support his Turkishness and Turkish nation formulations with a sociological foundation. With these two articles written by applying Durkheim's method, it can be said that from that point on, with the respect to the former children's game metaphor, Ziya Gökalp was ready to say 'duck'.

After 1915, Ziya Gökalp published several articles in several journals including *İslam*, *İktisad* (Economics), *İçtimâiyat* (Sociology), *Şâir* (Poet), and *Halka Doğru* (Towards the People). In these articles, Gökalp described *millet* as the 'genuine societies' which consisted of similar communities sharing the same language and culture while carrying the

---

[92] Gökalp, "Bir Kavmin Tedkikinde Takib Olunacak Usul" in Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler III*, M. Orhan Durusoy (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1977, pp. 3-16.
[93] Gökalp, "Eski Türkler'de İçtimaî Teşkilât ile Mantıkî Tasnifler Arasında Tenâzur", *Ibid*. pp. 17-98.

same ideal,[94] explained the necessity to exalt the professional codes of ethics in all over the nation,[95] resembled the Turkish nation to a huge single family,[96] and claimed the Turkish consciousness was one sole consciousness which could only accept one sole leader.[97] On 21 February 1916, Gökalp published another article in *İktisadiyat Mecmuası* (Journal of Economics) under the title of *Millet Nedir, Milli İktisat Neden İbarettir?* (What is Nation, What Does the National Economics Consist of?). In this article Gökalp defined the nation as it follows:

> With a simple language, we can describe the nation as 'a socially complete entity'. In the sociological world […] various layers that constitute the sociological life shall be accommodative with each other. […] These are […] the communities with common emotions, […] the expertise circles that are in need of each other, […] and the state. […] If these three layers are not accommodative with each other in a group, it means that the group has not been a socially complete entity yet; means it has not grow into a nation. Therefore, the nation is an idealistic group which was not able to appear in any society entirely. Every society is a nationality which tries to evolve into a nation.[98]

In his first *millet* definition in 1909, Gökalp defined the *millet* through some non-materialistic elements of a society like enduring the disasters together, achieving the glory together, and crying and rejoicing together. However, after seven years, his *millet* definition shifted into a description of a materialistic society by categorizing the society into layers while emphasizing the accommodation between them. On the other hand, the attitude towards the ideal concept within the *millet* definition was still intact. In his earlier definition Gökalp named that ideal 'the common purpose in the future' whereas this time he used 'idealistic' word to define the same future ideal that the nation should carry. Considering that 'future purpose' concept Gökalp used earlier shifted into *mefkure* (ideal) in time, it can be said that his inspiration from Durkheim made Gökalp to express his *millet* definition through some sociological patterns.

---

[94] Ziya Gökalp, "Milli Vicdanı Kuvvetlendirmek" in Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler IV*, Ferit Ragıp Tuncor (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1977, pp. 54-60.

[95] Ziya Gökalp, "Milli Tesânüdü Kuvvetlendirmek", *Ibid*. pp. 60-66.

[96] Ziya Gökalp, "Tam ve Medenî Bir Millet Olmak İçin Nelerimiz Eksik?", *Ibid*. pp. 67-70.

[97] Ziya Gökalp, "Muallimler Derneği'nde İlmî Münakaşalar", *Ibid*. pp. 75-80.

[98] *"Milleti mücerret bir lisanla 'içtimai bir külli-i tâm: tout complet' diye tarif edebiliriz. İçtimaiyât âleminde, […] içtimai hayatı terkib eden muhtelif tabakaların birbirine muntabık olması lazımdır. […] Bunlar […] müşterek duygulara malik bir zümre, […] birbirine muhtaç olan bütün ihtisas zümreleri, […] ve devlettir. […] Bir cemiyette bu üç tabaka birbirine tamamıyla muntabık değilse, o cemiyet henüz bir külli-i tâm olamamış, yani bir millet haline gelememiştir. O halde millet, mefkûrevi bir cemiyet olup hiçbir kavimde tamamıyla tecelli edememiştir. Her kavim millet olmaya çalışan bir milliyettir."* Ziya Gökalp, "Millet Nedir? Milli İktisat Neden İbarettir?" in Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler VIII*, Ferit Ragıp Tuncor (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1981, pp. 75-77.

Between 1916 and 1917, Ziya Gökalp focused on developing a national education system for the youth of Turkish nation through his article series titled *Milli Terbiye* (National Education) published in *Muallim Mecmuası* (Teacher Journal). In one of these articles, Gökalp claimed that the nations shall focus on searching the national culture and purifying the language. Additionally, Gökalp made a definition of the nation concept in the same article. He stated: "The nation is a community which has sympathy among its members on one hand and antipathy towards the members of other communities on the other". This definition could seem biased, weak, and incomplete. However, Gökalp's intention with this definition was to open a path for the Turkish culture among the tendencies of the Ottoman intellectuals towards Turkish, Islamic, and Western civilizations. According to him, the nations could only be exalted through their own culture; and the sympathy among the members of the society referred to the national culture whereas the antipathy was referring the import of the culture.[99] Hence, this *millet* definition could be taken as a 'way station' to fill the cultural gap in his future complete *millet* definition.

Moreover, Gökalp had written several articles on *Yeni Mecmua* (New Journal) between 1917 and 1918. This journal was published by Ziya Gökalp himself and it was financially supported by CUP. Therefore, considering Gökalp was serving as an ideologue of CUP, the topics of the journal were mostly based on explaining and exalting the Turkish nationalism. Similarly, Gökalp's articles in this journal were carrying the same purpose; through his articles, Gökalp formulated his thoughts on Turkism, Turkish nation, and Turkish culture in a more 'scientific' way. In his article titled *Millet Nedir?* (What is Nation?) published on 15 February 1918, the nation was neither consisted of people based on race, ethnicity, or people living under the ruling of an empire nor a community which an individual could identify themselves with their own pleasures.[100] This definition was not mentioning what nation 'should have'; instead, it compiled what nation 'should not have'. Therefore, nation should not be based on ethnical roots and personal preferences. This definition could be taken as another gap-filler through Gökalp's final conceptualization of nation.

---

[99] *"Millet, bir taraftan fertleri arasında tearüf (sympathie), diğer taraftan fertleriyle başka milletlerin fertleri arasında tenakür (antipathie) bulunan bir zümre demektir."* Ziya Gökalp, "Terbiye ve Milliyet: Millî Terbiye I" in Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler V*, Rıza Kardaş (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1981, pp. 29-37.
[100] Ahmet Selvi, *Yeni Mecmua'nın Tahlili*, Master's Thesis, Hülya Argunşah (Supervisor), Erciyes Üniversitesi SBE Yeni Türk Edebiyatı ABD, Kayseri, 1992.

From this perspective, it can be seen that Gökalp was still having some troubles with defining the *millet* concept clearly. Therefore, the *Küçük Mecmua* (Little Journal) journal of Gökalp could be helpful on finding his ultimate definition of nation. On 25 December 1922, Gökalp defined the nation concept by describing what the nation was actually not. Although it may seem a bit absurd at first glance, considering Gökalp was still trying to formulate his Turkism ideology for years and his formulation had not been completed yet, it would be beneficial to see what shall not be expected to picture after mentioning nation from Gökalp's eyes. In his article named *Millet Nedir?* (What is Nation?), Gökalp mentioned four features that the definition of nation could and should not carry: A nation was not a geographical community, a nation should not mean a race or an ethnicity, a nation was not a sum of people who live a common political life under an empire, and a nation was not a community based on an individual's personal desire or interests to choose. When nothing left to add into the definition of the concept of nation, Gökalp claimed the actual definition shall address to the non-material elements such as education, culture, and emotions. Therefore, according to Gökalp, "the nation is not a geographic, ethnic, political, or voluntary community. The nation is a cultural community consisted of the individuals who have a common language which means they were educated in the same way".[101] Considering Gökalp excluded the same items in his articles in both *Yeni Mecmua* and *Küçük Mecmua* on what a definition of nation should not carry within, and by grounding his definition on culture, it can be said that Gökalp's efforts on highlighting the culture element within the Turkish nationalism were to conceptualize *millet* culturally.

In his journey on introducing and familiarizing the Turkish culture, in the *Küçük Mecmua* journal, Gökalp had written several articles on defining the ancient Turkish traditions in laws, religion, prayers, hierarchy, daily life, literature, and political administration. In one of these articles published on 18 December 1922 titled *Türk Ensâbı* (Turkish Lineages), Gökalp explained all the social formations of a nation in a hierarchical order; started with the family (*ev* - house) and ended with the nation *(budun)*. Although this kind of method on searching the lineage of a social group was inherited from ancient Arabic culture under the name of *ilm-ül ensâb* (science of lineage/genealogy) which focused on examining the

---

[101] *"...millet ne coğrafî, ne ırkî, ne siyasî, ne de iradî bir zümre değildir. Millet, lisanen müşterek olan, yâni aynı terbiyeyi almış fertlerden mürekkep bulunan harsî bir zümredir".* Ziya Gökalp, "Millet Nedir?" in Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler VII*, M. Abdülhalûk Çay (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1982, pp. 226-231.

lineages of ancient Arab tribes,[102] Gökalp tried to adopt this system into ancient Turks. According to Gökalp, in the Orkhon Inscriptions, the concept of nation was defined with *budun* word. Additionally, in the same inscriptions, the smaller Turkish nations like Kirghiz were called as *budun*s as well. Gökalp mentioned Vilhelm Thomsen translated this word in both cases as *millet*. Therefore, Gökalp claimed that with the respect that *millet* concept was at the top position in any hierarchical social ranking system, regardless of its size, any nation could also be called *budun*.[103] With this article, he preferred to use the *millet* and *budun* words interchangeably. However, in his early *Altın Destan* (Golden Saga) poem of 1911, a decade earlier, through its glossary section, Gökalp used to describe *ulus* as nation and *budun* as a grand nation which covered all the Turks in the world. The change in this concept can be explained with the change of his *Turan* understanding. After conceptualizing nation through the culture, the former Pan-Turkism 'goal' of Gökalp shifted into a 'far ideal'.[104] Thereby, *budun*, which formerly resided in *Turan* in Gökalp's accounts, gave its place to *millet* in Gökalp's new nation formulation.[105]

Every article and poem Gökalp had penned throughout his intellectual journey served no other purpose than searching a sociological foundation for his ideological formulation. At the beginning of this journey, Gökalp used the race *(ırk)* concept to define nation, excavated through the history of the ancient Turks, tried to merge ummah and nation concepts, introduced new Turkish words to the literature, and tried to solve the nation puzzle with these words. However, after he embraced Durkheim's sociological model, Gökalp put these bothering explanation efforts away. He followed a sociological method by separating the *kavim*, *millet*, ethnicity, and ummah concepts. While explaining the concept of nation, Gökalp focused on a cultural tendency by addressing the cultural elements like language, education, and traditions. Therefore, after he was satisfied with what he had written throughout many years as articles and poems in several journals, in 1923, Gökalp published four different books to explain his Turkism formulations on the

---

[102] Mustafa Fayda, "Ensâb", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 11, pp. 244-249.

[103] Ziya Gökalp, "Türk Ensâbı" in Ziya Gökalp, *Türk Devleti'nin Tekâmülü*, Kâzım Yaşar Kopraman (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1981, pp. 99-101.

[104] Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, 7th Edition, Varlık, İstanbul, 1968, pp. 23-26.

[105] Actually, this attitude shows some great parallelism with Mehmet Akif's *ittihad-ı İslam* ideal. After Gökalp constituted his conceptualization of nation upon culture, there was no room left for the race-based *Turan* understanding; hence, he preferred to define it as a far ideal which Turkish nationalists shall work hard to make it real, one day. Similarly, Akif had seen the 'ethnic' nationalism and nation-state concepts became the actual agenda for the Muslims. Therefore, he had to limit his conceptualization of *millet* geographically with Islam in it, and he also put the *ittihad-ı İslam (Leyla)* ideal to a special shelf reserved for far ideals next to Gökalp's *Turan* by advicing the Muslims *(Mecnun)* to chase after in order to make it real.

concepts of nation and nationality: *Türk Töresi* (Turkish Traditions), *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (Principles of Turkism), *Doğru Yol* (True Path), and *Altın Işık* (Golden Light).

Türkçülüğün Esasları of Gökalp could actually be regarded as a materialized version of his decades-long tendency on expressing the concepts gradually, step by step. As it was stated in previous chapter, this book was considered the manifesto pamphlet of Turkism. The articles he had written earlier were organized, edited, reinforced, and presented as a sociologically formulated book by Gökalp. Therefore, in order to introduce the Turkish nationalism ideology to the masses, Gökalp preferred to define nation first:

> A nation is not a racial or ethnic or geographical or political or volitional group but one composed of individuals who share a common language, religion, morality and aesthetics, that is to say, who have received the same education. The Turkish peasant expresses it as 'the one whose language is my language, whose religion is my religion'. In truth, a man desires more to live with those who share his language and religion than with those who share his blood, for the human personality does not dwell in the physical body but in the soul.[106]

With this statement, Gökalp preferred to conceptualize *millet* subjectively. This subjective tendency originated from his long-sought culture concept. By listing cultural concepts such as language, religion, morality, and aesthetics which he also explained in details in the future chapters of his manifesto book, and also by excluding the ethnic and geographical elements from the definition of nation, it can be said that Gökalp's understanding of nation was nourished from the cultural elements more than anything else.

Considering the definition of nation above was the last definition, it can be said that Gökalp was satisfied with his ultimate definition of nation; therefore, he stopped to re-conceptualize it again as he did several times before. In these times, he transferred all his efforts to help the new Republic become a complete political entity while explaining his ultimate conceptualization of nation to the Turkish society. Indeed, in his articles published in several newspapers in the newly established Republic including *Yeni Gün* (New Day), *Yeni Türkiye* (New Turkey), and *Cumhuriyet* (Republic) Gökalp explained his definition on the concept of nation with emphasizing on the new issues which the Republic was trying to

---

[106] *"...millet, ne ırkî, ne kavmî, ne coğrafî, ne siyasî ne de iradî bir zümre değildir. Millet, lisanca, dince, ahlâkça ve bediıyatça müşterek olan, yâni aynı terbiyeyi almış fertlerden mürekkep bulunan bir zümredir. Türk köylüsü onu 'dili dilime uyan, dini dinime uyan' diyerek tarif eder. Filhakika bir adam, kanca müşterek bulunduğu insanlardan ziyade, dilde ve dinde müşterek bulunduğu insanlarla beraber yaşamak ister. Çünkü insanî şahsiyetimiz, bedenimizde değil, ruhumuzdadır." Ibid.* p. 20. The English version written above cited from Ziya Gökalp, *The Principles of Turkism*, Robert Devereux (Trans.), E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1968, pp. 15-16.

explain, adapt, and promote to the Turkish nation such as embracing the national culture, installing a national economy, reaching the level of the contemporary civilization, and the power of media in building a nation. In these articles, Gökalp mentioned that "each state was a community which has a special culture, and a community without a unique culture could not become a nation",[107] "the economic successes were the sole factors to guarantee the freedom and independence, to prepare the welfare and happiness, and to save the honor and glory of a nation",[108] and "the nations which their newspapers were capable of doing their foremost jobs sincerely would eventually get rid of all of their defects and would reach all the progresses and advancements".[109]

4. 3. A Comparison on Akif and Gökalp: Conceptualizing Nation

Both Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp had experienced different intellectual journeys while conceptualizing nation. Considering their journeys met in some similar points whereas they drew apart in some cases, it would be meaningful to compare their understanding on nation through the common elements mentioned in different definitions of nation. In the introduction section where the conceptual framework of nation explained in detail through various definitions of nation, three common constitutive elements of nation definitions in the contemporary sense were selected as political community, sovereignty, and common values. By this, utilizing these elements in Akif's and Gökalp's conceptualizations of nation could be a useful method to compare their understandings of nation.

4. 3. 1. Political Community and Nation

In his earlier writings, Mehmet Akif conceptualized nation with a religious approach while often using the *millet* word interchangeably with ummah. In his accounts, the reference point of this approach had two sides: His *ittihad-ı İslam* (unity of Muslims) ideal and his nostalgia towards the classical times of Islam. His article written in 1912 where he addressed the Muslim elements of the Empire one by one as Albanians, Circassians, Arabs,

---

[107] *"Her millet hususî bir harsa malik bir zümre demektir. Kendine mahsus harsı olmayan bir zümre, hiçbir zaman millet olamaz"* Ziya Gökalp, "Milletlerin Müsaviliği" in Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler IX*, Şevket Baysanoğlu (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, İstanbul, 1980, pp. 58-62.

[108] *"...bir milletin hürriyet ve istiklâlini temin eden, refah ve saadetini hazırlayan, şeref ve namusunu kurtaran âmilin, başlıca iktisadi muvaffakiyetler olduğunu..."* Ziya Gökalp, "Teşkilatçılar" in *Ibid.* pp. 111-115.

