

H. A. KINACI

**DILEMMAS OF TURKISH LIBERALISM IN THE EARLY REPUBLICAN
PERIOD: AHMET AĖAOĖLU**



HÜSEYİN ARİF KINACI

AYBU

2017

YILDIRIM BEYAZIT UNIVERSITY

JANUARY 2017

**DILEMMAS OF TURKISH LIBERALISM IN THE EARLY REPUBLICAN
PERIOD: AHMET AĞAOĞLU**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

OF

ANKARA YILDIRIM BEYAZIT UNIVERSITY

BY

HÜSEYİN ARİF KINACI

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN

**THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION**

JANUARY 2017

Approval of the Institute of Social Sciences

.....

Manager of the Institute

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

.....

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read all 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.

.....

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tuba KANCI DOĞAN (AYBU, PSPA)

.....

Assist. Prof. Dr. Mümin KÖKTAŞ (AYBU, PSPA)

.....

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fahri YETİM (ESOGÜ, History)

.....

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:

Signature:

ABSTRACT

DILEMMAS OF TURKISH LIBERALISM IN THE EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIOD: AHMET AĞAOĞLU

Kınacı, Hüseyin Arif

M.A., Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Mümin Köktaş

January 2017, 156 pages

This thesis examines Ahmet Ağaoğlu, a nationalist intellectual, at the same time one of the important figures of Turkish liberalism during the Early Republican Period in the Turkey. The concepts in which the liberal attitude in Ağaoğlu is observed and the dilemmas which are incompatible with classical liberalism in these concepts constitute the field of examination of this thesis. In this study, by examining Ağaoğlu's liberalism in the Early Republican Period it will be presented that the liberal values he defended during this period are not based on classic liberalism and its values but based on liberal nationalism. It will be shown that Ahmet Ağaoğlu's main controversy, and his liberal contradictions at the Early Republican Period are in fact not a contradiction but a characteristic of its liberal nationalist attitude, and that contradictions can be assessed in the context of Kemalist power-intellectual relations are also based on his eclectic ideology.

Keywords: liberalism, liberal nationalism, Turkish liberalism, Early Republican Period

ÖZET

ERKEN CUMHURİYET DEVRİNDE TÜRK LİBERALİZMİNİN İKİLEMLERİ:

AHMET AĞAOĞLU

Kınacı, Hüseyin Arif

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mümin Köktaş

Ocak 2017, 156 sayfa

Bu tez milliyetçi bir aydın olan Ahmet Ağaoğlu'nu aynı zamanda Erken Cumhuriyet dönemi Türk liberalizminin en önemli şahsiyetlerinden biri olması itibariyle incelemektedir. Ağaoğlu'ndaki liberal tutumun gözlendiği kavramlar, bu kavramlarda klasik liberalizmle bağdaşmayan ikilemler tezin inceleme alanını oluşturmaktadır. Bu çalışmada Ağaoğlu'nun Erken Cumhuriyet döneminde ileri sürdüğü liberal anlayış incelenerek, onun bu dönemde savunduğu liberal değerlerin temelinde klasik liberalizm ve onun değerlerinden ziyade liberal milliyetçiliğin var olduğu ortaya konacaktır. Tezimizin ana konusu olan Ahmet Ağaoğlu'nun Erken Cumhuriyet dönemindeki liberal çelişkilerinin aslında birer çelişki değil onun liberal milliyetçi tutumundan kaynaklanan özellikler olduğu ve Kemalist iktidar-entelektüel ilişkisi bağlamında değerlendirilebilecek çelişkilerinin de yine sahip olduğu bu eklektik ideolojisine dayandığı gösterilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: liberalizm, liberal milliyetçilik, Türk liberalizmi, Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi

To My Family and Tuğçe...



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This thesis aims to be a modest contribution to the synthesis of liberalism and nationalism belief in political theory. The inspiration of this thesis is taken from John Stuart Mill, Ernest Renan and Giuseppe Mazzini. Therefore, firstly I would like to express my gratitude to those who spent their lives to achieve this synthesis. I would especially like to thank Ahmet Ađaođlu, the representative of liberal nationalism in Turkey.

Later, I would like to thank my supervisor, Mumin Kktař, who has directed me into the correct path to excavate what I search for in the dark ways of history of political thought with his magical touches.

I must also acknowledge to the members of the committee, Tuba Kancı Dođan and Fahri Yetim, besides my supervisor.

Then I thank those who made works that opened the way to me, though indirectly, for this thesis, namely Fahri Sakal, Ufuk zcan, Franois Georgeon, and A. Holly Shissler.

Lastly, I thank my dear friends Kadriye Topal and Metehan Kmbeci who read and fixed the thesis.

I think there is no need to say how much I am indebted to my family, especially my sister Dr. Cemile Kınacı, and Tuđe who deserve the greatest thanks.