[109] *"Gazeteleri hakikî vazifelerini ifa eden bir millet, her türlü kusurlarından kurtularak, bütün terakkilere ve tekâmüllere nail olacağını bilmelidir."* Ziya Gökalp, "Yirminci Asrın En Mühim Müessesesi Gazetedir" in *Ibid.* pp. 125-128.

etc. and counted them as a grand Islamic nation[110] can be a clear example of Akif's conceptialization of nation was addressing a political entity with Islam in it. Additionally, his nostalgia towards the 'glorious' times of Islam could be seen in his relatively earlier poems. For instance, in his unnamed poem in *Hakkın Sesleri*, Akif stated:

> We were a nation once, what a great nation:
> We came to earth to teach what nationality means![111]

Considering this poem had two parts between the lines where Akif glorified the ancient political formation of Islam at the beginning and unhappy about the current status of Muslims in the second part adressed with 'once' word, it can be said that Mehmet Akif had used the concept of nation within the political field. Although he had also used nation for the Ottomans from time to time, these usages could be taken under the *ittihad-ı İslam* category where he assigned a job to each of the Muslim nations as it was previously stated; Akif resembled the Ottomans to the 'arms' of Islam.[112] Hence, within Akif's Islamic unity ideal, his *millet* understandings towards both the Muslim world and its minor [national] elements could be taken as addressing a political community. Therefore, regardless of it was addressing a deep nostalgia or an actual unity; it was clear that Akif's *millet* usages were corresponding to a political formation of the Muslims in the past and his own era.

In his late writings, especially after the end of WWI, Akif used the *kavim* word to define the ethnic elements within *millet*. As it was stated before, his hopes on saving Islam and therefore its last stronghold, Anatolia, were placed on the *Asım*'s generation. That generation was preparing to fight against the invaders, and Akif himself joined the fight as well. After his *ittihad-ı İslam* ideal got thinner, he separated *millet* from ummah. In his speeches and articles during this time, he had clearly distinguished these two terms from each other. In his second recorded speech in the mosques[113] during the Turkish War of Independence, Mehmet Akif counted both the Eastern and the Western nations as political

---

[110] "O Muslim community, you are neither Arab, nor Albanian, nor Kurdish, nor Laz, nor Circassian! You are the individuals of such a nation that, that great nation is nothing but Islam. You cannot champion your ethnicity claims unless you say farewell to Islam". *see.* Footnote 19.

[111] *"Bir zamanlar biz de millet, hem nasıl milletmişiz: / Gelmişiz dünyâya milliyyet nedir öğretmişiz!"* in Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 191.

[112] "You know: Egypt for the Islam world / Is like the head on the skinny body. / India is its sensitive heart in its chest. / And your people (Ottomans), the arms that seek to move". *see.* Footnote 24.

[113] "The humanity has awakened. The enslaved nations realized how great powers they were under the command of the dominating nations. [...] Additionally, a [Muslim] unity can provide great benefits to the Muslim nations who were stuck between north, south, east, and west until now. [...] There is only one [high school] for the eighty millions Indian Muslims". *see.* Footnote 33.

communities while using the 'Muslim' word as an adjective to describe them. The same political tendency on using the *millet* word to define a political community can be tracked in his parliamentary speeches and also in the Turkish national anthem. In two different lines within the anthem Akif stated "Independence is the absolute right of my God-worshipping nation".[114] Considering these lines were answers to his previously statement above about the status of the enslaved Muslim nations, it can be said that the conceptualization of nation in the march was also political for Akif. In short, whether it was addressing a religious society or an ethnic one, from the beginning to the end, Akif's *millet* understanding had always referred to a political community.

Even in his early 'undisciplined' and likewise 'undesired' chanting in high school against Sultan Abdul Hamid II, Ziya Gökalp's *millet* usages were always corresponding to a political entity. During his ages when he was an Ottoman nationalist, Gökalp had described and defined the nation in terms of the political sphere of the Empire. Even the early times when he used *millet* and ummah words similarly, he was addressing a political community. For instance, in his *Şaki İbrahim Destanı* poem,[115] Gökalp was describing the Ottoman nation as a political community with a government. Additionally, even after he had separated *millet* from ummah clearly in his poem titled *Uhuvvet Şarkısı*,[116] Gökalp was still counting the concept of nation under a political category.

Gökalp's tendency to approach nation in terms of political communities continued after he declared his fidelity to the Turkish nation. Even during his early formulations of Turkism, while Gökalp was still trying to implement a sociological basis in conceptualizating nation, he had reserved a special place to the state in his definition of nation in 1916;[117] therefore, he used the concept of nation within the political field along with a sociological definition.

---

[114] *"Hakkıdır, Hakk'a tapan, milletimin istiklâl".*

[115] "The veins of this nation are not over yet, / Every individual has still honor and effort, not over yet, / Aren't you afraid of the grudge of this ummah / You aren't afraid of the government's punishment / You aren't afraid of the God of this ummah / Have you abandoned the Islam religion?" *see.* Footnote 63.

[116] "We are Ottomans our brotherhood law is ancient / We are a single nation since *Mihal-Gazi* joined our army / Not seeking the religious differences is the purpose for us all / We are the sons of the fatherland, cults do not separate us / … / Religion is different, fatherland is different, realize this." *see.* Footnote 68.

[117] "With a simple language, we can describe the nation as 'a socially complete entity'. In the sociological world […] various layers that constitute the sociological life shall be accommodative with each other. […] These are […] the communities with common emotions, […] the expertise circles that are in need of each other, […] and the state. […] If these three layers are not accommodative with each other in a group, it means that the group has not been a socially complete entity yet; means it has not grow into a nation". *see.* Footnote 98.

Right before Ziya Gökalp completed his ideas on Turkism, and also before he completed his conceptualization of *millet*, in 1922, Gökalp had decided to exclude nation from the political field: "[…] the nation is not a geographic, ethnic, political, or voluntary community".[118] The reason behind this tendency was based on his efforts on defining the nation as a cultural entity. Additionally, in *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, where he had completed his ideas on Turkism, 1923, Gökalp enlarged the definition above and put the political characteristic of nation aside while conceptualizing it through non-materialistic elements.[119] With this definition, Gökalp had preferred to define the nation concept culturally. Moreover, in *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, by reserving a particular section for the 'political Turkism', it can be said that although Gökalp's conceptualization of nation did not involve politics within, it had a duty assigned for it in the political field. In short, although Ziya Gökalp introduced and formulized a political ideology, which was Turkism, his former consideration on conceptualizing nation politically gave its place to a cultural understanding.

To summarize, Akif's conceptualization of nation originated from Islam in the first place; his nostalgia towards the ancient Muslim political organization, and also his *ittihad-ı İslam* ideal during the late Ottoman times made his *millet*, *kavim*, and ummah understandings to correspond to political communities while identifying these in parallel to their affinities to Islam. On the other hand, for Gökalp, the conceptualization of nation originated from his identity in the first place. Since he determined his identity over nationality, his first conceptualizations of nation were addressing a political community until his ultimate formulation of Turkism shifted his understanding of nation to a cultural league. Hence, it is safe to say that Gökalp's nation which defined a political community once had changed whereas Mehmet Akif's nation had always corresponded to a political community whether it was a religious or an ethnic entity.

---

[118] *"[…] millet ne coğrafî, ne ırkî, ne siyasî, ne de iradî bir zümre değildir"*. Ziya Gökalp, "Millet Nedir?" in *Makaleler VII…* pp. 226-231.

[119] "A nation is not a racial or ethnic or geographical or political or volitional group but one composed of individuals who share a common language, religion, morality and aesthetics, that is to say, who have received the same education". *see.* Footnote 106.

4. 3. 2. Sovereignty and Nation

In dictionaries, the 'sovereign' term in the political field was described as "possessing independent national power".[120] Additionally, according to Francis Harry Hinsley, "the term sovereignty originally and for a long time expressed the idea that there was a final and absolute authority in the political community".[121] Since this political community he addressed refers to nation in this chapter, it is required to inspect the sovereignty term within the concept of nation through the accounts of Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp. On the other hand, the sovereignty term in Turkish is corresponded to *hakimiyet* and *egemenlik*. The usage of *egemenlik* is relatively new whereas the *hakimiyet* word was vastly used in Akif's and Gökalp's works. Hence, tracking this word in their accounts would help to pick some precise comments on the sovereignty.

In Arabic, the 'sovereignty' word was covered with *al-mulk* (الملك) and the 'owner of the sovereignty' term was covered with *Malek al-Mulk* (مالك الملك) which is considered one of the names of the God. Additionally, there is a chapter in Quran on this issue named *al-Mulk* (67th Chapter) and even in this chapter alone; the sovereignty belonged to the God in thirty-two different places.[122] Therefore, it is safe to say that according to Islam, the 'owner of the sovereignty' is the God, and this statement was mentioned in Quran numerous times. Considering Mehmet Akif's main agenda was always originated from Islamic discourses, regardless of the topic, it could be expected that in Akif's approach to the nation, there was no place to claim the sovereignty for nation. However, in his unnamed poem in *Hakkın Sesleri*, Akif brought a unique approach to this comment as it follows:

> O God, You say 'I am the owner of the sovereignty'... Right, agreed.
> Is there a true disposal for human? Never!
> If a nation captured a sovereignty with an invasion;
> If a nation handed over the whole sovereignty carelessly;
> You are the taker, you are the granter, and you rule the world.[123]

From this piece of poem, it can be claimed that the God was indeed the sole owner of the sovereignty but he could grant sovereignty to which he desired and also he could take it

---

[120] "Sovereign", The Oxford American Dictionary of Current English, Oxford University Press, New York & Oxford, 1999, p. 776.

[121] Francis Harry Hinsley, *Sovereignty*, 2nd Edition, Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1986, p. 1.

[122] M. Sait Özervarlı, "Mülk", *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 31, TDV, İstanbul, 2006, p. 540.

[123] *"İlâhî, 'Mâlike'l-mülk'üm' diyorsun… Doğru, âmenna. / Hakîkî bir tasarruf var mıdır insan için? Aslâ! / Eğer almışsa bir millet, edip bir mülkü istila; / Eğer vermişse bir millet bütün bir mülkü bi-perva; / Alan sensin, veren sensin, senin hükmündedir dünya."* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 175.

whenever he wanted. Therefore, in Akif's understanding, the sovereignty granted to nations was originated from the God. Indeed, in his speech at Beyazıt Mosque in 1913, Akif clearly stated his understanding on sovereignty:

> Albeit the God says 'I am the owner of the sovereignty'; he can dispose in this world as he desires; takes from whom he wants, grants to whom he wants; he can raise whom he wants, he can lower whom he wants. No doubt on this. However, no ethnie could be shown that it perished before despised, enslaved, and condemned; no nation can be seen that it loses its fatherland without losing its own sovereignty.[124]

Since the unity of Muslims ideal occupied an important place in Akif's teachings, the geographical shrinking of this ideal in time could be explained with these two quotes above. During the Balkan Wars, after witnessing the ethnic claims of the Empire's Muslim elements caused a huge cleave in Akif's ideal which was covering a vast amount of space once, shrank to the lands of the Empire. At this point, an acceptance could be sensed in Akif's works. Since the sovereignty belonged to the God, there is a chance that the God had decided to grant a piece of his sovereignty to these newly emerged ethnic political entities. Hence, for Akif, it should be accepted that the God desired so; therefore, in order to claim God's prosperity again, the Muslims shall be united once again. This could be the reason that Akif had paid the utmost importance on the unity of *millet* while despising the *kavim* concept. Additionally, along with his stresses on unity, the emphases on 'working hard to claim God's favor' were mostly mentioned together in this period starting from the Balkan Wars to the early days of the Turkish War of Independence. For example, in his *Süleymaniye Kürsüsünde* poem, Akif stated:

> Without a division in a nation, enemies cannot invade;
> If the hearts beat together, the cannons cannot suppress these.
> [...]
> The space is reserved for the runner certainly;
> The God granted the right to live to the strong.[125]

With regard to these lines were at the same page in the book and following a sequence, it can be said that according to Akif, in order to claim the God's favor, in this case

---

[124] *"Vakıa Cenab-ı Hak, 'Mâlik-el-mülk'üm' diyor; bu âlemde istediği gibi tasarruf eder; dilediğinden alır, dilediğine verir; istediğini î'zâz eyler, istediğini tezlîl eder. Bunda şüphe yok. Fakat hiçbir kavim gösterilemez ki kendisi, zillete, esarete, mahkûmiyete istihkak kesbetmeden inkırâza gitmiş olsun; hiçbir millet görülemez ki mülküne sahib olmak istidâdını kaybetmeden vatan elinden çıkmış bulunsun."* in Mehmed Akif, "…Bayezid Kürsüsünde…".

[125] *"Girmeden tefrika bir millete, düşman giremez; / Toplu vurdukça yürekler onu top sindiremez. [...] Bu da gâyetle tabî'î, koşanındır meydan; / Yaşamak hakkını kuvvetliye vermiş Yaradan."* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 162.

sovereignty, the Muslims shall eradicate the internal divisions and be united first, and to work harder second because the God desired to grant his favor to the strong ones. Therefore, according to Akif, the tables could turn again and the Muslim societies could be 'glorious' once more as long as they unite and work hard. The same recipe showed itself once more with a single sentence in a speech he had given right before Akif had joined the national forces to defend the Anatolia; he stated: "We have to guarantee the unity among each other and start to work as a whole".[126] These efforts could be taken as Akif's faith in the sovereignty could be granted to the Muslims by the God again; as long as some conditions were fulfilled.

As long as the sovereignty could only be presented to nations which the God desired, Akif believed the former Ottoman sovereignty could be taken and given to a new political entity by the God, which was the Ankara Government in that time. Therefore, from Akif's perspective, in order to receive the sovereignty that originally the God had, it is needed to work hard and be united as nation. The European nations had worked hard and the God granted the sovereignty to them. If the Muslims desired to claim their own sovereignty, they had to follow the same path that the Westerners walked once; otherwise, these nations could enslave the Muslims and claim their sovereignty:

> Because, if -God forbid!- we lose our right to live in one day, we will fall into the condemnation disaster that we will have no difference than four-legged animals in the eyes of the ones who sovereign over us. […] They will use us just like how we use our cattle and horses.[127]

Additionally, in his famous Nasrullah Mosque speech in 1920, Mehmet Akif read some verses of Quran about the God's hatred towards the non-Muslim nations and claimed that these nations had no love towards Muslims. According to him, the sovereignty was given to them because they worked hard. The Empire was sovereign over three continents once; however, since 17th century,[128] the Ottomans, therefore Muslims, stopped working. After this, the sovereignty was taken from the Muslims gradually and given to the ones who worked; only the Muslims in Anatolia left as sovereign. Thus, these Muslims should be united together, fight together, and rip the Treaty of Sevres together. Because, the God's

---

[126] *"Biz aramızda vahdeti temin ederek topluca çalışmaya koyulmalıyız"*. in Mehmed Akif, "…Karesi'de Zağnos Paşa Cami-i Şerifi'nde…".
[127] *"Çünkü biz maazallah hakk-ı hayatımızı kaybettiğimiz gün, mahkûmiyet felaketine düşeriz ki bizi tahakkümleri altına alanların nazarında behâimden farkımız kalmaz. […] Biz sığırlarımızı, beygirlerimizi nasıl kullanıyorsak onlar da bizi öyle kullanırlar." Ibid.*
[128] In the original writing, it was stated as 'year 1000' in Mohammedan Calendar.

gift (sovereignty) should be protected: "Can it be imagined a more despicable thing than betrayal to this supreme gift which was inherited from father to son, from century to century and reached us? Or else, aren't we the sons of those grand ancestors?".[129] As a reply to this question, Akif realized that the sovereignty was taken from the Empire and the next Muslim candidate to claim this gift was the Ankara Government. Therefore, in the same year, Akif became a deputy in the Ankara Parliament and on 12 March 1921 he had completed writing the national anthem for the nation. In the first article of the 1921 Constitution *(Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunu)* of the Ankara Government, which was valid between 20 January 1921 and 20 April 1924, it was stated "the sovereignty rests unconditionally with the nation".[130] In the times Akif had written the march, this rule was valid. Considering the march included several indicators that belong to the concept of sovereignty like national flag, fatherland, national borders, and independence, it can be said that Akif came to believe that the God had indeed granted his gift to the Muslim nation of Anatolia in the last days of the Empire. Therefore, in Akif's conceptualization of nation, the sovereignty was postulated as an item that could only be presented by the God.

Ziya Gökalp on the other hand, did not follow a religion-centric path towards sovereignty, and he always claimed that sovereignty belonged to the nation.[131] For instance, in an article he penned in 1909, he claimed the Constitution gave sovereignty to the Ottoman nation.[132] After Gökalp's fidelity shifted from being Ottoman to being Turk, in another article written

---

[129] *"Babadan evlâda, asırdan asıra intikal ede ede bize kadar gelen bu emanet-i kübrâya hıyanet kadar zillet tasavvur olunabilir mi? Yoksa bizler o muazzam ecdâdın ahfâdı değil miyiz?"* in Mehmed Akif, "Nasrullah Kürsüsü'nde...".

[130] *"Hakimiyet bilâ kayd-ü şart milletindir".*

[131] For example, *Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti* (Countrywide Resistance Organization) re-named itself *Halk Fırkası* (People's Party) and declared nine principles as the party program in 1923. These principles were focusing on national sovereignty in politics, economics, public security, military service, jurisdiction, government institutions, incorporation, social insurance, and also in one principle it declared the caliphate was embodied within the Ankara parliament. These principles drew some negative reactions among some veterans of the Turkish War of Independence. Hilal Karavar Öz, "Birinci Meclis İçindeki Tartışmalar ve Halk Fırkası'nın Kuruluş Süreci", *Journal of Current Researches on Social Sciences*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 2017, pp. 363-374. In order to extinguish these reactions, Gökalp had penned a review named *Doğru Yol* (True Path) in the same year. In this review, Gökalp noticed that although it was called as nine principles, there were actually thirty-eight principles between the lines. He categorized this program under twelve chapters as political, religious, educational, juridical, etc. and explained and commented on each of them. In this program, he showed the utmost attention on the *'Hâkimiyet bilâ kayd-u şart milletindir'* (Sovereignty rests unconditionally with the nation) principle, explained the concepts of nation and sovereignty historically from the Empire's perspective, and summarized his thoughts on this principle with the following words: "If the palace is sovereign in a country, the nation cannot be sovereign. If the nation desires to claim the sovereignty fully, there cannot be a palace anymore" (*"...bir memlekette saray hâkimse millet hâkim olamaz. Millet, tamamiyle hâkimiyeti istimal etmek isterse, artık saray kalamaz"*). Ziya Gökalp, "Doğru Yol: Hâkimiyet-i Milliyye ve Umdelerin Tasnif, Tahlil ve Tefsiri" in Ziya Gökalp, *Yeni Hayat Doğru Yol*, Müjgân Cunbur (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1976, pp. 55-69.

[132] Ziya Gökalp, "Yeni Osmanlılar" in *Makaleler I...* pp. 62-65.

in 1911, Gökalp claimed that the Turkish will, intelligence, and sensivity were strong and therefore the future sovereignty would be promised[133] to Turkish nation.[134] In the contrary to Mehmet Akif, in an article where Gökalp came up with a sociological method to determine a nation's characteristics in 1915, he mentioned that the ability to govern was not based on the divine rules but the sovereignty of the nation in the legislative nations.[135] Therefore, Gökalp claimed that sovereignty did not belong to the God but in the possession of nation.

In *Türkleşmek, İslâmlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, Gökalp defined national sovereignty through a comparison between the ruling class and nation. According to him, previously the [Ottoman] ruling class was the only dominant clique in defending the fatherland; they could assign anyone on this duty. However, when the compulsory military service and the national sovereignty understandings were accepted as national obligations by the [Ottoman] parliament, the sovereignty shifted from the ruling class to the nation. Hence, the nation who had no idea how to rule earlier became a supervisor on the ruling class; in this case the government.[136] Gökalp's formulation on the national sovereignty over the parliament was an enlightening statement indeed; however, Gökalp did not only attribute sovereignty to nation but also claimed that sovereignty of nation should be conducted by national assemblies through elections. Hence, in an article he had written, Gökalp stated:

> The voting right my nation gave to me is also a sacred duty. I would be a sinner if I do not use this right in a beneficial way for my nation. We will deliver the national sovereignty to the deputies via election. If the deputies we will elect do not behave well, the fatherland could suffer some great damages. […] if you vote for the political party candidates, national sovereignty could be saved to become a toy in the hands of the individuals.[137]

---

[133] The 'promised' word here Gökalp used while expressing his thoughts on sovereignty could attract the attention and cause some confusions about a possible religious tendency. At this point, Ülken's previous warning about Durkheim's absolute influence on Gökalp started with 1915 could be a helpful reminder. In these times, Gökalp was in tendency to make a synthesis between Islam, Turkishness, and the West which will eventually fuse into *Türkleşmek, İslâmlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* with Fouillée's influence.

[134] Ziya Gökalp, "Yeni Hayat ve Yeni Kıymetler" in *Makaleler II*, pp. 40-46.

[135] *"Hükûmet artık hukuk-u ilâhiye (drolt Divin) esasına değil Hâkimiyet-i Milliyet yani siyasî efkâr-ı âmme umdesine müsteniddir."* Ziya Gökalp, "Bir Kavmin Tedkikinde Takib Olunacak Usul" in *Makaleler III...* pp. 3-16.

[136] Ziya Gökalp, "Milliyet Mefkûresi" in Ziya Gökalp, *Türkleşmek, İslâmlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, 5th Edition, Mustafa Özsarı (Ed.), Ötüken, İstanbul, 2018, pp. 70-76.

[137] *"Bana milletimin verdiği intihap hakkı, aynı zamanda mukaddes bir vazifedir. Ben bu hakkı milletime faydalı olacak bir surette kullanamazsam günahkâr olurum. Biz intihap tarîkiyle, millî hâkimiyeti mebusların eline teslim edeceğiz. İntihap edeceğimiz mebuslar iyi hareket etmezlerse vatan büyük zararlara düşebilir. […] eğer siz reylerinizi fırka namzetlerine verirseniz, millî hâkimiyet, fertlerin elinde oyuncak olmak*

From this statement, it can be said that the sovereignty category occupied a wide place in Gökalp's conceptualization of nation.

In *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, Ziya Gökalp clearly stated that sovereignty belonged to the Turkish nation as follows: "Previously the Turkish nation had no recognized place in Turkey, whereas today every right belongs to the Turk. Sovereignty over this land is Turkish sovereignty and the Turkish people are dominant in politics, culture and economy".[138] According to this, it can be said that Gökalp recognized no other superior position over the nation for sovereignty. However, in an article he penned on 26 July 1924, Gökalp claimed that a share of sovereignty could be transferred or abandoned for a higher ideal. In Gökalp's approach, this higher ideal was a membership of an international organization. He claimed that this organization in his time was the League of Nations, and Turkey should be a member of this organization; however, he stated that the members of this organization were former enemies of Turkey. Considering the Mosul Question was on the agenda, and the Turkish side was asking for a referendum from the League of Nations, Gökalp was hesitant and partisan of a 'wait and see policy' in order to see the actual usefulness of the League. He stated:

> Every state should abandon a share of its independence and sovereignty and should accept to become a subject to a World State [organization]. This state cannot be Europe alone. Because, the European public opinion does not mean the world's public opinion; the European world cannot represent the humanity alone.[139]

It seems, Gökalp's solid and sole national sovereignty ideal could be shared with others, and one share could be presented to another higher authority for the sake of nation. At this point, Gökalp could be accused of having a pragmatic approach for the prosperity of his nation. However, it could be beneficial to review this attitude as nation could transfer some of its own sovereignty to another authority with its own preference. The vital part here is the 'own preference'. This issue alone could be helpful to differentiate Akif's sovereignty approach from Gökalp's. According to Akif, the sovereignty belonged to the God and it

---

tehlikesinden kurtulmuş olur." Ziya Gökalp, "Fırkalar İçtimaiyâtı: Reyimi Kimlere Vermeliyim?" in *Makaleler IV...* pp. 8-12.

[138] *"Evvelce Türkiye'de, Türk Milletinin hiçbir mevkii yoktu. Bugün, her hak Türk'ündür. Bu topraktaki hâkimiyet Türk hâkimiyetidir, siyasette, harsta, iktisadda hep Türk hâkimdir."* in Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün...* p. 14. The English version written above cited from Gökalp, *The Principles...* p. 11.

[139] *"...her devlet istiklâlinden ve hâkimiyetinden bir kısmını terk ederek, bir Cihan Devleti'nin tabiiyeti altına girmeği kabul etmelidir. Bu Cihan Devleti, yalnız Avrupa olamaz. Zira Avrupa efkâr-i âmmesi, cihân efkâr-ı âmmesi demek değildir. Avrupa âlemi, tek başına insanîyeti temsil edemez."* Ziya Gökalp, "Milletler Cemiyeti" in *Makaleler IX...* pp. 134-137.

could only be granted, or in this case transferred, with the consent of him. Therefore, if a nation desired to participate in a higher authority by submitting some of its sovereign rights, this could only happen because the God desired so. However, for Gökalp, the sovereignty rested in nation and only nation could transfer it as a whole or in some shares. At the end of the day, although their origins, understandings, and ultimate destinations varied, it can be easily claimed that the concept of sovereignty found its respective place within the conceptualization of nation in both Akif's and Gökalp's accounts.

4. 3. 3. Common Values and Nation

Islam was not only the origin of Mehmet Akif's conceptualization of nation but also was the honored guest; in some cases even the 'host'. Therefore, although he did not use the 'culture' word in his writings to address the common values, the common values that the nation concept should carry within could be named Islam and Islamic traditions in Akif's conceptualization of nation. In his earlier works, where he used the nation and ummah words interchangeably, Akif was building a set of values through Islam; whenever he witnessed the Islamic values degenerated, he felt sorry. For instance, in one his early poems, *Köse İmam*, the Muslim prayer leader complained about the members of the Muslim society which they took the prayer leaders as religious fanatics instead of 'once respected' Muslim scholars:

> Noone lets us to talk anymore, see our trouble;
> The hands are full with [fanatic] stamps now.
> When we warn them after witnessing an evil thing,
> They hit on our foreheads with [sultan's stamp]![140]

Although this poem was criticizing Sultan Abdul Hamid II's ruling style initially, it can also be taken as the degenerated attitude of the society towards the 'once respected' prayer leaders which Akif considered them within the common values of nation. The 'once' word in this comment could be a reference point to hold since Akif was yearning for the former values of the Islamic communities. According to him, the Islamic nation was great 'once'; yet, by losing the Islamic dignity and modesty, the Muslims became worse than beggars:

> O! Great nation, how great you were once. How is your end?
> The foreigners abhor you, of course they do:

---

[140] *"Kimse söyletmiyor artık bizi bak sen derde; / «Mürteci!» damgası var şimdi bütün ellerde. / Bir fenâlık görsek, yapma, desen alnına ta, / İniyor hatt-ı celîsiyle Hamîdî Tuğra!"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, p. 115.

Honestly, even the beggars are more honorable than you.
You have long-forgotten the dignity, the modesty;
You had bitten the holiness, attacked to the God!
You neither respected your memories nor remembered the traditions;
Did your ancestors do that, O!, miserable son?[141]

This piece of poem indeed harsh; yet, it in order to be a 'great nation' again, or at least a 'nation' again, it was required to follow the same footsteps once the ancestors walked; which means traditions in Akif's accounts.

From Akif's perspective, if the sole bond that bound the nation was Islam; then, the common values in Akif's understanding of nation could be named Islamic traditions. Additionally, Akif put the tradition in the same league with the Islamic values. According to Akif, the Muslim world was in despair, the blood in the veins of ummah was stuck, and the nation forgot the ancient teachings of the religion, which were the Islamic traditions:

Oh, where is that religion, the religion of resolve and persistence;
Where is the world's religion that came from the sky, the religion of life?
How boxed, stereotyped tradition it is?
Islam, you said? [No, absolutely not at all]![142]

This poem shows that according to Akif, the teachings of Islam were indeed traditions of the ummah; yet, people forgot these traditions, and named them stereotyped practices. As a result of this, the Muslims sought another master to help replacing these 'stereotyped practices', which was the West. At this point, Akif did not confine himself with preserving the Islamic traditions alone but he also criticized the 'imported' traditions from the West which aimed to replace the long-ingrained national traditions.[143] When Akif witnessed that the 'national' values clashed with the 'imports', he came up with a plan to accommodate

---

[141] *"Nasıldın ey koca millet? Ne oldu âkıbetin? / Yabancılar ediyormuş –eder ya– istikrâh: / Dilenciler bile senden şereflidir billâh. / Vakarı çoktan unuttun, hayâyı kaldırdın; / Mukaddesâtı ısırdın, Hudâ'ya saldırdın! / Ne hatırâtına hürmet, ne an'anâtını yâd; / Deden de böyle mi yapmıştı ey sefîl evlâd?"* Ibid. p. 227.

[142] *"Ah o din nerde, o azmin, sebâtın dini; / O yerin gökten inen dini, hayatın dini? / Bu nasıl dar, ne kadar basmakalıp bir görenek? / Müslümanlık mı dedin?... Tövbeler olsun, ne demek!"* Ibid. p. 370.

[143] For instance, in an article he penned in 1910 Akif narrated an anecdote about a visit to a mansion. In this mansion, Akif had encountered with two Ottoman children who were dressed as French children, educated in French, and were talking in French but unaware of their own culture. When the children saw him with his beard and in Ottoman clothes instead of in the French-style fashion they were familiar with, they yelled to Akif and ran away. Their father tried to persuade Akif that they had no intention to insult him but the children had seen Akif in Ottoman fashion and thought he would harm them. Akif despised this attitude and tried to discourage them to import traditions, and he scolded the parents that they were the reason to instill French traditions and abhor Muslim traditions which caused those young boys to think in stereotype and they believed Akif was an evil man which could harm them. Mehmed Akif, "Eski Hatıralar", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 10 Cemaziyelevvel 1328/6 Mayıs 1326 (20 May 1910), Vol. 4, No. 89, p. 188.

these two elements, which was uniting the national values and the imports in order to become a 'virtuous' nation again. To execute the plan, Akif had started this task with reviewing the history of the nation first. According to him, the Muslim nation was a prideful one once; but it was in a bad situation now, and its wounds could not be healed:

> The perfect past with full of [glorious values],
> O God, how wounded today it is, cannot be cured![144]

Akif had a program to cure the wounds of the nation; a program which focused on civilizing the national values in order to reach the 'virtuous' level as the Islamic nation. In several of his works in various times, Akif had drawn a roadmap to reach this goal. In his poem named *Süleymaniye Kürsüsünde*, Akif stated:

> Take the science of the West, take its art [and technique];
> And work at high pressure in your labor.[145]

The same approach showed itself again in his speech in Nasrullah Mosque which comes right after his criticism on the European attitude towards the Muslims: "It is needed to import these men's techniques and sciences but we shall never believe in them and be possessed with them. […] it is a mandatory individual religious duty to work hard in order to possess whatever our enemies have in the name of the strength".[146] Therefore, with the regard of his attitude towards the West, it can be said that Akif promoted importing the science, technique, and art from the West but not to be fooled by its values. Indeed, the same selective attitude can also be tracked in his own life. For example, Akif was in favor of importing the branches of art from the West which the Muslim nation did not have, because the art does not have a nationality.[147] After reading *"Quo Vadis?"* of the Polish author Henryk Sienkiewicz several times, which was a novel about the life of Prophet Jesus, Akif had bewailed that the Muslims had no author to write such a great novel for Prophet Mohammad.[148] Similarly, Akif had also admitted that the vivid lantern portrayal in

---

[144] *"Şark'ın ki mefâhir dolu, mâzi-i kemâli, / Yâ Rab, ne onulmaz yaradır şimdiki hâli!"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 442.

[145] *"Alınız ilmini Garb'ın, alınız san'atini; / Veriniz hem de mesâînize son sür'atini."* Ersoy, *Sahafat*, 2013, p. 170.

[146] *"Heriflerin ilimlerini, fenlerini almalı fakat kendilerine asla inanmamalı, asla kapılmamalıdır. […] düşmanlarımızın kuvvet namına neleri varsa hepsini elde etmek için çalışmak, efrâd-ı müslimînin her birine farz-ı ayındır".* Mehmed Akif, "Nasrullah Kürsüsü'nde…"

[147] *"Çünkü milliyeti yok san'atin, ilmin; yalnız…"* (Because the art [and technique] and science do not have nationality). Ersoy, *Safahat*, p. 170.

[148] Erişirgil, *İslamcı…* pp. 75-79.

his famous poem *Seyfi Baba* was inspired from the French writer Alphonse Daudet.[149] Therefore, it can be deduced that Akif's thoughts on 'what to import' and 'how to import' were clear even in his regular works and his daily routines.