Of course, for the mistakes in the thesis, it is me who is responsible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM

ABSTRACT

ÖZET

DEDICATION

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. AHMET AĞAOĞLU: LIFE AND WORKS	9
2.1. Family, Youth and Early Years of Education (1869-1888)	9
2.2. French Years and Higher Education Period (1888-1894)	12
2.2.1. French Years Influence on Ağaoğlu's Ideas	18
2.3. Azerbaijan Years and Struggle Period at Caucasia (1894-1909)	25
2.3.1. Current Situation of Caucasia	25
2.3.2. Activities at Caucasia	31
2.4. Ottoman Empire Period (1909-1921)	36
2.5. New Turkey Period (1921-1939)	44
2.6. Ağaoğlu's Main Works	47
3. LIBERALISM AS A POLITICAL THOUGHT	53
3.1. Historic Roots of Liberalism	53
3.2. Sources of Classical Liberalism	55
3.3. Principles of Classical Liberalism	60
3.4. Liberal Nationalism	64
3.5. Liberal Thinking in Turkey	68
3.5.1. Liberalism at the Ottomans	68
3.5.2. Liberalism at the Early Republic Period	69

3.5.2.1. Progressive Republican Party (PRP)	70
3.5.2.2. Free Republican Party (FRP)	73
4. AĖAOĖLU, LIBERALISM and CONTRADICTIONS	77
4.1. Traces of Liberalism in AĖaoĖlu	77
4.1.1. Individual	77
4.1.2. State	81
4.1.3. Government	90
4.1.4. Economic Freedom	94
4.1.5. Democracy and Parliamentary Multi-Party System	98
4.1.6. Society	105
4.1.7. Religion and Secularism	109
4.1.8. Woman	117
4.1.9. Family	122
4.2. A Liberal Opponent Journal: Akın	126
4.3. Liberal Dilemmas of Ahmet AĖaoĖlu	130
5. CONCLUSION	146
REFERENCES	149

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Ed.	Editor
Edt.	Editing
etc.	et cetera (other similar things)
FRP	Free Republican Party (Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası)
PRP	Progressive Republican Party (Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası)
RPP	Republican People's Party (Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası)
TBMMZ	Turkish Grand National Assembly Zabıt Ceridesi (official report)
TGNA	Turkish Grand National Assembly (Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi-TBMM)
Trans.	Translator

1. INTRODUCTION

Ahmet Ağaoğlu, who spent his life in Azerbaijan, Russia, French and finally Turkey (1869-1939), is an important intellectual who heavily influenced Turkish intellectual life, an ardent politician, a master of polemic, and a journalist actively involved in the Turkish and Azerbaijanis process of nation building and a pioneer in the struggle of Turkish Nationalism idea. During his life, which started in 1869 with his birth in Shusha and ended with his death in Istanbul in 1939 he saw three revolutions which concerned the societies he lived in; 1905 Russian Revolution¹, 1908 Young Turk Revolution², 1917 Bolshevik Revolution³, one world war, First World War, and one national independence war, Turkish National War, some personally involved in. In fact, the period, in which Ağaoğlu lived, end of nineteenth century and beginning of twentieth century, the whole world especially the West witnessed the disintegration of empires and structural transformation of the state, society and humanity politically, socially and economically. At this period, Ahmet Ağaoğlu involved in many ideas and political movement which would shape the Caucasia under the rule of Tsarist Russia, Ottoman Empire and eventually Turkish Republic.

With the 1789 French Revolution⁴, ideas of nationalism first spread to France and then to the whole world. These ideas influenced both the Ottoman intellectuals who witnessed the fall of the empire in Turkey, and Ağaoğlu, who was born and raised in an identity crisis in Azerbaijan under Russian rule, in various ways. The turmoil created by the nations to gain their independence within the Ottoman Empire, which has a multinational structure, forced

¹ For more information, see: Abraham Ascher, *The Revolution of 1905: A Short History* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), Donald C. Rawson, *Russian Rightists and the Revolution of 1905* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), Sidney Harcave, *The Russian Revolution of 1905* (London: Collier Books, 1970), V. I. Lenin, *“Left-Wing” Communism: An Infantile Disorder* (Resistance Books, 1999). N. V. Riassanovsky and M. D. Steinberg, *Rusya Tarihi Başlangıçtan Günümüze...* (Trans:Figen Dereli) (İstanbul: İnkılap Kitapevi, 2011).

² For more information, see: Kemal Karpat, *Turkey's Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959), Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London, Oxford University Press, 1961), M. Şükrü Hanioglu, *Preparation for a Revolution: The Young Turks, 1902-1908* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought: A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas* (Syracuse University Press, 2000).

³ For more information, see: William Henry Chamberlin, *The Russian Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), Edward Hallett Carr, *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1923* (W. W. Norton, 1985)

⁴ For information about impacts of French Revolution on Turkey, see: Bernard Lewis, *The Impact of the French Revolution on Turkey: Some Notes on the Transmission of Ideas* (Paris: Librairie de Méridiens, 1953).

the Ottoman intellectuals to think of ways and to produce various thoughts to get the empire out of this turmoil. Turkish and Muslim communities under the rule of the Tsarist Russia, which is a multinational empire like the Ottoman Empire, gathered around the nationalist movements to strengthen their position against the Tsar and to protect their rights. Ahmet Ağaoğlu struggled in these movements as an intellectual, a journalist and a politician in order to strengthen the position of Turkish and Muslim society in the Caucasus against the West and Russia. Because of his struggle, he was oppressed by Tsarist Russia and at a time when he could not tolerate this oppression came to Turkey from Russia part due to the gain of power of the Union and Progress Party⁵ in the Ottoman Empire. He struggled for the Ottoman Empire's survival in Istanbul and when the empire disintegrated, he took various duties in the National Struggle and the building of new Turkey.