At this point, on one hand Akif defended importing from the West, and on another he was against this kind of import. In this dilemma, Akif managed to get out of a huge pile of possible criticisms with the following words: "I think the ones who say the East have everything do not know the West alone but also the East; hence, the ones who claim the West has everything do not know the East and also the West". Additionally, Akif claimed the Muslim nations already had 'many great things' in their own. For instance, the ummah had also philosophy of its own, and it had managed to introduce great figures on that particular branch. Just because it focused on the religion in particular and its name was Sufism,[150] there was no need to insult and abandon this centuries-old tradition.[151] With this regard, it was best for Akif to preserve what the nation had[152] and strengthen its faltering

---

[149] Mithat Cemal, pp. 43-47. This poem alone can materialize the capability of Akif's pen. To summarize, the poem begins with Akif's arrival to his own home. The ones (probably his wife and children) in his home stated that *Seyfi Baba*, who (seems) was his family friend and definetely a constructor skilled in roofs, was sick. At this point, Akif took two things with him, a lantern and a stick, and set off to *Baba*'s place. When he reached *Baba*'s house, the door was half open. In the following lines, it seems a woman in his neighbourhood had visited him. Akif tried to ease his pain by offering some drinks and with some short-talks; and when *Baba* fell asleep, Akif desired to donate some money to *Baba*'s purse; yet, he could not find any money in his own. The poem concludes with Akif's sorrow. The lantern portrayal Mithat Cemal mentioned was stated in three particular passages of this poem which were vividly described. First, when Akif left his home, he had to bounce over some rocks since the street became like a swamp (probably after heavy rain) and resembled his lantern like a second boat next to his. Second, after he managed to ride the marsh out, he had witnessed three oncoming lanterns, which were welcomed as signal lamps by Akif's imaginary boat. Third, after Akif sneaked in *Baba*'s house through the half open door, he had some difficulties to light *Baba*'s own lantern. It is not clear in which part Akif had inspired from Daudet (probably the first one); yet, all these three passages had some vivid descriptions to identify Akif's talent in poetry. For the mentioned poem, *see.* "Seyfi Baba" in Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, pp. 60-63.

[150] Sufism, which was corresponded to *Tasavvuf* in Muslim terminology 'simply' defines the intimacy between the God and 'the subject of the God' within a religious periphery. Since it had many branches of its own and another thesis required to be written to describe this concept at even an introduction level, for brief information *see.* Reşat Öngören, "Tasavvuf" in *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 40, İstanbul, 2011, pp. 119-126 and for detailed information from the Turkish scholars *see.* Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı, *100 Soruda Tasavvuf*, Gerçek, 2nd Edition, İstanbul, 1985, Ethem Cebecioğlu, *Tasavvuf Terimleri ve Deyimleri Sözlüğü*, 5th Edition, Ağaç, İstanbul, 2009, and for detailed information from the Western scholars, *see.* Annemarie Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1975, Titus Buckhardt, *İslam Tasavvuf Doktrinine Giriş*, Fahreddin Arslan (Trans.), Ribat, İstanbul, 1982, and for detailed information from the Eastern scholars, *see.* Ebu'l-Alâ Afîfî, *Tasavvuf: İslâm'da Manevi Devrim*, H. İbrahim Kaçar & Murat Sülün (Trans.), Risale, İstanbul, 1996, İzzeddîn Mahmûd bin Ali Kâşânî Natanzî, *Tasavvufun Ana Esasları*, Hakkı Uygur (Trans.), Kurtuba, İstanbul, 2010.

[151] *"Bana öyle geliyor ki ne varsa şarkta vardır, diyenler yalnız garbı değil, şarkı da bilmiyorlar; nitekim ne varsa garpta vardır davasını ileri sürenler yalnız şarkı değil garbı da tanımıyorlar".* Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 16 Haziran 1327/3 Receb 1329 (30 June 1911), Vol. 6, No. 147, pp. 257-259.

[152] The same tendency on preserving what the nation had showed itself in linguistic as well. For instance, in an article he had written on 10 June 1910, Akif defended the national language. According to Akif, the Ottoman intellectuals during his time were trying to conduct purification on the language. They were trying

parts with the imports from the West. By importing what was needed, the nation could be strengthened once again; because, the Japanese example[153] was standing right in front of the world. The Japanese imported what they lacked, and combined the imported ones with their own traditions. Thereby, there was no reason for the Muslims not to get inspired from this example: Take what was needed, reject what you already had.[154]

On the other hand, importing 'what was needed' for the nation would not be enough for Akif. It was a two-sided job; because, in order to apply the 'imported' to the nation, it was needed to fix the challenges the Muslims were facing first. The Muslim society was ignorant and illiterate; and this situation could only be avoided by the education:

> The reason of the disaster, no doubt, is our ignorance;

---

to introduce some ancient Turkish words instead of long-accepted and commonly-used terms. Akif claimed that the national language indeed should be purified; however, this kind of replacement by inventing new or reviving archaic words could not be accepted by the public. According to him, the language was a tradition within its own geography; he expressed a sentence with an archaic and lexiphanicist Ottoman Turkish and translated it to common Turkish, and he stated: "The meaning that the public can understand should be written in the language that the public uses; however, a political outcome should not be written in [archaic Turkish]. Because, neither side will be able to understand that" *("[«Mehmed Bey'in hanesine leylen ferceyab-ı duhul olan sârık sekiz adet kaliçe-i giranbaha sirkat etmiştir.» deyip de «Mehmed Bey'in bu gece evine hırsız girmiş, sekiz halı çalmış.» dememek adeta maskaralıktır.] Avamın anlayabileceği maâni avamın kullandığı lisan ile eda edilmeli; lakin bir icmal-i siyasî Çağatayca yazılmamalı. Çünkü iki taraf da anlayamayacak.")*. Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 1 Cemaziyelevvel 1328/27 Mayıs 1326 (10 June 1910), Vol. 4, No. 92, pp. 237-238.

[153] Both Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp used the Japanese example to justify their approaches on what to import from the West. On this issue, Akif had penned:
> Ask me now, what kind of nation is the Japanese?
> I cannot describe it successfully, strange!
> […]
> The civilization was only entered with its science…
> That could only penetrated by their permission.

("Sorunuz, şimdi Japonlar da nasıl millettir? / Onu tasvîre zafer-yâb olamam, hayrettir! […] Medeniyyet girebilmiş yalınız fenniyle… / O da sâhiplerinin lâhik olan izniyle"). Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, pp. 153-154. The same example shows itself in Gökalp's famous *Türkçülüğün Esasları* book. He stated: "The Japanese became Western without abandoning their religion and nationality and, as a result, have caught up with the Europeans in every respect". Gökalp, *The Principles…* p. 47. Additionally, both of them followed a selective method on what to import from the West. For instance, Akif stated:
> The things of the West can pass if they are worthy;
> The sins that come as fashion will rot in the customs!

("Garb'ın eşyâsı, eğer kıymeti hâizse yürür; / Moda şeklinde gelen seyyie günrükte çürür!"). Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 154. In these lines, it is clear that Akif preferred to build a social and also imaginary customhouse to supervise what was imported from the West. If the imported ones were sins, or it can be altered as discordant with the national and religious culture, it cannot pass. The same imaginary customhouse institution shows itself in Gökalp's works as well. Gökalp stated: "Just like the traditions of the Turkish and the Islamic civilizations, the traditions of the European civilization are allowed to pass through our cultural borders; however, under the condition of being liable to the customs examination" *("Türk ve İslâm medeniyetlerinin an'aneleri gibi, Avrupa medeniyetinin an'aneleri de harsımızın hudutlarından geçmeye mezundur; fakat, gümrüklerde muayeneye tabî olmak şartıyla")*. Gökalp, *Makaleler V*, p. 44.
[154] Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, pp. 153-154.

No remedy can be found to this trouble without schools.[155]

The same approach on paying importance on the education to eradicate the ignorance of the Muslim societies shows itself in several of Akif's works. In his speech in Süleymaniye Mosque, Akif stated: "The one and sole remedy to save us –as I have previously stated– is the education; the true education, the genuine education. If we bring this to the country, we are saved. […] Yes, both the religion and the world exist with the education".[156] According to Akif, the ignorance can only be defeated with educating the youth with the sciences of the age; as *Köse İmam* formerly stated, "the ignorance cannot proceed because the age was «the age of science»".[157]

So far, Mehmet Akif had offered to import what the nation lacked, and then he offered to educate the youth to avoid the ignorance. After securing these two, Akif claimed there was only one option to guarantee the nation to remain intact and glorious: Working hard. Indeed, if it was needed to define the most emphasized advice of Akif among others with one word; it would be the 'working'. In almost all his accounts including poems, articles, and speeches, Akif stressed out 'working' more than anything else. Akif put advising the society to work hard so high that he claimed even with no hope left in the world the Muslims shall keep working:

> Even there is no light in the world, you have to create!
> O laying goofy man with crossed arms; get up![158]

The Muslims shall work under any condition:

> My dear, is it a shame to work, is it a sin to carry load?
> The shame is begging; while the hand operates, the foot walks.[159]

And the perpetuity of the nation could only be achieved by working:

> If one believes in perpetuity, knows the effort as a duty;

---

[155] *"Felâketin başı, hiç şüphe yok, cehâletimiz; / Bu derde çâre bulunmaz –ne olsa– mektepsiz"*. *Ibid*. p. 243.

[156] *"Bizi kurtaracak yegâne çare –geçende de söylemiştim– maariftir; maarif-i sahihâdır, maarif-i hakîkiyedir. Memlekete bunu sokarsak kurtuluruz. […] Evet, din de maarifle kâim, dünya da"*. Mehmed Akif, "Hutbe ve Mevize: Üçüncü Vaaz: Üstad-ı Muhterem Mehmed Âkif Beyefendi Tarafından Süleymaniye Kürsüsünde", *Sebilürreşad*, 7 Şubat 1328/14 Rebiülevvel 1331 (21 February 1913), Vol. 9-2, No. 232-50, pp. 405-408.

[157] Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 115.

[158] *"Âlemde ziyâ kalmasa, halk etmelisin, halk! / Ey elleri böğründe yatan, şaşkın adam, kalk!"* Ersoy, *Safahat*, 2013, p. 186.

[159] *"Kuzum, ayıp mı çalışmak, günâh mı yük taşımak? / Ayıp: Dilencilik, işlerken el, yürürken ayak."* *Ibid*. p. 21.

Work, because the perpetuity can only be claimed by the effort.[160]

Even in his speech in Zağnos Pasha Mosque in 1920 when the Turkish War of Independence was at the gate, Akif attached great importance to working. According to him, while the Muslims could not operate a ferry regularly even from Bandırma to Istanbul, the Western nations were working so hard that they could even go underwater; their machines could dive from New York and can surface in Hamburg. Therefore, he asked how this could even be possible and replied his own question as:

> How the skinny arm of the men could dominate the universe while the nature has thousands of steel biceps? How can it ensure to dominate the natural forces? […] It is not one arm to operate but thousands, millions of arms. These all came together, cooperate with each other, they work day and night, and they labor".[161]

From the perspective of what Akif had stressed out throughout his life on the Islamic values and the Western civilization, it can be said that Akif identified three particular stages to fulfill in order to secure the national values intact: Importing the science and technique from the West alone, educating the youth, and working hard as united.[162] It seems Akif had formulated this roadmap long ago in his mind. Because, the same features of this roadmap showed itself in both his earlier poems like *Köse İmam* or *Küfe* and his late works like the speeches he had delivered during the last years of the Empire; even with a brief glimpse. After determining what to import from the West, there was only Islamic values left for Akif. He preferred to name them as the national values and built his discourse upon them. Therefore, it can be said that Akif had valued the common cultural

---

[160] *"Bekâyı hak tanıyan, sa'yi bir vazîfe bilir; / Çalış çalış ki bekâ sa'y olursa hakkedilir." Ibid.* p. 216.

[161] *"Tabiat bin çelik bazûya sahipken insanın bir cılız kolu nasıl kâinata hâkim oluyor? Nasıl bu kadar kuvvâ-yi tabîyeyi hükmü altına alıyor? […] Bu kadar işleri gören bir kol değil, binlerce, milyonlarca koldur. Bunların hepsi bir araya gelmiş, teşrîk-i mesâi etmişler, geceli gündüzlü çalışıyorlar, uğraşıyorlar".* Mehmed Akif, "…Karesi'de Zağnos Paşa…"

[162] The late intellectuals of Islamism either enjoyed or criticized Akif's roadmap on this particular issue. For instance, Sezai Karakoç argued Mehmet Akif's plan was actually good and he was able to adapt his plan in his own life. In his argument, he claimed Akif was digging trenches in the frontline in order to defend the Muslim nation. Sezai Karakoç, *Mehmed Âkif*, 6th Edition, Diriliş, İstanbul, 1987, pp. 44-45. In the contrary, İsmet Özel did not support Akif's plan. According to him Akif preferred an eclectic style by picking whatever he needed from the West and that was wrong. For Özel, the West was whole and its fruits were bound together; it was impossible to pick one while leaving another. İsmet Özel, *Üç Mesele: Teknik-Medeniyet-Yabancılaşma*, 18th Edition, Tam İstiklâl, 2013, pp. 45-51. Additionally, Karakoç claimed the fighters for the national traditions were the Islamists, and therefore Akif; but, at the end of the day, when the struggle on modernization was completed, the disciples of the Westernism were at the stage to speak, not the Islamists. Karakoç, pp. 26. As a counter-view to the previously mentioned eclectic style, Yasin Aktay seems sided with Karakoç's approach and did not agree with Özel's eclectic approach. According to him, the eclectic civilization process Mehmet Akif offered had never fully materialized in Turkey; it remained merely as a valuable proposal. Additionally, the Western culture was imported perforce by the hand of the state through some reforms while creating the 'secular citizen'. Yasin Aktay, "Reform, İctihad ve Tecdid Bağlamında İslâm ve Hayat", *Milel ve Nihal*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 43-73.

elements within his conceptualization of nation. This attitude showed itself in Turkish Independence March as well. His wish from the God on the continuity of the calls to the prayers *(ezan)*,[163] his advice on respect and not to harm the martyr ancestors,[164] and his emphasis on the national value of being free for all eternity[165] could be taken as the cultural constitutive element in Akif's understanding of nation.

It is known that Gökalp had constituted his nation concept upon culture, which can quite easily be taken as the common values for this section. However, Gökalp's culture understanding was deeply influenced by the civilization, especially from the Western civilization, more than anything else. Hence, in order to understand the exact place of the 'common values' in his nation conceptualization, it would be beneficial to check his formulation which accommodated civilization and culture.[166] It can be claimed that Ziya Gökalp's New Life *(Yeni Hayat)* formulation which was briefly mentioned in the previous chapter played a significant role in his conceptualization of nation.

In an article named *Türk Harsı ve Osmanlı Medeniyeti* (Turkish Culture and the Ottoman Civilization), Gökalp claimed that in any nation at any given time, there were two communities as the common folk and the elites *(güzîdeler)*. The elites referred to the intellectuals who were 'by its nature' assigned to educate, organize, fix, develop, and

---

[163] *"Bu ezanlar ki şehâdetleri dînin temeli / Ebedî yurdumun üstünde benim inlemeli"*.

[164] *"Sen şehîd oğlusun, incitme, yazıktır atanı"*.

[165] *"Ben ezelden beridir hür yaşadım, hür yaşarım"*.

[166] It is clear that Ziya Gökalp had paid the utmost respect to the culture and formulized his nation concept around the values that constituted the culture. In his early writings when he was an Ottoman nationalist, Gökalp was differentiating the ethnicity from the nation. According to him, the realities of the 'things' did not change from one nation to another; they were solid, unchangeable. English, French, and the Ottoman applied the same technique to the engineering, chemistry, medicine; these were sciences and they did not change. However, the politics and the language should be national. These were considered the national values. Ziya Gökalp, "Eskiliğin Mukavemeti" in *Makaleler II*, pp. 22-28. In this article he had written in 1911, Gökalp was indeed an Ottoman nationalist and he claimed the ethnic elements should be stripped from the Ottoman national culture. However, in 1915, when he had penned a very long article to find the ancient Turkish culture and place the Turkish nation under the cultural nations, Gökalp defined the Turkish culture as traditions *(töre)*. According to him, the ancient Turkish traditions had some inspirations from the ancient Chinese traditions; but, in time, Turks were able to create their own traditions and therefore they were able to become a nation. The ancient Turkish religion system, calendar system, political administration system, and philosophical system were the common values of the nation. Ziya Gökalp, "Eski Türkler'de İçtimâî Teşkilât ile Mantıkî Tasnifler Arasında Tenâzur" in *Makaleler III*... pp. 17-98. The quest on finding a cultural basis for the Turkish nation made Gökalp to write this article that he could formulate his nation concept culturally. After Gökalp managed to apply the culture to his nation concept, he had defined it. According to him, "the sum of the judgements of values that live within the conscience of a [ethnic] nation means culture" (*"Bir kavmin vicdanında yaşayan kıymet hükümleri (jugements de valeur)'nin mecmuuna, o kavmin hars (culture)'ı denilir"*). Ziya Gökalp, "Terbiye ve Milliyet: Millî Terbiye I" in *Makaleler V*, pp. 29-37. From this statement, it can be said that the common values had indeed reserved in a special place in Gökalp's understanding of nation.

record the culture of the common folk in order to advance in civilization. However, in the Empire, the elites despised the common folk and eventually brought their 'imported' culture to the society. Therefore, in the Ottoman civilization, the social institutions had emerged as pairs: Two languages, two literatures, two music styles, two aesthetics, two philosophies, and more. But, this duality could bring no achievement to the nation. Thus, due to the nation could only prosper with the efforts of these elites, Turkism aimed to make the Turkish elites to abandon the spoilt Eastern civilization –which was the Ottoman civilization– and to discover and exalt the Turkish culture.[167] From this perspective, it can be seen that Gökalp's attitude towards the Ottoman civilization was inclined to ignore it and to exalt the Turkish nation more than anything else which was built on the Turkish culture.