Within the context of the Ottoman emancipation from the above-mentioned turmoil, at the second half of the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century, various ideas such as *Ottomanism*⁶, *Islamism*⁷ and *Turkism*⁸ emerged among the Ottoman

⁵ For details of Union and Progress Party (İttihat ve Terakki Partisi), see: M.Şükrü Hanioglu, *Bir Siyasal Örgüt Olarak Osmanlı İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti ve Jön Türkler* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1985), İsmail Küçükkalınç, *Jön Türklük ve Kemalizm Kısacasında İttihadçılık* (İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat Neşriyat, 2016), Feroz Ahmad, *The Young Turks: the Committee of Union and Progress in Turkish politics, 1908–1914* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).

⁶ Yusuf Akçura, who first named, classified and analyzed political styles in the Ottoman State, defines Ottomanism as “To create an Ottoman nation by representing and combining various nations subject to the Ottoman government” (Akçura, 2014:17). Şükrü Hanioglu as “Ottomanism is a political and ideological movement trying to prevent the independence movements and the efforts of the various elements to break away from the empire which became one of the biggest problems of the Ottoman Empire by creating the concept of Ottomanism over every ethnic nation.” (Hanioglu, 1985: 1389-1390). For more information on ottomanism, see: Yusuf Akçura, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 6. Edition, 2014), M. Şükrü Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Princeton University Press, 2008), Kemal Karpat, *İslamın Siyasallaşması* (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 5th Edition, 2015), Osmanlı Modernleşmesi (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2014), Hasan Kayalı, *Arabs and Young Turks: Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908–1918* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997).

⁷ Islamism which came to the forefront with the Ottoman idea movement losing influence after the Balkan Wars is the idea of “[...]combining all the Islam under the administration of the government politically benefiting from the fact that the caliphate right is in the rulers of the Ottoman Empire.” (Akçura, 2014: 17). For more information on Islamism, see: İsmail Kara, *Türkiye’de İslamcılık Düşüncesi I-II* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2012), Mümtaz’er Türköne, *Siyasi İdeoloji Olarak İslamcılığın Doğuşu* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2. Edition, 1994), Tanıl Bora, *Türk Sağının Üç Hali Milliyetçilik Muhafazakarlık İslamcılık* (İstanbul: Birikim, 1988), Yusuf Akçura, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 6th Edition, 2014).

⁸ The idea of nationality first emerged in non-Muslims (because of the failure of Ottomanism), then in Albanian and Arabic (due to the failure of Islamism) and finally in Turks (Gökalp, 1977:8). This idea of nationality that emerged in the Turks is called Turkism. Akçura defines Turkism as "forming a political Turkish nation based on race" (Akçura, 2014: 17). For more information on Panturkism, see: Ziya Gökalp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak,*

intellectuals. Turkism one of these three ideas is separated from other ideas, due to its effects as well as the subject of our thesis. In fact, although Turkism emerged relatively later than other intellectual ideas, it undertook the infrastructure role in carrying out and succeeding the National Struggle which emerged after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, Turkism is of great importance because it is an idea movement that plays a role in organizing the Republic. In addition, Turkism influenced the entire Turkish world to a great extent through the *Cedidism*⁹ Movement. Ahmet Ağaoğlu, Yusuf Akçura¹⁰, İsmail Bey Gaspiralı¹¹ are the reflections of this influence on the Turkish world. One of the main aims of the Turkism movement which filled the gap created by the ineffectiveness of the Ottomanism movement especially after the Balkan war and the Islamist movement due to the revolts of the Muslims of the empire. Turkism movement was to raise awareness of the Turks living in an unconscious way under the Ottoman flag with a national feeling and to make them aware of their nationality. At the same time, it aspired to strengthen the shaken foundation of the Ottoman Sultanate, and to continue the Turkish modernization which has been

Muasırlaşmak (İstanbul: Kadro Yayınları, 1977), *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat, 4. Edition, 2016), Yusuf Akçura, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 6. Edition, 2014), Kemal H Karpat, *Osmanlı'da Değişim, Modernleşme Ve Uluslaşma* (İstanbul, İmge Kitabevi, 2006), Niyazi Berkes, *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 20. Edition, 2014), Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (İstanbul, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2nd Edition, 2014).

⁹ *Cedidism* is a reform movement that began in the field of education and culture among the Muslims of Russia towards the end of the nineteenth century. The emergence of Cedidist movement and overall view of its in Turkistan, see: Adrienne Lynn Edgar, *Tribal Nation: The Making of Soviet Turkmenistan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), Andreas Kappeler, *The Russian Empire: A Multiethnic History* (New York: Pearson Education, 2001), Adeeb Khalid, *Islam after Communism: Religion and Politics in Central Asia* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2007), Nadir Devlet, *Rusya Türklerinin Milli Mücadele Tarihi (1905-1917)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2. Edition, 1998), Serge A. Zenkovsky, *Rusya'da Türkçülük ve İslam* (Ankara: Güncel Yayıncılık, 2000), Adeeb Khalid, *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform Jadidism in Central Asia* (Los Angeles, London: Berkeley, 1998), *Representations of Russia in Central Asian Jadid Discourse* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), Cemile Kınacı, "Kazak Aydını Mirjakip Duvlatuli'nin (1885-1935) Balkiya (1922) Tiyatro Eserinde Cedidçi Düşünce ve Dönemin Sosyal Meseleleri" (Gazi Türkiyat, Bahar 2016, pp. 171-194), Hakan Kırımlı, *National Movements and National Identity Among the Crimean Tatars: (1905-1916)* (Leiden, New York, Köln: E. J. Brill, 1996).

¹⁰ Some books of Akçura include: *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Kader, 2. Edition, 1912), *Türkçülük-Türkçülüğün Tarihi Gelişimi* (İstanbul: Türk Kültür Yayınları, 1978), *Mevkufiyet Hatıraları* (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Kader, 1904), Ulum ve Tarih (Kazan: 1906), *Türk, German ve İslavların Münesabatı Tarihiyesi* (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Kader, 1910), *Eski "Şuray-ı Ümmet"te Çıkan Makalelerimden* (İstanbul: Tanin Matbaası, 1911), *Muasır Avrupa'da Siyasi ve İctimai Fikirler ve Fikri Cereyanlar* (İstanbul: Maarif Vekaleti Neşriyatı, 1923), *Türk Yılı 1928* (İstanbul: Yeni Matbaa, 1928), *Zamanımız Avrupa Siyasi Tarihi* (Ankara: Hakimiyeti Milliye Matbaası, 1933), *Osmanlı Devletinin Dağılma Devri* (İstanbul: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1940).

¹¹ For more information on Gaspiralı, see: *İsmail Bey Gaspiralı İçin* ((Ed.) Hakan Kırımlı, Ankara: Kırım Türkleri Kültür ve Yardımlaşma Derneği Yayınları, 2004), *İsmail Gaspiralı Seçilmiş Eserleri II Fikri Eserleri* (Yavuz Akpınar (Ed.), İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat, 2004).

continued since the Tanzimat period¹². This movement became a state policy with the Unionists taking the power after the declaration of the Second Constitutional Period¹³ in 1908. However, it must be said that it is very difficult to distinguish Ottomanist, Islamist and Turkist from each other with certainty¹⁴. Even the intellectuals who are in the same movement think differently in many subjects. For example, Ziya Gökalp¹⁵, Yusuf Akçura and Ahmet Ağaoğlu, the leading thinkers of Turkism intellectual movement, have very different point of views in terms of individual-society-state relations¹⁶.

Various ideas Ahmet Ağaoğlu defended throughout his life mainly are affected by the political events he has gone through, Ağaoğlu has a very special place because of the duties and responsibilities he took within the intellectual and political circles in Turkey, and also at the beginning of the twentieth century in the Caucasus during the II. Constitutional and republic periods. For example, Ağaoğlu was born at the end of nineteenth century in an environment where the Shiite influence was felt, educated in schools attached to the Tsarist

¹² For more information on Tanzimat Period, see: Feroz Ahmad, *The Making of Modern Turkey* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), Kemal Karpat, *Türk Siyasi Tarihi* (İstanbul: Timaş, 2014), Ali Akyıldız, *Osmanlı Merkez Teşkilatında Reform* (İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 1993). *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet’in Birikimi* (In Bora, T., Gültekinçil M. and Alkan M. Ö (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol: 1, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2014), Roderic H. Davison, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Reform (1856-1876)* (İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, 2015), Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu, *Tanzimat* (İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2010).

¹³ For details of this period, see: Ahmet Bedevi Kuran, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İnkılap Hareketleri ve Milli Mücadele* (İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları, 2012), Ahmet Turan Alkan, *II. Meşrutiyet Devrinde Ordu ve Siyaset* (İstanbul: Ufuk Kitapları, 2001), İsmail Hami Danişmend, *31 Mart Vakası* (İstanbul: İstanbul Kitapevi, 1974), William Hale, *Turkish Politics and the Military* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994).

¹⁴ For more information, see: Ziya Gökalp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (Ankara: Kadro Yayınları, 1977). Ahmet Agayef, “Türk Âlemi I” (*Türk Yurdu* 1 (1): 12–17.), H. A. Shissler, *Between Two Empires Ahmet Ağaoğlu and the New Turkey* (London: I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd., 2002)

¹⁵ For more information on Ziya Gökalp, see: Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Ziya Gökalp* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2007), Orhan Türkoğan, *Ziya Gökalp ve Sosyolojik Düşünce Sistemi* (Konya: Çizgi Kitapevi Yayınları, 2015), Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), Uriel Heyd, *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp* (London: The Harvill Press, 1950), T. Parla and A. Davison, *Corporatist Ideology in Kemalist Turkey: Progress or order* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2004), Taha Parla, *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye’de Korporatizm* (İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2001), Fahri. Z. Fındıkoğlu, *Ziya Gökalp İçin Yazdıklarım ve Söylediklerim* (İstanbul, 1955).