Additionally, according to Gökalp, the civilization was a dress which the nations could easily change.[168] In this regard, the non-Muslim nations of the Empire were able to take the civilization 'dresses' from the shops and wear it; because their cultures were already showing some similarities with the teachings of the European civilization. However, the Turkish nation of the Empire could not fit in this dress. Due to the Islamic culture the Turkish nation had already had, they were in need of tailor-made dresses, not the ones sold in the shops.[169] Moreover, in another account, Gökalp claimed that the Empire had to be collapsed because it was consisted of multiple components just like all the other empires without a culture of its own.[170] Hence, in a position where the Empire which had no culture of its own that cannot wear the dress bought from the shop and where it cannot restrain its non-Muslim elements not to wear that dress due to it did not have its own culture to promote; there was just one option left for Turkish nation: Sewing its own dress. Thus, in 1911, Gökalp had come up with a fresh plan in order to sew the national dress with some cultural ornaments attached on, which he advocated for the rest of his life: *Yeni Hayat* (New Life).

In his article titled *Yeni Hayat ve Yeni Kıymetler* (New Lives and New Values) published in 1911, Gökalp introduced a new lifestyle for the Turkish 'nation' of the Empire. According to him, the political revolution was indeed completed in 1908; however, the

---

[167] *Makaleler IV*, pp. 44-50.
[168] *Makaleler IX*, p. 39.
[169] *Makaleler II*, pp. 44-45.
[170] Gökalp 1968, p. 39.

'actual' duty was not completed and a new lifestyle shall be implemented into the nation by a social revolution.[171] Gökalp claimed the social revolution was disapproving the previous life and establishing a new one. Hence, the New Life was establishing a new economic system, a new family system, a new aesthetics system, a new philosophical system, a new moral system, a new law system, and a new political system.[172] After stating what he desired to establish, Gökalp focused on 'proving' his hypothesis. According to him, New Life was a social movement which carried a set of methods within. Additionally, Gökalp resembled New Life to science; it did not include certain values but it had some certain rules to follow.[173] At this point, two different concepts emerged: Rule and value.

Gökalp defined the rule concept over the traditions. According to him, both the conservatives and the radicals set their identities over some exact rules. The conservatives did not want the rules to be changed whereas the radicals took the rules as the laws. These two camps, which were obstacles in front of the desired advance and progress in his approach, did not check the origins of the rules; according to them, the rules had always been existed and they would exist forever. At this point, Gökalp claimed the rules became habits in time by repeating them countless times. Therefore, the elderly people tended to be conservatives by repeating the same rule many times whereas the young took the rules of the Western nations as laws and eventually became 'radicals' by imitating them. However, regardless of the name assigned to them, the rules were stable, fixed, and therefore they were dead entities. Yet, the essence of the life was based on a creative progress. Turkish nation on the other hand, always tended to throw the old rules away and import the new rules and institutions. Thereby, these newly imported rules could not find enough time to adapt themselves into the Turkish nation. Instead of doing this, the Turkish nation should have revived its own ancient rules. The ancient rules of Turkishness and Islam had changed too many times that they left some residues behind which the society considered them laws. Since the traditions of Turkishness and Islam were not investigated deeply, the European civilization introduced itself to the Ottoman society as a set of some fixed rules

---

[171] Although their ultimate goals were not completely similar, by claiming the necessity of a 'social revolution' after the 1908 Revolution, this attitude alone shows some similarities with the Socialist movement during the Second Constititutional Era. From this particular example, it can be claimed that the intellectual movements during this era were prone to justify themselves over the 1908 Revolution by asserting their own proposals and suggesting a 'social revolution' to the Ottoman society more than anything else. For detailed information *see*. Chapter 1, Footnote 100.

[172] *Makaleler II*, pp. 40-41.

[173] *Ibid.* pp. 43-44.

and principles which was expected to be imported and applied immediately. However, the rules were indeed fixed, and unable to create anything. On the other hand, the traditions were alive. Therefore, the newly imported rules shall be grafted into the traditions to blossom. Hence, by avoiding conservatism and 'tradition-less' rule importing, New Life could produce a modernized Turkish nation by importing the contemporary science, technique, and philosophy of the age and grafting them into the religious and national traditions of the nation.[174]

The value concept had some important role to play in this New Life program. Gökalp claimed the social structure of the Turkish nation was strong, and the Turkish nation was the most civilized society among the Muslim communities of the world. Although this nation carried all these positive characteristics within, it was still way too behind from the European civilization. Therefore, it was needed to examine two concepts which played a huge role in the rise of the civilized societies: The social cooperation and the differentiation of the values. The values should not be confused with the facts. Facts were solid, and fixed for everyone. However, the values differ from one man to another, related with their perspectives. Additionally, the institutions of a civilization and culture evaluated the values from their own respective perspectives. For instance, a naked painting of a woman could be considered a bad thing from the eyes of the ethical values; however, it could be a monumental piece of art from the perspective of the aesthetical and artistic values. Moreover, the interest *(faiz)* was strictly forbidden for the Islamic values; on the other hand, it was beneficial for the economical values. Therefore, Gökalp argued that each value shall be considered within its own league. If something was considered 'sacred' it shall be categorized under the religious values, if it was considered 'good' it shall be put into the moral values, if it was considered 'beautiful' it shall remain within the aesthetical values. Thus, in order to be 'civilized', it is needed to evaluate the values within their own contexts. In order to implement the New Life, importing the European values would not be enough; these imported values shall be considered within their own category, without confusing the values of the Turkish and Islamic discourses.[175]

The third issue *Yeni Hayat* focused on was the social cooperation. According to Gökalp, the social cooperation concept had two different pillars which shall support each other:

---

[174] Gökalp, *Türkleşmek…* pp. 25-30.
[175] *Makaleler IV*, pp. 67-70.

Solidarity within the borderlands of the nation and the division of labor among the nation. According to Gökalp, although the nations of the Western civilization had fallen behind in the civilized morals, they were in a higher place in their national morals than the Turkish nation. For instance, the European nations tended to torture the war prisoners and regard seizing their claims as an ordinary action. On the other hand, they never abandoned their nation and fatherland, and they did not abandon their national values for some financial gains. Therefore, although the Turkish nation was merciful towards the individuals of other nations, they lacked in the national morals. This was the reason Turkish nation had hundreds and thousands of traitors of nation during the late Ottoman times whereas the Western nations had none. Gökalp bewailed that he would have chosen the national values instead of civilized morals if he had a chance. Because, according to him, the higher the national values were, the stronger the social cooperation was. In the end, the fatherland was nothing but the national culture. Thus, the national morals were nothing more than the sum of national values, ideals, and duties.[176]

By naming the fatherland concept as the national culture alone, he clearly stated what the common values referred to. However, in this formulation there was another constitutive element which was vital for the Turkish nation and shall be paid the utmost importance: Islam. In an article he penned on 9 November 1916 with the name of *İttihad ve Terakki Kongresi – I* (Congress of Union and Progress – I), Gökalp participated in the famous *mani-i terakki* debate. In this article, Gökalp claimed some intellectuals believed that Islam could never be able to unite and cohere itself with the modern civilization. On the other hand, the members of CUP, and naturally Gökalp, were carrying sincere opinion that Islam was completely in accordance with the modern civilization. However, it was required to find the suitable ground to match these two concepts. According to him, the Turkish nation could not abandon its religion, Islam, and could not break the link with the modernization. He claimed it was very possible for an Islamic state to transform into a modern and civilized Islamic state. During the *Tanzimat* period, this idea was tried to be implemented to the society. However, in the end, neither the state was modernized nor Islam was able to retain its respected status. Therefore, in order to find the suitable ground to advance in civilization, these two shall be reconciled.[177] Because, as Gökalp stated:

---

[176] *Ibid.* pp. 60-61.
[177] *Makaleler VIII*, pp. 60-63.

The things that make the men happy is the religion first, and the civilization second. Neither the irreligious civilization can serve nor the uncivilized religion… If the religion and the civilization can go side by side in a country, the people of that state can live happy.[178]

This statement alone could be taken as Gökalp's justification efforts to reconcile Turkishness, Islam, and the West. However, considering this text was written in 1920, he had already reconciled 'successfully but incompletely' these three concepts in *Türk Yurdu* journal under the name of *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* with the influence of Alfred Fouillée. Therefore, it is needed to review his final thoughts on this matter.

In his conceptualization of nation in *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, Gökalp focused on the common values. In his nation definition in this book,[179] Gökalp clearly stated that he preferred to include the common values within the nation definition while excluding the ethnicity and race. Considering Mehmet Akif had also stressed out the common values like religion, language, and education; it can be said that the conceptualizations of nation in the accounts of Akif and Gökalp were same in terms of the common values. To summarize, both Akif and Gökalp preferred to describe the nation as a sovereign entity through the non-materialistic features rather than racial and ethnic identities while Akif addressed it as a political one whereas Gökalp preferred to strip that from the political field in the end.

4. 4. Conclusion

Throughout their lives, Akif and Gökalp had conceptualized nation in different ways. Akif used the *millet* word which corresponded to an Islamic society in his writings. The Islamic society Akif addressed was Ottomans once, was ummah for some time, and it was the Muslims in the Anatolia in the end. However, regardless of his addressed society, Akif was always considering Islam within his nation understanding. On the other hand, Gökalp had followed a different path. He conceptualized nation through his identity, through his fidelity to a political society. In his early life, even when his intellectual capabilities could

---

[178] *"İnsanı mes'ud eden evvelâ din, sonra medeniyettir. Ne dinsiz medeniyet bir işe yarar, ne de medeniyetsiz din… Bir memlekette dinle medeniyet berâber giderse, o memleket ahâlisi bahtıyâr yaşar"*. Fevziye Abdullah Tansel (Ed.), *Ziya Gökalp Külliyâtı – II: Limni ve Malta Mektupları*, 2nd Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1989, p. 436.

[179] "A nation is not a racial or ethnic or geographical or political or volitional group but one composed of individuals who share a common language, religion, morality and aesthetics, that is to say, who have received the same education. The Turkish peasant expresses it as 'the one whose language is my language, whose religion is my religion'. In truth, a man desires more to live with those who share his language and religion than with those who share his blood, for the human personality does not dwell in the physical body but in the soul" *see*. Footnote 106.

be taken as relatively weak, Gökalp had managed to conceptualize nation. According to him, he felt he was an Ottoman and therefore he pledged his allegiance along with his fidelity to the Ottoman nation. However, later, he had realized that the Ottomans could not be a nation according to his sociological self-training, and he asserted his Turkishness identity along with his understanding of the Turkish nation. From this point on, Gökalp had come up with several new ideas and methods to define nation, and he tried to fix the lacking parts of his conceptualization of nation by improving his Turkism ideal.

The changes in their understandings of nation followed a similar path with the changes of the political environment which they had witnessed. Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp were born during the European age of nationalism, prospered during the Ottoman age of intellectual movements which was the Second Constitutional Era, and eventually became the eye-witnesses of an enormous transition in the politics and society by the establishment of the Turkish Republic. Considering the fact that both Akif and Gökalp were representing two distinctive political trends in the late Ottoman society, with the respect of the intense intellectual disputes between the followers of Turkism and Islamism movements through several periodicals during the Second Constitutional Era, it was expected from them to keep their identities intact. However, although they have followed different paths throughout their lives and altered their identities several times, both Akif and Gökalp had met at the same point in the end: Limiting the space of their conceptualizations of nation with Anatolia alone.

In the beginning, the Turkish Republic defined the nation through the society which had participated in the Turkish War of Independence, the Anatolian society. Additionally, the Turkish Constitution of 1921 described the nation over the sovereignty. Therefore, Mehmet Akif's and Ziya Gökalp's conceptualizations of nation shifted towards the same tendency. Mehmet Akif put the sovereignty into the Turkish Independence March with some Islamic terms, and conceptualized nation upon some traditional elements. Akif approved the constitutional definition of the nation, and put his faith in the nation's sovereignty which he addressed as "The days shall come as the God promised to you"[180] in the march which was written more than two years earlier than the establishment of the new regime. On the other hand, Gökalp's tendency on sovereignty emphasis in the Constitution showed itself in the culture. Gökalp conceptualized nation through the culture, and limited

---

[180] *"Doğacaktır sana vadettiği günler Hakk'ın".*

the nation concept with Turkish culture alone, which he defined it with the fatherland word. From these two perspectives of Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp, it can be said that the nation conceptualization of the Constitution influenced both of them. Therefore, in the end, both Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp finalized their particular conceptualization journeys of nation; and although they followed different paths, their ultimate versions of nation met at the similar definition with the Constitution of the newly established Turkish state; particularly with the Anatolia alone, more or less.

CONCLUSION

It is argued in this thesis that the conceptualizations of nation in the accounts of Mehmet Akif Ersoy and Ziya Gökalp had changed in time, in parallel to the sociopolitical changes of Turkey. By this, the main research question derived from this problematization was "Did Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp change their conceptualizations of nation during the Second Constitutional Era?". Naturally, the main question brought several other sub-questions which were "If their understandings of nation had changed in time, which situations had an impact on these changes?", "How many times did they change?", "Did their understandings change completely each time or can some residues of earlier versions be tracked?", "Did their conceptualizations meet at some similar points or draw completely apart?", "Did their conceptualizations of nation influence their fellow followers of the particular intellectual movement they represented?", "What was the impact of Turkist and Islamist conceptualizations of nation in the late Ottoman politics?", and "Can their nation understandings be evaluated with the constitutive elements of the contemporary definition of nation?".

In order to find an answer to the research question, the first and foremost job was reviewing their [original] works in detail. After reviewing their thoughts on nation, in a quest to find answers for the sub-questions along with the main question, two hypotheses emerged for the thesis. The first hypothesis argued Akif's and Gökalp's conceptualizations of nation had changed several times in parallel to the sociopolitical changes in Turkey, and second one argued Akif's and Gökalp's conceptualizations of nation can be evaluated with the constitutive elements of the contemporary definition of nation. Although the main engagement was consulting the works written by Akif and Gökalp themselves, at some unclear situations and to clearly state some complicated challenges, the works and comments of other scholars who studied on Akif and Gökalp earlier were utilized.

After both the questions and methods were clear, the thesis focused on to determine the conceptual framework and reviewed various definitions of nation along with the origins of the term. Additionally, since the nation term had its own correspondent in Turkish, *millet*, the semantic shifts this word had received in the late Ottoman times were discussed briefly. After general characteristics of the *millet* word were reviewed, it was time to examine the period Akif and Gökalp flourished as two famous intellectuals of two different intellectual movements during the Second Constitutional Era; yet, the background of this period shall be reminded briefly.

Ottoman Empire, had managed to grow its area of influence over three continents during its first three centuries or so. The conquest of Constantinople by Sultan Mehmed II in 1453, Sultan Selim I's campaign of Mamluk Sultanate in the early 16th century, and Siege of Vienna in 1529 by Sultan Süleyman I can be given as examples on expanding the Ottoman political influence beyond Anatolia. However, in the course of time, particularly in the early 18th century, the Empire started to lose its influence beyond Anatolia. The main reason of this gradual loss of power was the military and economic rise of the Western states. Thus, the Ottoman sultans and statesmen made an analysis of the situation, and they had decided to make several reforms for the troubling parts of the Empire while importing modern institutions, sciences, and techniques from the West. Although these modernization attempts were mostly based on military branches at first, the Empire had also sent civilian students to European states for education. These students trained themselves well, they had learned several newly emerged political terms from Europe, and they introduced these terms to the Ottoman society; the nation, the civilization, and the fatherland terms could be named among these.

While making reforms was initially regarded as the duty of the ruling class in the Empire, with the growing numbers of Ottoman intellectuals as a result of European-style education, these intellectuals involved in the reform process and either criticized the situation or proposed some alternatives in addition to the promotion of implementation of some certain reform steps. The intellectuals during the late Ottoman times had struggled to fix the adverse parts of the Empire with their own proposals; yet, the throne considered these proposals and ideas as 'ill' and therefore both Young Ottomans and Young Turks had to spread their ideas from Europe. However, with the introduction of a new period to the Empire in 1908, the Second Constitutional Era, the former exiled intellectuals seized the

opportunity to influence power. The era presented a relatively free intellectual environment; therefore, several sociopolitical periodicals had emerged during this time. Additionally, these periodicals were representing different intellectual movements; the movements which claimed they had the 'best' solution to save the Empire. Among the others, two intellectual movements during the Second Constitutional Era had the enormous impact to the society: Islamism and Turkism.