¹⁶ “In Ahmet Agaoglu's thoughts individual come to the forefront (Agaoglu, 1933) in Gökalp’s it is society. According to Ağaoğlu, Gökalp neutralizes the individual with the social view formulated as “there is no right but duty” (Filizok, 2005: 268) (Agaoglu, 2013: 68). However, contrary to Ağaoğlu's liberal stance, Akçura has the idea of “economic statism” (Tekeli and İlgin, 1982).

ruling, and influenced by an orientalist¹⁷ environment in France where he went for higher education. In his early life he had a pro-Shiite-Persian stance. In this period, we see that he identifies his identity with an Iranianism that also includes the anti-Turkishness. After completing his higher education and return from France to Caucasia we find him playing an active role in the Cedidist Movement. Ağaoğlu cut off the interest he gave to Shiism in this period and gave up his identity of Iran. He is now an intellectual and political forerunner of the national movement in Azerbaijan, which sometimes has Pan-Islamist qualities¹⁸. Ağaoğlu, who had to escape from the Caucasus because of the pressures of the Tsarist Russia, came to Istanbul, the capital of the Ottoman Empire. In Turkey, he first witnessed the collapse of the Empire, and then the national struggle and the new Turkey which was founded as a result of this struggle and the radical changes brought by the new Republic regime. In his life in Turkey, he added new identities like Turkist, pro-Western, Kemalist and liberal to his identities such as Iranian, Turkish, Russian Muslim, Turkish Muslim, whom he had previously felt in France and the Caucasus.

In another word, Ağaoğlu has been attached to the political preferences mentioned above as a result of great transformations he witnessed or personally involved throughout his life and he has taken on different identities that constantly change in the direction of these preferences. Especially in the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the new Turkey, the Republic, the tension and identity crisis of the Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals embodies itself in Ağaoğlu. Although Ağaoğlu opposed the administrations such as Shahdom, Tsarism and Sultanate in the Early Republican Period due to its autocratic and repressive nature, in this period he has turned into organic intellectual¹⁹ of the nation state. However, in spite of this

¹⁷ "Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between "the Orient" and (most of the time) "the Occident." (Said, 1978: 2). For more information on orientalism, see: Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978).

¹⁸ For Ağaoğlu's Panislamist characters, see: Fahri Sakal, *Ağaoğlu Ahmet Bey* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999).

¹⁹ "*Organic intellectual*" is a term used by Gramsci. Organic intellectuals are the people each new ruling class needs to organize a new social order (Gramsci, 1971: 5). For more information on Gramsci and organic intellectuals, see: Antonio Gramsci, *Selection From The Prison Notebooks* (Edt. /Trans: Q. Hoare ve G.N. Smith, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), Giuseppe Fiori, *Antonio Gramsci Bir Devrimcinin Yaşamı* (Trans: K.Emiroğlu) (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2009), David Forgacs, *Gramsci Kitabı Seçme Yazılar 1916-1935* (Trans: İ.Yıldız, İstanbul: Dipnot Yayınları, 2010), Antonio Gramsci *Aydınlar ve Toplum*. (Trans: V.Günyol, İstanbul: Alan Yayınları. 1985), Antonio Gramsci, *Hapishane Defterleri* (Trans: A. Cemgil,

social engineering role played by Ağaoğlu in order to give legitimacy to the Turkish revolution, he emerges as an important figure of the tradition of Turkish liberalism. It comes to mind many remarkable names such as Prince Sabahattin²⁰, Ohannes Pasha, Mehmet Cavit Bey, Ali Şükrü Bey, Hüseyin Avni Ulaş and Ali Fethi Okyar in Turkish liberalism within the historical process²¹. Ahmet Ağaoğlu is one of the most important persons who can be accepted as liberal in terms of the values he defends and his attachment to these values in the Early Republican Period.

In this period, besides nationalism Ağaoğlu was seen as a liberal intellectual because of his position in the Free Republican Party (FRP). He defended liberal values, especially individual freedoms, and opposed to Kemalist power after FRP was closed. However, the liberal identity of Ağaoğlu has become a matter of debate because of its close relationship with Kemalist power and its other contradictions. For example, important names such as Ufuk Özcan, Holly Shissler, Fahri Sakal and François Georgeon, who wrote valuable works on Ağaoğlu, have very different views on his liberalism. Ağaoğlu's liberalism was evaluated as "periodical" according to Özcan (Özcan, 2010: IX), "enlightened liberal" according to Georgeon (Georgeon, 2013: 117-130), "liberal and democratic" according to Sakal (Sakal, 1999: 210) and "liberal nationalist" (Shissler, 2002: 208) according to Shissler.