The introduction of new political concepts, especially by the Young Ottomans, led to the transform of the meanings of some age-old political concepts. Moreover, the center of new political lexicon had also fundamentally changed in a relatively short span of time. With the emergence of different intellectual movements during the Second Constitutional Era, these movements had defined and conceptualized some terms in parallel to their own sociopolitical thoughts. The nation term, which is corresponded to *millet* word in Turkish, already had several different usages and a long history; in both political and religious aspects. Against this background, this research focused on both the changes of the term in time, Islamist and Turkist conceptualization of nation, and a comparison between these two movements over the approaches of their famous intellectuals; Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp, two leading figures of two different and competing intellectual movements in the Second Constitutional Era, whose legacies can still be considered alive, even today.

Additionally, the *millet* and ummah definitions had experienced a cross-change in their ultimate positions in the late Ottoman times. Historically *millet* word was addressing a religious society whereas the ummah word was addressing a political society, and they were also used in this manner in Quran. However, with some mistranslations of the orientalists who translated Quran into European languages, the *millet* word became a political matter while ummah started to represent a religious society. At this point, Islamists and Turkists had also felt obliged to say something on this change, refreshed their understandings of nation, and they had conceptualized nation through their own perspectives. Reviewing through the written accounts of two leading figures of these two intellectual trends, Akif and Gökalp, although their core definitions of nation remained relatively sticky in parallel to their intellectual trends in different periods, their nation conceptualizations had altered alongside with the sociopolitical conditions of Turkey.

Moreover, Mehmet Akif was always an Islamist and he had always placed Islam on top in his discourses. Considering his fall on the ideal of Muslim unity, *ittihad-ı İslam*, it was

more meaningful for Akif to conceptualize nation over the ummah concept. However, this conceptualization had also changed in time. Although his understanding of nation had always included strong references to ummah, the scope of people he addressed as ummah and similarly nation shrank in time, geographically. At first, when the Empire was relatively strong over three continents, Akif's nation understanding was addressing a greater ummah which covered a space of Muslim community from the Balkans to Arabian Peninsula. However, the Balkan Wars and territorial losses had shrunk the scope of his conceptualization of nation to unity of Ottoman Muslim elements in the Empire. His speeches in this period were tended to unite these elements. With the loss of Hejaz, the Balkans, and North Africa the Empire had to retreat back to its ancient mainland, Anatolia. At this point, Akif's conceptualization of nation was simply through the Anatolian Muslims. So indeed that the Turkish Independence March Akif had penned in 1921 was also addressing the nation by using Islamic terms. As a result, in Akif's accounts, his conceptualization of nation had always shaped around the Muslim identity, regardless of its changes; but, the scope had changed and also geographically shrank.

Ziya Gökalp on the other hand, conceptualized the nation in the modern sense. As it was analyzed earlier, Gökalp was an Ottoman nationalist in the beginning and he became a Turkish nationalist in time. By this, he had conceptualized nation towards his fidelity to a 'national' community in accordance with the changes in the sense of his identity. When he was an Ottoman nationalist, he preferred to define the nation concept with reference to his Ottoman identity. After he turned to a Turkish nationalist, he excavated through the history, found appropriate tools to justify his hypothesis, and conceptualized nation through his Turkish identity. In order to do this, he built his nation concept via cultural nationalism and defined Turkism through the social impact of the culture. The sociopolitical condition that caused the changes in Gökalp's nation understanding was same with Akif's conditional surroundings; but, actually it was not. Akif constructed his nation concept based on Islam; hence, as long as Turkey remained Muslim, his core conceptualization of nation would remain same. On the other hand, Gökalp had altered his nation concept in accordance with his political loyalty. While the Empire was an absolute monarchy, Ziya was an Ottoman 'subject'. When the regime had changed into a constitutional monarchy, Gökalp became an Ottoman 'citizen'. It was the age of

intellectual movements in the Empire, and Gökalp simply derived his nation understanding from the indoctrination of Turkism.

Among several constitutive elements of nation, the thesis selected three core elements from the previously mentioned definitions of nation in the introduction chapter as political community, sovereignty, and common values in order to compare Akif's and Gökalp's conceptualizations of nation. In conceptualizing nation as a political community, it is clear that Akif and Gökalp differed from each other. Akif's approach to nation was addressing a political society and it was similar with Gökalp in his Ottoman nationalist times. However, when Gökalp turned to a Turkish nationalist, he had moved his nation understanding from political area to cultural area, and defined the characteristics of nation culturally whereas Akif had always addressed a political community in his definitions (or descriptions) of the nation concept. Likewise, Akif's perspective on the sovereignty was originated from the Islamic teachings; the one true sovereign was the God and he could grant the sovereignty to which he desired. Gökalp however, always claimed the sovereignty belonged to the nation. It was Ottoman nation in his earlier thoughts, and he had claimed the Turkish nation was the sole sovereign entity in his late accounts. Finally, Akif had taken Islam and Islamic traditions into consideration in his conceptualization of nation. Even both in his earlier poems and articles and also his late work, the Turkish Independence March, this tendency on taking common values as the teachings of Islam could easily be traced. Gökalp on the other hand, used the common values addressing in his conceptualization of nation and described nation through culture. Hence, it is clear that apart from their attributed emphasis on the sovereignty of the nation as a constitutive element, Akif and Gökalp had also met at the same point with regard to the central role of the common values in their conceptualizations of nation; yet, it should be reminded that former one was taking Islam and Islamic teachings as the common values whereas the latter had respected the culture as the common values.

After reviewing the changes in the conceptualization of nation in Mehmet Akif and Ziya Gökalp's accounts, it is clear that Akif was more conservative in his changes while Gökalp had more tendencies to change his understanding from bottom to the top. Akif had never given up conceptualizing nation around the religion, Islam; but Gökalp had changed his central position often. Is is because he was intensively influenced from various Western intellectuals during his intellectual journey. The same reason caused Cemil Meriç to

criticize Gökalp harshly for getting continuously influenced from the Western intellectuals and changed his origin often when it comes to suggest an intellectual opinion.[1] The conservative attitude of Akif in his conceptualization of the nation however was always strictly based on his beliefs, his utmost faith in Islam in this case. As a matter of fact, Akif's attitude towards his faith was precisely summarized by Nazım Hikmet with a few words as follows:

> - In our Independence March, there is a halting part,
> I do not know how to tell.
> Akif, is a [believer].
> Yet I do not believe in
> Everything he believed.[2]

It is clear that with the assessments this thesis pointed out, the research question that caused it to be written was answered thoroughly. However, the weak parts of the thesis can be reviewed under two titles as the challenges in translation and the organization of the thesis. For the translation part, the quotes from the articles were translated one-on-one. However, in poems, instead of translating the words one by one, in several cases, the 'actual' meaning of the poem were given. Additionally, Akif and Gökalp did not follow a straight path in their writings. So, the quotes from their works include several triple dots, which can be taken as a weak point on aesthetics of the thesis, and both the subjects and the verbs had to be altered in translations. For the organization of the thesis, the comparison between Akif and Gökalp on the similarities and differences on some specific matters both intellectuals dealt with apart from the concept of nation could be reviewed in a separate chapter. However, such an attempt was beyond the scope of the thesis and this is why these comparisons had to be placed in the footnotes instead.

Finally, since this thesis focused on comparing the changes of the nation concept alone, similar changes can also be tracked in other concepts which were extensively introduced by the Young Ottomans to the Turkish political and intellectual life first, like civilization (*medeniyet*) and fatherland (*vatan*). Yet, these terms could be analyzed in other works because this thesis had limited itself with conceptualization of nation alone. Hopefully, the

---

[1] Hüsamettin Arslan, "Cemil Meriç ile Mülâkat" in *Nesillerin Mirası Türkiye Kültür ve Sanat Yıllığı*, Türkiye Yazarlar Birliği, Ankara, 1986, pp. 586-594.
[2] *"- Bizim İstiklâl Marşında aksayan bir taraf var, / bilmem, nasıl anlatsam. / Akif, inanmış adam. / Fakat onun ben / inandıklarının hepsine inanmıyorum."* Nazım Hikmet, *Kurtuluş Savaşı Destanı*, Yön, İstanbul, 1965, p. 71.

method of this thesis would be taken as a reference point for other researchers to grasp, and Akif's and Gökalp's –as well as other leading figures of different intellectual trends during the Second Constitutional Era– conceptualizations of civilization, fatherland, justice, order, etc. which are still waiting to be studied in the social sciences will be reviewed. After all, as Tunaya stated in the beginning of the first chapter, "the Second Constitutional Era was -in some sort of- a political laboratory".[3]

---

[3] Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri*, Yedigün, İstanbul, 1960, pp. 97-98.

REFERENCES

1. Articles

Adıvar, Abdülhak Adnan, "Türkiye'de İslâmi ve Batılı Düşüncelerin Etkileşimi" in _____, *Türkiye'de İslâm ve Laiklik (Derleme)*, İnsan, İstanbul, 1995, pp. 11-21.

Akçura, Yusuf, "Hüseyinzade Ali Bey", *Türk Yurdu*, No. 82, 23 Nisan 1331, pp. 2566-2570.

Akgün, Birol & Şaban H. Çalış, "Tanrı Dağı Kadar Türk, Hira Dağı Kadar Müslüman: Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Terkibinde İslâmcı Doz" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce – Milliyetçilik*, 3rd Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2008, pp. 584-600.

Aktay, Yasin, "Reform, İctihad ve Tecdid Bağlamında İslâm ve Hayat", *Milel ve Nihal*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 43-73.

Andı, M. Fatih, "Medeniyyet Dediğin…" in Hasan Akay & M. Fatih Andı (Ed.), *İstiklâl Marşı İstikbâl Marşı 41 Dize 41 Yorum*, 5th Edition, Hat, İstanbul, 2013, pp. 269-278.

Arslan, Hüsamettin, "Cemil Meriç ile Mülâkat" in _____, *Nesillerin Mirası Türkiye Kültür ve Sanat Yıllığı*, Türkiye Yazarlar Birliği, Ankara, 1986, pp. 586-594.

Ayata, Yunus, "Mehmet Akif Ersoy'un Asım'ında Toplumsal Meseleler", *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Vol. 2, No. 38, 2015, pp. 35-52.

Aydın, Mustafa, "Kültür ve Medeniyet İkilemine Farklı Bir Bakış" in Süleyman Güder & Yunus Çolak (Ed.), *Medeniyet Tartışmaları Yüceltme ve Reddiye Arasında Medeniyeti Anlamak Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, İstanbul, 2013, pp. 103-114.

Baş, Muhammed Fazıl, "Ziya Gökalp'in Malta Konferansları" in Korkut Tuna & İsmail Coşkun (Ed.), *Ziya Gökalp (1875-1924)*, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, Ankara, 2011, pp. 151-167.

Bayat, Asef, "Islamism and Social Movement Theory", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 6, 2005, pp. 891-908.

Berkes, Niyazi, "Sociology in Turkey", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 42, No. 2, September 1936, pp. 238-246.

Belge, Murat, "Türkiye'de Sosyalizm Tarihinin Ana Çizgileri" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce – Sol*, 2nd Edition, Vol. 8, İletişim, İstanbul, 2008, pp. 19-48.

Beysanoğlu, Şevket, "Ziya Gökalp'te Diyarbakır, Diyarbakır'da Ziya Gökalp", *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Sosyoloji Konferansları*, 1976, Vol. 14, pp. 17-24.

Birinci, Necat, "Akif'in Hayatı ve Eserleri", *Türk Edebiyatı (Mehmed Âkif Anıt Sayısı)*, December 1986, No. 158, pp. 70-77.

Canefe, Nergis and Tanıl Bora, "The Intellectual Roots of Anti-European Sentiments in Turkish Politics: The Case of Radical Turkish Nationalism", *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 127-148.

Çetin, Nurullah, "İstiklal Marşımızı Anlamak", *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Türkoloji Dergisi*, Vol. 2, No. 21, 2014, pp. 25-92.

Çetinsaya, Gökhan, "İslâmcılıktaki Milliyetçilik" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce – İslâmcılık*, 2nd Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2005, pp. 420-451.

Daşcıoğlu, Yılmaz, "Edebiyat Üzerinden Ulus İnşası: Ziya Gökalp'in Şairliği" in Korkut Tuna & İsmail Coşkun (Ed.), *Ziya Gökalp (1875-1924)*, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, Ankara, 2011, pp. 57-65.

Demir, Mustafa, "Türk-İslam Medeniyetinde Şehirleşme", *İslami Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 2003, pp. 156-165.

Denby, David, "Herder: Culture, Anthropology and the Enlightenment", *History of Human Sciences*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 2005, pp. 55-76.

Doğan, Necmettin, "Türk Düşüncesinde 'Mani-i Terakki' Meselesi", *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Year 9, No. 17, Spring 2010, pp. 177-187.

Doğan, Necmettin, "İlerleme ve Medeniyet Kavramlarının Türk Düşüncesinde Etkileşimi" in Süleyman Güder and Yunus Çolak (Ed.), *Medeniyet Tartışmaları Yüceltme ve Reddiye Arasında Medeniyeti Anlamak Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, İstanbul, 2013, pp. 247-267.

Eikmeier, Dale C., "Qutbism: An Ideology of Islamic-Fascism", *Parameters*, No. 14, 2007, pp. 85-97.

Erdoğan, Aynur, "Tanzimat Döneminde Yurtdışına Öğrenci Gönderme Olgusu ve Osmanlı Modernleşmesine Etkileri", *İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Dergisi*, Vol. 3, No. 20, 2010, pp. 121-151.

Gülendam, Ramazan, "Mehmet Âkif'e Göre Müslümanlardaki Ümitsizlik İlleti", *SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, No. 20, December 2009, pp. 121-134.

Gülmez, Mesut, "Tanzimat'tan Sonra İşçi Örgütlenmesi ve Çalışma Koşulları (1839-1919)" in Collective, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 3, İletişim, İstanbul, 1985, pp. 792-802.

Güneş, İhsan, "II. Meşrutiyet Dönemi Hükümet Programları (1908-1918)", *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi OTAM*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1990, pp. 171-269.

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Meslek-i İçtima Akımı" in Collective, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 2, İletişim, İstanbul, 1985, pp. 382-386.

İnalcık, Halil, "II. Meşrutiyet: Anayasa Rejimi Geliyor, Cumhuriyet Yolu Açılıyor" in Taşkın Takış & Sunay Aksoy (Ed.), *Doğu Batı Halil İnalcık: Makaleler II*, Doğu Batı, Ankara, 2008, pp. 203-209.

Kabakçı, Enes, "Durkheim ve Gökalp: Tarih, İdeoloji vs Sosyolojinin Özerkliği Meselesi" in Korkut Tuna & İsmail Coşkun (Ed.), *Ziya Gökalp (1875-1924)*, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, Ankara, 2011, pp. 205-217.

Kara, İsmail, "İslamcı Söylemin Kaynakları ve Gerçeklik Değeri" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce – İslâmcılık*, 2nd Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2005, pp. 34-47.

Kara, İsmail, "Kimin Milletindensin? İstiklal Marşı'ndaki 'Millet' Üzerine Bir Deneme", *Dergâh*, Vol. 21, No. 251, January 2011, 16-19.

Karakaş, Mehmet, "Türkçülük ve Türk Milliyetçiliği", *Doğu Batı*, No. 38, August, September, October 2006, pp. 57-76.

Karagöz, Mehmet, "Osmanlı Devletinde Islahat Hareketleri ve Batı Medeniyetine Giriş Gayretleri (1700-1839)", *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi OTAM*, Vol. 6, No. 6, 1995, pp. 173-194.

Kardaş, Rıza, "Ziya Gökalp'in 'Eğitim Anlayışı'na Toplu Bir Bakış" in Ziya Gökalp, *Makaleler V*, Rıza Kardaş (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1981, pp. 1-26

Kurtoğlu, Mehmet, "Mehmet Akif Kültür Evi", *Vakıflar Dergisi*, No. 44, December 2015, pp. 131-144.

Lee, Dwight E., "The Origins of Pan-Islamism", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 47, N. 2, January 1942, pp. 278-287.

Mertoğlu, Suat, "Akif Araştırmalarına Bibliyografik Bir Katkı: Mehmet Akif'in Arapça'dan Yaptığı Tercümeler Üzerine Notlar", *Divan: Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, Vol. 1999/2, No. 7, pp. 235-249.

Mertoğlu, Suat, "Doğrudan Doğruya Kur'an'dan Alıp İlhamı: Kur'an'a Dönüş'ten Kur'an İslamı'na", *Divan: Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, Vol. 2010/1, No. 28, pp. 69-113.

Ortaylı, İlber, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Millet" in Collective, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 4, İletişim, İstanbul, 1985, pp. 996-1001

Ozan, İbrahim Halil, "II. Abdülhamid Döneminde İslamcı Muhalefet ve Mehmet Akif Ersoy", *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, No. 4-5, 2016, pp. 146-164.

Öz, Hilal Karavar, "Birinci Meclis İçindeki Tartışmalar ve Halk Fırkası'nın Kuruluş Süreci", *Journal of Current Researches on Social Sciences*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 2017, pp. 363-374.

Özbalcı, Mustafa, "Batılılaşma Gayretlerimiz ve Mehmet Akif Ersoy", *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 190-221.

Özgen, Mustafa, "Mehmet Akif Ersoy'un Türk Eğitimine Katkıları", *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, No. 4-5, 2016, pp. 146-164.

Palabıyık, Mustafa Serdar, "Broadening the Horizons of the 'International' by Historicizing it: Comparative Historical Analysis", *All Azimuth*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2019, pp. 307-325.

Sabev, Orlin, "The Legend of Köse Mihal Additional Notes", *Turcica*, No. 34, 2002, pp. 241-252.

Sağlam, Mustafa Kemal, "Osmanlı Modernleşmesinde Entelijansiyanın İcadı: Şinasi" in Aytaç Yıldız (Ed.), *Türkiye'den Aydın Portreleri – I: Kurtuluş Kayalı*, Doğu Batı, Ankara, 2017, pp. 278-293.

Somel, Selçuk Akşin, "Osmanlı Reform Çağında Osmanlıcılık Düşüncesi (1839-1913)" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce – Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası: Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi*, 8th Edition, İletişim, İstanbul, 2009, pp. 88-116.

Şener, Abdülkadir, "İslam Hukukunda İçtihad ve Taklid Problemi", *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol. 1990, No. 24, pp. 375-387.

Şimşirgil, Ahmet, "Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluşunda Hizmeti Geçen Alpler ve Gaziler" in Güler Eren (Ed.), *Türkler*, Vol. IX, Yeni Türkiye, pp. 99-106.

Toprak, Zafer, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Korporatif Dünya Görüşü: Meslekçilik" in Collective, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 2, İletişim, İstanbul, 1985, pp. 371-376.

Tunaya, Tarık Z., "Amme Hukukumuz Bakımından İkinci Meşrutiyetin Siyasî Tefekküründe «İslâmcılık» Cereyanı", *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası*, Vol. 19, No. 3-4, 1954, pp. 630-770.

Tütengil, M. Cavid, "Prens Sabahaddin", *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, Vol. 2, No. 4-5, 1954, pp. 176-220.

Uyanık, Necmi, "Batıcı Bir Aydın Olarak Celâl Nuri İleri ve Yenileşme Sürecinde Fikir Hareketlerine Bakışı", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 1, No. 15, 2004, pp. 227-274.

Uyanık, Necmi, "Celal Nuri İleri ve Tarih Anlayışı", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, No. 16, Fall 2004, pp. 239-258.

Ünsal, Fatma Bostan, "Mehmet Akif Ersoy" in Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekingil (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce - İslamcılık*, 2nd Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2005, pp. 72-89.

Weber, Max, "Millet", Ebru Çerezcioğlu (Trans.), *Doğu Batı*, No. 39, November, December, January 2006-2007, pp. 181-188.

Zürcher, Erik Jan, "Genç Türkler: Hudut Boylarının Çocukları?", İlknur Türe (Trans.), *Muhafazakâr Düşünce*, No. 16-17, Spring-Summer 2008, pp. 231-242.

2. Books

Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi (1996), *Son Vak'anüvis Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi Tarihi: II. Meşrutiyet Olayları (1908-1909)*, Bayram Kodaman & Mehmet Ali Ünal (Ed.), Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.

Abidin Nesimi (1940), *Türkiye'nin Tekâmül Hamlesinde Ziya Gökalp*, Sebat, İstanbul.

Afîfî, Ebu'l-Alâ (1996), *Tasavvuf: İslâm'da Manevi Devrim*, H. İbrahim Kaçar & Murat Sülün (Trans.), Risale, İstanbul.

Ağaoğlu, Ahmet (2013), *Üç Medeniyet*, 3rd Edition, Doğu, İstanbul.

Ahmad, Feroz (1993), *The Making of Modern Turkey*, Routledge, London & New York.

Ahmad, Feroz (2003), *Turkey: A Quest for Identity*, Oneworld, Oxford.

Akçura, Yusuf (1976), *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.

Akşin, Sina (1997), *Ana Çizgileriyle Türkiye'nin Yakın Tarihi 1789-1980 1. Cilt*, Cumhuriyet Gazetesi.

Akşin, Sina (2009), *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki*, 5th Edition, İmge, Ankara.

al-Hilâlî , Muhammad Taqî-ud-Dîn & Muhammad Muhsin Khân (___), *Translation of the Meanings of The Noble Qur'ân in the English Language*, King Fahd Glorious Qur'ân Printing Complex, Madinah.

Altuntaş, Halil & Muzaffer Şahin (Ed.) (2011), *Kur'an-ı Kerim Meali*, 12th Edition, Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı, Ankara.

Anderson, Benedict (1991), *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Revised Edition, Verso, London and New York.

Atatürk, Mustafa Kemal (2010), *Medeni Bilgiler*, 2nd Edition, Afet İnan (Ed.), Toplumsal Dönüşüm, İstanbul.

Barthold, W. and M. Fuad Köprülü (1984), *İslâm Medeniyeti Tarihi*, 6th Edition, Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı, Ankara.

Baykara, Tuncer (1992), *Osmanlılarda Medeniyet Kavramı ve Ondokuzuncu Yüzyıla Dair Araştırmalar*, Akademi, İzmir.

Bayur, Yusuf Hikmet (1991), *Türk İnkılâbı Tarihi Cilt I Kısım I*, 4th Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.

Bayur, Yusuf Hikmet (1991), *Türk İnkılâbı Tarihi Cilt I Kısım II*, 4th Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.

Berkes, Niyazi (1959), *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization: Selected Essays of Ziya Gökalp*, Columbia University, New York.

Berkes, Niyazi (1997), *200 Yıldır Neden Bocalıyoruz - 1*, Cumhuriyet Gazetesi, İstanbul.

Beysanoğlu, Şevket (1956), *Doğumunun 80. Yıldönümü Münasebetiyle Ziya Gökalp'in İlk Yazı Hayatı: 1894-1909*, Diyarbakır'ı Tanıtma Derneği, İstanbul.

Buckhardt, Titus (1982), *İslam Tasavvuf Doktrinine Giriş*, Fahreddin Arslan (Trans.), Ribat, İstanbul.

Bulaç, Ali (1985), *İslâm Dünyasında Düşünce Sorunları*, 2nd Edition, İnsan, İstanbul.

Bulaç, Ali (1991), *Çağdaş Kavramlar ve Düzenler*, 11th Edition, Endülüs, İstanbul.

Bulaç, Ali (1991), *Din ve Modernizm*, 2nd Edition, Endülüs, İstanbul.

Bulaç, Ali (1993), *İslâm ve Demokrasi Teokrasi – Totaliterizm*, 2nd Edition, Beyan, İstanbul.

Bülbül, Kudret (2015), *Siyasal Bir Düşünür ve Devlet Adamı Said Halim Paşa*, Tezkire, İstanbul.

Callinicos, Alex (2013), *Toplum Kuramı Tarihsel Bir Bakış*, 6th Edition, Yasemin Tezgiden (Trans.), İletişim, İstanbul.

Cebecioğlu, Ethem (2009), *Tasavvuf Terimleri ve Deyimleri Sözlüğü*, 5th Edition, Ağaç, İstanbul.

Ceyhan, Abdullah (1991), *Sırat-ı Müstakîm ve Sebîlürreşad Mecmuaları Fihristi*, Diyanet işleri Başkanlığı, Ankara.

Corcuff, Philippe (2009), *Bireycilik Sorunu Stirner Marx Durkheim Proudhon*, Aziz Ufuk Kılıç (Trans.), Versus, İstanbul.

Cündioğlu, Dücane (2010), *Akif'e Dair*, 2nd Edition, Kapı, İstanbul.

Çağaptay, Soner (2006), *Islam, Secularism, and Nationalism in Modern Turkey: Who is a Turk?*, Routledge, London & New York.

Dawisha, Adeed (2003), *Arab Nationalism in the Twentieth Century: From Triumph to Despair*, Princeton University, Princeton & Oxford.

Durkheim, Émile (1986), *Meslek Ahlâkı*, 3rd Edition, Mehmet Karasan (Trans.), Milli Eğitim, İstanbul.

Durkheim, Émile (2004), *Ahlak Eğitimi*, Oğuz Adanır (Trans.), Dokuz Eylül, İzmir.

Durkheim, Émile (2006), *Sosyoloji Dersleri*, Ali Berktay (Trans.), İletişim, İstanbul.

Düzdağ, M. Ertuğrul (1996), *Mehmed Akif Ersoy*, 2nd Edition, Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara

Eliaçık, R. İhsan (2004), *Çağa İz Bırakan Müslüman Önderler Mehmet Akif Ersoy*, İlke, İstanbul.

Eliaçık, R. İhsan (2014), *Nuzül Sırasına Göre Yaşayan Kur'an Türkçe Meal/Tefsir*, 5th Edition, İnşa, İstanbul.

Ergün, Mustafa (1996), *İkinci Meşrutiyet Devrinde Eğitim Hareketleri*, Ocak, Ankara.

Erişirgil, Mehmet Emin (1984), *Bir Fikir Adamının Romanı Ziya Gökalp*, 2nd Edition, Aykut Kazancıgil & Cem Alpar (Ed.), Remzi, İstanbul.

Erişirgil, Mehmet Emin (2006), *İslamcı Bir Şairin Romanı Mehmet Akif*, 3rd Edition, Aykut Kazancıgil & Cem Alpar (Ed.), Nobel, Ankara.

Ersoy, Mehmet Âkif (2011), *Safahat*, Şenol Tanju (Ed.), Türk Telekom, İstanbul.

Ersoy, Mehmed Âkif (2013), *Kur'an Meali Fatiha Sûresi – Berâe Sûresi*, 2nd Edition, Recep Şentürk & Asım Cüneyd Köksal (Ed.), Mahya, İstanbul.

Ersoy, Mehmed Âkif (2013), *Safahat*, 9th Edition, M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (Ed.), Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, Ankara.

Fuzuli (1958), *Leylâ ve Mecnun*, Nevzat Yesirgil (Ed.), Yeditepe, İstanbul.

Gellner, Ernest (1983), *Nations and Nationalism*, Cornell University, New York.

Georgeon, François (1986), *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935)*, Alev Er (Trans.), Yurt, Ankara.

Georgeon, François (2006), *Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi 1900-1930 Seçilmiş Makaleler*, Ali Berktay (Trans.), Yapı Kredi, İstanbul

Gökalp, Ziya (1968), *The Principles of Turkism*, Robert Devereux (Trans.), E. J. Brill, Leiden.

Gökalp, Ziya (1968), *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, 7th Edition, Varlık, İstanbul.

Gökalp, Ziya (1976), *Makaleler I*, Şevket Baysanoğlu (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, İstanbul.

Gökalp, Ziya (1976), *Türk Medeniyeti Tarihi*, İsmail Aka & Kâzım Yaşar Kopraman (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, İstanbul.

Gökalp, Ziya (1976), *Yeni Hayat Doğru Yol*, Müjgân Cunbur (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara.

Gökalp, Ziya (1977), *Makaleler III*, M. Orhan Durusoy (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara.

Gökalp, Ziya (1977), *Makaleler IV*, Ferit Ragıp Tuncor (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara.

Gökalp, Ziya (1980), *Makaleler IX*, Şevket Baysanoğlu (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, İstanbul.

Gökalp, Ziya (1981), *Makaleler V*, Rıza Kardaş (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara.

Gökalp, Ziya (1981), *Makaleler VIII*, Ferit Ragıp Tuncor (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara.

Gökalp, Ziya (1981), *Türk Devleti'nin Tekâmülü*, Kâzım Yaşar Kopraman (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara.

Gökalp, Ziya (1982), *Makaleler II*, Süleyman Hayri Bolay (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara.

Gökalp, Ziya (1982), *Makaleler VII*, M. Abdülhalûk Çay (Ed.), Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara.

Gökalp, Ziya (2018), *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, Mustafa Özsarı (Ed.), 5th Edition, Ötüken, İstanbul.

Göksel, Ali Nüzhet (Ed.) (1949), *Ölümünün 25. Yıldönümü Münasebetiyle Ziya Gökalp Hayatı-Eserleri*, Ahmet Halit, İstanbul.

Göksel, Ali Nüzhet (1956), *Ziya Gökalp'in Neşredilmemiş Yedi Eseri ve Aile Mektupları*, Diyarbakır'ı Tanıtma Derneği, İstanbul.

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbâki (1985), *100 Soruda Tasavvuf*, 2nd Edition, Gerçek, İstanbul.

Gövsa, İbrahim Alaettin (1943), *Elli Türk Büyüğü*, Yedigün, İstanbul.

Gözübüyük, A. Şeref and Suna Kili (1982), *Türk Anayasa Metinleri 1839-1980*, 2nd Edition, AÜSBF, Ankara.

Halliday, Fred (2005), *The Middle East in International Relations: Power, Politics and Ideology*, Cambridge University.

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü (1981), *Bir Siyasal Düşünür Olarak Doktor Abdullah Cevdet ve Dönemi*, Üçdal, İstanbul.

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü (1995), *The Young Turks in Opposition*, Oxford University.

Heyd, Uriel (1950), *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp*, Luzac & Company Ltd. & The Harvill Press Ltd., London.

Hinsley, Francis Harry (1986), *Sovereignty*, 2nd Edition, Cambridge University, Cambridge.

Itani, Talal (2014), *The Quran English Translation*, ClearQuran, Dallas (Beirut).

Kansu, Aykut (1995), *1908 Devrimi*, Ayda Erbal (Trans.), İletişim, İstanbul.

Kara, İsmail (1986), *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi Metinler/Kişiler*, Risale, İstanbul.

Kara, İsmail (2017), *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi 1 Metinler Kişiler*, 3rd Edition, Dergâh, İstanbul.

Kara, İsmail (2017), *Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi 2 Metinler Kişiler*, 3rd Edition, Dergâh, İstanbul.

Kara, İsmail (2018), *Din ile Modernleşme Arasında Çağdaş Türk Düşüncesinin Meseleleri*, 6th Edition, Dergâh, İstanbul.

Karakoç, Sezai (1987), *Mehmed Âkif*, 6th Edition, Diriliş, İstanbul.

Karal, Enver Ziya (2003), *Osmanlı Tarihi VII. Cilt*, 6th Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.

Karal, Enver Ziya (2007), *Osmanlı Tarihi VIII. Cilt*, 6th Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.

Karataş, Cengiz (2014), *II. Meşrutiyet Dönemi Fikir hareketleri ve Türk Edebiyatına Yansımaları*, Akçağ, Ankara.

Karpat, Kemal H. (2001), *The Politicization of Islam: Reconstructuring Identity, State, Faith, and Community in the Late Ottoman State*, Oxford University, New York.

Kedourie, Elie (1961), *Nationalism*, Revised Edition, Hutchinson University, London.

Keyder, Çağlar (1987), *State and Class in Turkey: A Study in Capitalist Development*, Verso, London & New York.

Kınalızâde Ali Efendi (____), *Ahlâk-ı Alâî*, Hüseyin Algül (Ed.), Tercüman 1001 Temel Eser, No. 30, Kervan Kitapçılık.

Kınalızâde Ali Efendi (_____), *Devlet ve Aile Ahlâkı*, Ahmet Kahraman (Ed.), Tercüman 1001 Temel Eser, No. 69, Kervan Kitapçılık.

Koloğlu, Orhan (2010), *Osmanlı Dönemi Basınının İçeriği*, İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi, İstanbul.

Kuran, Ahmet Bedevi (2000), *İnkılâp Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler*, 2nd Edition, Kaynak, İstanbul.

Kutay, Cemal (1964), *Prens Sabahattin Bey, Sultan II. Abdülhamit, İttihat ve Terakki,* Tarih, İstanbul.

Kutay, Cemal (1964), *Üç Paşalar Kavgası*, Tarih, İstanbul.

Leaman, Oliver (Ed.) (2006), *The Qur'an: An Encyclopedia*, Routledge, London & New York.

Lewis, Bernard (1968), *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 2nd Edition, Oxford University.

Lewis, Bernard (2002), *The Arabs in History*, 6th Edition/Reissued, Oxford University.

Mardin, Şerif (1990), *Din ve İdeoloji*, 4th Edition, İletişim, İstanbul.

Mardin, Şerif (1992), *Türk Modernleşmesi*, 2nd Edition, İletişim, İstanbul.

Mardin, Şerif (2000), *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas*, Syracuse University.

Mardin, Şerif (2008), *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri 1895-1908*, 15th Edition, İletişim, İstanbul.

Mardin, Şerif (2012), *Türkiye'de Din ve Siyaset*, 17th Edition, İletişim, İstanbul.

Meriç, Cemil (2013), *Sosyoloji Notları ve Konferanslar*, Ümit Meriç (Ed.), 15th Edition, İletişim, İstanbul.

Mertoğlu, M. Suat (2008), *Sırat-ı Müstakim Mecmuası Açıklamalı Fihrist ve Dizin*, Klasik, İstanbul.