This thesis examines Ahmet Ağaoğlu as a nationalist intellectual and at the same time one of the most important figures of Turkish liberalism during the Early Republican Period. The concepts that Ağaoğlu has a liberal tendency are examined and the dilemmas which are

İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1997), Hugues Portelli, *Gramsci ve Tarihsel Blok* (Trans: K.Somer, Ankara: Savaş Yayınları, 1982), Anna S. Sassoon, *Gramsci's Politics* (Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press, 1987).

²⁰ For more information on Prens Sabahattin and his opinions, see: Prens Sabahattin, *Türkiye Nasıl Kurtarılabilir* (İstanbul: Elif Yayınları, 1965), *Görüşlerim* (Buruc Yayınları, 1999), Kaan Durukan, *Prens Sabahattin ve İlm-i İçtima, Türk Liberalizminin Kökenleri* (In Bora, T, Gültekingil M. (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol: I, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004), Nezahat N. Ege, *Prens Sabahaddin Hayatı ve İlmi Müdafaları* (İstanbul, Güneş Neşriyat, 1977).

²¹ For more information on these thinker and politicians, see: F. Hasan Erol, *Mehmet Cavit Bey* (In Bora, T, Gültekingil M. (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol:7, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2005), Hamit Bozarlan, *Ali Fethi Okyar* (In Bora, T, Gültekingil M. (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol:7, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2005), Ahmet Demirel, *Ali Şükrü Bey ve Tan Gazetesi* (In Bora, T, Gültekingil M. (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol:7, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2005), *Hüseyin Avni Ulaş* (In Bora, T, Gültekingil M. (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce*, Vol:7, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2005). Erdoğan, Mustafa, *Liberalizm ve Türkiye'deki Serüveni, Aydınlık, Modernlik ve Liberalizm* (Ankara: Orion Yayınevi, 2006).

incompatible with classical liberalism in these concepts constitute the field of examination of this thesis. In this study, by examining Ađaođlu's liberalism in the Early Republican Period it will be presented that the liberal values he defended during this period are not based on classic liberalism and its values but based on liberal nationalism as Shissler pointed out. It will be shown that Ahmet Ađaođlu's main controversy, and also the liberal contradictions at the Early Republican Period, is in fact not a contradiction but a characteristic of its liberal nationalist attitude. Also contradictions which can be assessed in the context of Kemalist power-intellectual relations are also based on his eclectic ideology.

Thesis is comprised of five parts. These are 1. Introduction, 2. Ahmet Ađaođlu: Life and Works, 3. Liberalism as a Political Thought, 4. Ađaođlu, Liberalism and Contradictions and 5. Result respectively. At the second part Biography of Ahmet Ađaođlu; Family, Youth and First Years of His Education (1869-1888), French Years and Higher Education Period (1888-1894), Azerbaijan Years and Struggle Period in Caucasia (1894-1909), Ottoman Empire Period (1909-1921) and New Turkey Period (1921-1939) will be examined in details. In addition, principal works which are vital to this thesis have also been examined under the heading of Ađaođlu's Principal Works. In the second part, the aim is to reveal the identity problem of Ađaođlu by making a detailed examination of biography and works and to be able to follow his thoughts changing according to time and conditions as a whole. In the third part, liberalism and liberal values are examined under the titles of Historic Roots of Liberalism, Sources of Classical Liberalism, Principles of Classical Liberalism and Liberal Nationalism, The emergence of liberal nationalism in the historical process and its place in the political theory has been examined and within the context of our thesis its differences with classic liberal theory have been shown. However, in this section, the tradition of liberal thought during the Ottoman and Early Republican period in Turkey was mentioned under the heading of Liberal Thinking in Turkey. The Progressive Republican Party's (PRP) and the Free Republican Party's (FRP), which characterized themselves as liberals during the Early Republican Period, position against Kemalism is examined. There are two main purposes for the writing of the third chapter in terms of our thesis. First purpose is to show and compare classical liberalism and liberal nationalism's concepts like individual, society and state and the other one is to understand the position of liberalism against Kemalist

power-opposition conundrum during the Early Republican Period in Turkey. The fourth part is the most critical part of our thesis. Here, the liberal attitude of Ahmet Ağaoğlu and the contradictions in this attitude are shown. In this part, under the title of Traces of Liberalism in Ağaoğlu, main ideas of him are shown by the concepts like individual, state, government, economic freedom, democracy and parliamentary multi-party system, society, religion and secularism, woman, and family. Also the liberal magazine, which he published in Istanbul after the FRP was closed and become completely ineffective politically in Ankara, has been examined under the title of A Liberal Magazine: *Akın*. This magazine is an important element for characterizing Ağaoğlu as liberal. The final title of the fourth part is Dilemmas of Ahmet Ağaoğlu's Liberal Attitude. Under this title Ağaoğlu is examined as a representative of liberal nationalism rather than a classic liberal in the context of the relation between individual, society and state. In the conclusion part, how we should evaluate Ağaoğlu's liberalism and its contradictions during the Early Republican Period is described.