Mithat Cemal (1986), *Mehmet Akif Ersoy*, Türkiye İş Bankası, Ankara.

Natanzî, İzzeddîn Mahmûd bin Ali Kâşânî (2010), *Tasavvufun Ana Esasları*, Hakkı Uygur (Trans.), Kurtuba, İstanbul.

Nazım Hikmet (1965), *Kurtuluş Savaşı Destanı*, Yön, İstanbul.

Ortaç, Yusuf Ziya (1963), *Bir Varmış Bir Yokmuş Portreler*, 2nd Edition, Akbaba, İstanbul.

Ortaylı, İlber (2008), *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*, Timaş, İstanbul.

Özel, İsmet (2013), *Üç Mesele: Teknik-Medeniyet-Yabancılaşma*, 18th Edition, Tam İstiklâl.

Özkırımlı, Umut (2000), *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction (Foreword by Fred Halliday)*, Macmillan.

Özkırımlı, Umut (2005), *Contemporary Debates on Nationalism: A Critical Engagement*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Parla, Taha (1985), *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp: 1876-1924*, E. J. Brill, Leiden.

Quataert, Donald (2003), *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu 1700-1922*, 3rd Edition, İletişim, İstanbul.

Safa, Peyami (1981), *Türk İnkılâbına Bakışlar*, Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara.

Said Halim Paşa (2006), *Buhranlarımız ve Son Eserleri*, 5th Edition, M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (Ed.), İz, İstanbul.

Schimmel, Annemarie (1975), *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Swingewood, Alan (1984), *A Short History of Sociological Thought*, Macmillan.

Şefkatli, Murat (Ed.) (1998), *Türk Yurdu Cilt 1*, Tutibay, Ankara.

Şefkatli, Murat (Ed.) (1999), *Türk Yurdu Cilt 2*, Tutibay, Ankara.

Şefkatli, Murat (Ed.) (1999), *Türk Yurdu Cilt 3*, Tutibay, Ankara.

Tansel, Fevziye Abdullah (Ed.) (1989), *Ziya Gökalp Külliyâtı – I: Şiirler ve Halk Masalları*, 3rd Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.

Tansel, Fevziye Abdullah (Ed.) (1989), *Ziya Gökalp Külliyâtı – II: Limni ve Malta Mektupları*, 2nd Edition, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.

Tansel, Fevziye Abdullah (1991), *Mehmed Âkif Ersoy (Hayatı ve Eserleri)*, 3rd Edition, Mehmet Akif Ersoy Fikir ve Sanat Vakfı.

Tanyu, Hikmet (1981), *Ziya Gökalp'in Kronolojisi*, Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara.

Temo, İbrahim (2000), *İbrahim Temo'nun İttihad ve Terakki Anıları*, 2nd Edition, Bülent Demirbaş (Ed.), Arba, İstanbul.

Topuz, Hıfzı (1973), *100 Soruda Türk Basın Tarihi*, Gerçek, İstanbul.

Tunaya, Tarık Zafer (1960), *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri*, Yedigün, İstanbul.

Tunaya, Tarık Zafer (1988), *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler – Cilt I: İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi 1908-1918*, 2nd Edition, Hürriyet Vakfı, İstanbul.

Tunaya, Tarık Zafer (1998), *Hürriyet'in İlanı: İkinci Meşrutiyet'in Siyasi Hayatına Bakışlar*, Cumhuriyet Gazetesi.

Tunaya, Tarık Zafer (2007), *İslâmcılık Akımı*, 2nd Edition, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Türköne, Mümtaz'er (1991), *Siyasî İdeoloji Olarak İslâmcılığın Doğuşu*, İletişim, İstanbul.

Türköne, Mümtaz'er (2003), *Siyaset*, Lotus, İstanbul.

Uçarol, Rifat (2010), *Siyasi Tarih 1789-2010*, 8th Edition, Der, İstanbul.

Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1992), *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*, 3rd Edition, Ülken, İstanbul.

Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (2013), *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*, İş Bankası Kültür, İstanbul.

Weber, Max (2014), *Toplumsal ve Ekonomik Örgütlenme Kuramı*, 2nd Edition, Özer Ozankaya (Trans.), Cem, İstanbul.

Yanow, Dvora & Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (Ed.) (2006), *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, M. E. Sharpe.

Zürcher, Erik J. (2004), *Turkey: A Modern History*, 3rd/Revised Edition, I. B. Taurus.

Zürcher, Erik J. (2010), *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*, I. B. Taurus, London & New York.

3. Encyclopedia Sections

_____, "Durkheim, Émile", *Türk ve Dünya Ünlüleri Ansiklope*disi, No. 34, Anadolu, İstanbul, 1983, pp. 1864-1866.

_____, "Ersoy, Mehmed Âkif", *Türk ve Dünya Ünlüleri Ansiklope*disi, No. 36, Anadolu, İstanbul, 1983, pp. 2021-2023.

Bulut, Halil İbrahim, "Ümmet", *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 42, TDV, İstanbul, 2012, pp. 308-309.

Çelebi, Muharrem, "Corcî Zeydân" in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 8, TDV, İstanbul, 1993, pp. 69-71

Duymaz, Recep, "Celâl Nuri İleri" in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 7, TDV, İstanbul, 1993, pp. 242-245.

Düzdağ, M. Ertuğrul & M. Orhan Okay, "Mehmed Âkif Ersoy", *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 28, TDV, Ankara, 2003, pp. 432-439.

F. A. T., "Ersoy, Mehmed Âkif", *Türk Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 15, Milli Eğitim, Ankara, pp. 337-344.

Fayda, Mustafa, "Ensâb", *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 11, TDV, İstanbul, 1995, pp. 244-249.

Okay, M. Orhan, "Gökalp, Ziya" in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 14, TDV, İstanbul, 1996, pp. 124-128.

Öngören, Reşat, "Tasavvuf" in *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 40, TDV, İstanbul, 2011, pp. 119-126

Özervarlı, M. Sait, "Muhammed Abduh" in *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 30, TDV, İstanbul, 2005, pp. 482-487.

Özervarlı, M. Sait, "Mülk", *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 31, TDV, İstanbul, 2006, p. 540.

Pekdoğan, Celal, "Kılıçzâde Hakkı" in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 25, TDV, İstanbul, 2002, pp. 415-416.

Tuncer, Hüseyin, "Türk Yurdu" in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 41, TDV, İstanbul, 2012, pp. 550-551.

Uçman, Abdullah, "Muallim Nâci" in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 30, TDV, İstanbul, 2005, pp. 315-317.

Uzun, Mustafa, "Abdürreşid İbrahim" in *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 1, TDV, İstanbul, 1988, pp. 295-297.

5. References in Ottoman Turkish

_____, "İslam Şairi Akif Bey", *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No. 25, 28 Nisan 1336. Available at http://gazeteler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/milli_kutup/1541/1541_2/0099.pdf (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Gökalp, Ziya, *Yeni Hayat*, Evkâf-ı İslâmiye Matbaası, İstanbul, 1918. Available at https://acikerisim.tbmm.gov.tr/xmlui/handle/11543/1125 (Verified on 16 May 2019).

İsmail Hakkı, Manastırlı, "Kesb-ü Ticaret ve Tesis-i Sanayiin Nazar-ı İslamiyette Mergubiyeti", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, Vol. 2, No. 47, 29 July 1909, pp. 323-324. Available at

https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19258 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

İsmail Hakkı, Manastırlı, "Tarih-i İslamiyet Nam-ı Müstearıyla Doktor Dozy'nin Türkçeye Mütercem Risalesine Karşı Reddiye", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, Vol. 4, No. 90, 26 May 1910, pp. 203-205. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19469 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Açık Mektub Ebuzziya Tevfik Efendi'ye", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 21 Safer 1328/18 Şubat 1325, Vol. 3, No. 78, pp. 409-410. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19457 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Bolşeviklik Müslümanlığın Aynı mıdır?", *Sebilürreşad*, 21 Mayıs 1337/12 Ramazan 1339, Vol. 19, No. 481, p. 131. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/20188 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Eski Hatıralar", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 10 Cemaziyelevvel 1328/6 Mayıs 1326, Vol. 4, No. 89, p. 188. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19468 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Eski Hatıralar" in *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 23 Eylül 1326/2 Şevval 1328, Vol. 5, No. 109, pp. 73-74. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19574 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 1 Cemaziyelevvel 1328/27 Mayıs 1326, Vol. 4, No. 92, pp. 237-238. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19471 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 17 Haziran 1326/22 Cemaziyelahir 1328, Vol. 4, No. 95, pp. 290-291.Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19560 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 9 Eylül 1326/18 Ramazan 1328, Vol. 5, No. 107, pp. 37-38. Avalable at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19572 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal", *Sebilürreşad*, 26 Zilhicce 1330/22 Teşrinisani 1328, Vol. 9-2, No. 221, pp. 232-233. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/18670 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal", *Sebilürreşad*, 12 June 1913, 30 Mayıs 1329/7 Receb 1331, Vol. 10, No. 248, p. 221. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/18998 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 16 Haziran 1327/3 Receb 1329, Vol. 6, No. 147, pp. 257-259. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19866 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Hasbihal Koleraya Dair", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 4 Teşrinisani 1326/15 Zilkade 1328, Vol. 5, No. 115, pp. 178-179. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19671 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Hutbe ve Mevâiz: İkinci Vaaz: Üstâd-ı Muhterem Mehmed Âkif Beyefendi Tarafından Fatih Cami-i Şerîfinde", *Sebilürreşad*, 31 Kanunisani 1328/7 Rebiülevvel 1331, Vol. 9-2, No. 231-49, pp. 389-395. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/18680 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Hutbe ve Mevize: Üçüncü Vaaz: Üstad-ı Muhterem Mehmed Âkif Beyefendi Tarafından Süleymaniye Kürsüsünde", *Sebilürreşad*, 7 Şubat 1328/14 Rebiülevvel 1331, Vol. 9-2, No. 232-50, pp. 405-408. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/18681 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Köy Hocası", *Sebilürreşad*, 8 Rebiülevvel 1337/12 Kanunievvel 1334, Vol. 15, No. 382, pp. 331-332. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19701 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Mevaiz-i Diniyyeden: İttihad Yaşatır, Yükseltir Tefrika Yakar, Öldürür", *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, 22 Zilkade 1328/11 Teşrinisani 1326, Vol. 5, No. 116, pp. 205-207. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19672 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Meviza: Üstad-ı Muhterem Mehmed Akif Beyefendi'nin Karesi'de Zağnos Paşa Cami-i Şerifi'nde İrad Buyurdukları Mevizanın Hülasası", *Sebilürreşad*, 21 Cemaziyelevvel 1338/12 Şubat 1336, Vol. 18, No. 458, pp. 183-186. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/19998 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Nasrullah Kürsüsü'nde Üstad-ı Muhterem Mehmed Akif Beyefendi'nin Kastamonu'da Nasrullah Cami-i Şerifinde İrad Buyurdukları Mevizaların Hülasasıdır", *Sebilürreşad*, 25 Teşrinisani 1336/15 Rebiülevvel 1339, Vol. 18, No. 464, pp. 249-259. Available at http://katalog.idp.org.tr/sayilar/7207/18-cilt-464-sayi (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Tefsir-i Şerif", *Sebilürreşad*, 19 Rebiülevvel 1330/24 Şubat 1327, Vol. 8, No. 183, p. 5. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/20070 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Tefsir-i Şerif", *Sebilürreşad*, 5 Recep 1330/7 Haziran 1328, Vol. 8-1, No. 198-16, pp. 293-294. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/20085 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Tefsir-i Şerif", *Sebilürreşad*, 15 Şevval 1330/13 Eylül 1328, Vol. 89-2, No. 212-30, pp. 61-63. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/20181 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Tefsir-i Şerif", *Sebilürreşad*, 29 Şevval 1330/27 Eylül 1328, Vol. 9-2, No. 214-32, pp. 101-102. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/20183 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Tenkid ve Takriz: Medeniyet-i İslamiye Tarihi'nin Hataları", *Sebilürreşad*, 22 Mart 1328/16 Rebiülahir 1330, Vol. 8-1, No. 187, p. 92. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/20074 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Mehmed Akif, "Üstad-ı Muhterem Mehmed Akif Beyefendi Tarafından Bayezid Kürsüsünde", *Sebilürreşad*, 29 Safer 1331/24 Kanunisani 1328, Vol. 9-2, No. 230-48, pp. 373-376. Available at https://dijital-kutuphane.mkutup.gov.tr/tr/periodicals/catalog/issue/18679 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

5. Other Resources

_____, "Manifesto", İstiklâl Marşı Derneği. Available at http://www.istiklalmarsidernegi.org.tr/Sayfa.aspx?SID=13 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

_____, Mehmed Âkif Ersoy Araştırmaları Merkezi", *Türkiye Yazarlar Birliği*, 19 July 2010. Available at http://www.tyb.org.tr/mehmed-akif-ersoy-arastirmalari-merkezi-1170h.htm (Verified on 6 June 2019).

_____, "Sıratımüstakim Dergisi Yeniden Yayında", Bağcılar Belediyesi, 4 July 2013. Available at http://www.bagcilar.bel.tr/icerik/523/9822/siratimustakim-dergisi-yeniden-yayinda.aspx (Verified on 6 June 2019).

_____, The Oxford American Dictionary of Current English, Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, 1999.

_____, *Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Gizli Celse Zabıtları*, Term No. 1, Vol. 1, Session Year No. 1, Session No. 147, 8 Şubat 1337 Salı, pp. 410-411. Available at https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tutanaklar/TUTANAK/GZC/d01/CILT01/gcz01001147.pdf (Verified on 6 June 2019).

_____, *Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi*, Term No. 1, Vol. 9, Session Year No. 2, Session No. 6, Sitting No. 2, 12 Mart 1337 Cumartesi, pp. 84-90. Available at https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tarihce/istiklalmarsi_c9.pdf (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Altan, Çetin, "Enver Paşa'nın Kız Kardeşi ve Mehmet Akif'in Oğlu", *Sabah*, 5 August 1999. Available at http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/1999/08/05/y03.html (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Brown, Guillermo B. (Ed.), *El Quran Santo (Koran) Interpretación Española de Los Significados*. Available at https://globalquran.com/download/download.php?file=pdf/Spanish-Quran-2.pdf (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Brown, William B. (Ed.), *Heiliges Quran (Koran) Deutsche Deutung der Bedeutungen.* Available at https://globalquran.com/download/download.php?file=pdf/German-Quran.pdf (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Çınar, Alev (Coord.), *Türkiye'de Güncel İslami Siyasi Düşüncenin Üretimi, Dinamikleri ve Ana Kavramları: Medeniyet, Adalet ve Düzen*, TÜBİTAK 1001 Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Projelerini Destekleme Programı – SOBAG, Project No: 115K283, Ankara, January 2018.

Kılıç, Emel, *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Yılı Etkinlikleri*, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Araştırma ve Eğitim Genel Müdürlüğü. Available at http://aregem.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR-12228/mehmet-akif-ersoy-yili-etkinlikleri.html (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Kurdakul, Şükran, "Tevfik Fikret ile Mehmet Akif, İslam Birliği Umudu Paramparça Olur -3-", *Cumhuriyet*, 22 January 1986. Available at http://earsiv.sehir.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/handle/11498/11875 (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Redhouse, J. W. (1856), *An English and Turkish Dictionary in Two Parts, English and Turkish, and Turkish and English*, Bernard Quaritch, London.

Redhouse, J. W. (1880), *Redhouse's Turkish Dictionary in Two Parts, English and Turkish, and Turkish and English*, 2nd Edition, Charles Wells (Ed.), Bernard Quaritch, London.

Redhouse, J. W. (1884), *A Lexicon, English and Turkish*, 3rd Edition, A. H. Boyajiyan, Constantinople.

Selvi, Ahmet, *Yeni Mecmua'nın Tahlili*, Master's Thesis, Hülya Argunşah (Supervisor), Erciyes Üniversitesi SBE Yeni Türk Edebiyatı ABD, Kayseri, 1992. Available at https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=ePX_SaJ0b35Gq45swKG3lMA3 Tai5sH0v1g9nIkQWrnPXZPhWT-GWE5cASBNFE-kk (Verified on 6 June 2019).

Terkoğlu, Barış, "İsmail Kahraman'ın Yanıt Veremediği Soru", *Cumhuriyet*, 26 November 2018. Available at http://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/koseyazisi/1151508/ismail_Kahraman_in_yanit_vermedigi _soru.html (Verified on 6 June 2019).

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ:

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN:

Soyadı   : Ufuk

Adı   : Kemal

Bölümü   : Uluslararası İlişkiler

TEZİN ADI:

Islamist and Turkist Conceptualization of Nation in the Late Ottoman Period: A Comparison of Mehmet Akif Ersoy and Ziya Gökalp

TEZİN TÜRÜ:

Yüksek Lisans ☐   Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak göstermek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐

2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐

3. Tezimden bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ☐

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ:

____/____/____