2. AHMET AĞAOĞLU: LIFE AND WORKS

2.1. Family, Youth and First Years of Education (1869-1888)

Ahmet Ağaoğlu was born in the city of in the Karabakh region of Russian controlled Azerbaijan in 1869 (Shissler, 2005: 67; Ülken, 2014: 603). His paternal ancestors probably emigrated from Erzurum to Karabakh in the eighteenth century. His father Mirza²² Hasan, married Taze Khanum from a seminomadic tribe called Sarıca Ali and Ahmet Ağaoğlu come to this world from this marriage (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 440-441; Sakal, 1999: 7). His father and uncles had vast lands, and the source of income for the family was cotton. Taking into consideration the conditions of the period, it can be said that Ahmet Ağaoğlu had a comfortable childhood in a wealthy family that dealt with cotton trade in Karabakh. The title used by the family was Mirza, showing that the family was included in the *ulema* class and that they were in a respectful position in the Persian-Shiite society hierarchy (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 440-441; Özcan, 2010: 13). His grandfather Mirza İbrahim was one of the most famous scholars in. Apart from Turkish, his father and his uncles knew Persian, Arabic and Russian (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 440-441). The family undertook the carriage of Persian culture and the spiritual leadership of the Shiite community in the Caucasus under Russian rule (Özcan, 2010: 14). As Ağaoğlu stated, Azerbaijan was still torn in the strict networks of religious life and there were no worries or thoughts other than religious issues (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 442). For this reason, national identity did not develop in the family (Özcan, 2010: 14). More precisely, the family did not use nationalist elements when describing itself, but rather religious identity elements (Shissler, 2002: 69). People of especially the scholars gathered at the Mirza's home and make trivial discussions about religion for days, weeks, months and years (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 442). Ahmet Ağaoğlu had spent his childhood in the midst of these trivial discussions. Ahmet Ağaoğlu in his memoirs compares his father and his identity through these religious discussions which he does not care about. He expresses

²² "Mirza is a historical title of Persian origin, denoting the rank of a high nobleman or Prince. [...] Historically, it was used as a title by and signified patriarchal lineage to the imperial families of the Turkish Empire, Persia, Circassia, Shirvan, Moğol and Muslim Rajputs. It was also a title bestowed upon members of the highest aristocracies in Tatar states, such as the Khanates of Kazan and Astrakhan." (Mirza, 2016).

his father's deprivation of national identity with a slightly humiliating, slightly sarcastic statement:

If someone were to ask him Who are you? he would reply I am of the community of Blessed Mohammed, I am a devotee of Ali, my father is Mirza Ibrahim and his father is Hasan Ağa of the Kurteli [tribe]. It never occurred to him that he was a Turk. He did not reflect that the Russians had come and spread their wings in the land of the Kurteli. The Russians did not bother the great estates. Rather they gave estate-holders titles of nobility... So, why should my father, son of Mirza Ibrahim, son of Hasan Ağa of the Kurteli, have worried or reflected? He ate, he drank, he hunted with dogs and falcons. (Shissler, 2002)

His father did not care very much about Ahmet Ağaoğlu's education, this duty remained with his great uncle Mirza Mehmed who is also the head of the family (Sakal, 1999: 8). Great uncle Mirza Mehmed has an absolute power over the whole family; his word was accepted as law by the whole family (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 442). "Hajji Mirza Mehmet envisioned his nephew's future in Kerbela and Nejef studying to become a mujtahid²³." (Shissler, 2003: 72). For this reason, he was sent to traditional local *mahalle* (district) and *sibyan* (primary) school²⁴. These schools are were the same sibyan schools in the whole Islamic world and they gave education using traditional methods. In addition, Ahmet Ağaoğlu also took Arabic lessons from a private teacher (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 443). Although Mirza Mehmed hoped that Ahmet Ağaoğlu would be a good mujtahid, his mother Taze Hanım wanted him to be an attractive, neat and high-ranking Russian officer. To accomplish this, after finishing elementary school she secretly hired a Russian teacher for his son (Sakal, 1999: 8; Shissler, 2003: 80; Özcan, 2010: 17). His maternal uncle and his mother contributed significantly to him to attend Russian lessons. When his father and uncle discovered these lessons and they reacted, but his powerful maternal uncles' intervention was enough to soften his uncle

²³ *Mujtahid* is "an authoritative interpreter of the religious law of Islam; especially a living religious teacher that is recognized by the Shi'a as competent to exercise private judgment in formulating authoritative answers to legal questions" (*Mujtahid*, 2016).

²⁴ "The Ottoman Empire inherited the primary school (*Sibyan Mektebi*) system from Seljuk and other Turkish states. Reading Quran was a compulsory course in these schools. Issues related to religious matters, learning to write and arithmetic were also taught to the students in these schools. Although Sibyan Schools were serving the needs of Ottoman Society at the beginning, later on they become not functional and not meeting the Society's needs as they were indifferent to changes and development in social life and as they were refusing to reform the school system" (Demirtaş, 2007:173). For more information, see: Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire. The Classical Age 1300-1600* (2nd edition, New Rochelle, 1989), Cahid Baltacı, *Osmanlı Eğitim Sistemi* (Yeni Türkiye, Eğitim Özel Sayısı 7, 1996, pp. 467-470).

(Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 443). In the end, Ahmet Ağaoğlu had enrolled in the Russian high school after successful exams (Sakal, 1999: 9).

When Ağaoğlu enrolled in Russian high school, the ethnic and religious distribution of the class he included presents the socio-economic and political situation of Caucasus. Only five of the forty five students were Azerbaijani Turks, while the forty were Armenians. However, the population of Azerbaijanis' in the region was over 80% of the total population (Sakal, 1999: 9). Thanks to this Russian School, Ahmet Ağaoğlu also experienced Armenians' hostility towards Turks for the first time (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 443). “[...] years, beginning with the encounter with the Armenian students who made up the majority in the school was the first phase of his identity change” (Özcan, 2010: 17).

The following passage of Ağaoğlu gives us various clues for the beginning of this change.

It is impossible to define how those five people suffered from Armenians during their education life having continued for years. During breaks we, five Turkish students deemed it a great success to act quickly and lean our backs up against a wall. Hundreds of Armenian students attacked suddenly on us, some of them took our kalpaks [skullcaps] from our heads and threw them. Then the others kicked those kalpaks made of Bukhara leather, worth four or five pieces of gold on the ground. Some of them asked for our clothes which were valuable and generally made of camel wool, and when they had gotten them they tore them up. If we tried to object them they pulverized us with punches, slaps, and kicks. Sometimes they united and cast aspersions upon us, gave false testimonies and punished us unjustly. Most of my friends could not endure this and left the school. Among the Turks, I was the only one who made it to the last grade (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 443).

Ahmet Ağaoğlu on successfully continued his high school education despite the pressures of Armenian majority but by the recommendation of a friend enrolled in Tbilisi Science High School in 1884, which provided more modern and higher quality education (Sakal, 1999: 9). At that time Tbilisi was a very lively city, culturally and socially. Environments in which revolutionary movements against Tsarism developed rapidly due to various movements of ideas and some places in which secret revolutionary and nationalist organizations operated were in Tbilisi. This was also the main centre where the anti-regime ideas were adopted and supported by the educational circles (Özcan, 2010: 18). All these influenced Ağaoğlu who studied at Tbilisi High School. The main issue which influenced him was the current situation of Christians and Muslims in Tbilisi. Revolutionary movements against Tsarism

and cultural activities in the city were always carried out by Christians. The places where Christians lived were planned and clean. They had operas, theatres, and conference and concert halls. On the contrary, the Muslim neighbourhoods of Tbilisi had dirty, narrow and ugly streets. Muslims were not interested in revolutionary movements; they stayed away from cultural activities. Ağaoğlu was the only Turkish and Muslim student to study at Tbilisi High School during that period. Graduated from Tbilisi High School in 1887 successfully, he learned a lot about Russian culture and history (Sakal, 1999: 10). Tbilisi is the first step in the identity problem that will continue throughout his life. It is a process of getting to know the West and Western values from the Azerbaijan's intellectual climate which is under the Shia-Persian culture, and to learn Russian history and culture.

2.2. French Years and Higher Education Period (1888-1894)

Ahmet Ağaoğlu graduated successfully from high school in 1887. Right after graduation from high school he went to Petersburg for higher education and enrolled in the Polytechnic Institute. Unable to withstand even a year in Petersburg he had to return his country. We have to say that there are different opinions about why Ağaoğlu returned to his country. According to Akçura, Ağaoğlu had to return to his country because his health condition prevented his education (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 444; Ülken, 2014: 603). However, it can be said that this opinion emerged as a result of a misunderstanding. In his memoir “Ağaoğlu wrote [...] went to Paris because he could not tolerate St. Petersburg's climate” (Sakal, 1999: 12). The air mentioned here is not a disease but the spiritual, political and cultural climate of Petersburg. Ağaoğlu could not tolerate racist behavior against him in Petersburg and decided to go to Paris to continue his education there (Sakal, 1999: 12). Nevertheless, it would be a big mistake to say that the brief Petersburg adventure did not contribute to Ağaoğlu himself. Not to mention the fact that, he became friends with Hüseyinzade Ali Bey and Topçubaşı Ali Merdan Bey²⁵ in Petersburg, and this friendship continued throughout his life (Shissler, 2002: 61-62). On 8 January 1888, Ahmet Ağaoğlu reached Paris with a train passing through Berlin. When Ağaoğlu started to move towards the West, he left behind the political, social

²⁵ For information on these intellectuals, see: Vügar İmanov, *Ali Merdan Topçubaşı (1865-1934)* (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi, 2003), Ali Haydar Bayat, *Hüseyinzâde Ali Bey* (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı Yayını, 1998).

and cultural pressures that Russia had increased in Azerbaijan, beginning of the growth of oil-related modern industry and trade in the Caucasus, landowners beginning to lose their old statuses, the wave of reforms that enveloped all over Russia, especially the reforms that started among Muslims of the Caucasus and various revolutionary ideologies, in short, many social, political and economic incidents. In fact, all these problems that he left behind were events that activated his desire to do something for his community. He was thinking about where his own community should be in the world, and he thought how this position could become even stronger. His mind was full of contradictions in describing himself as Russian Muslim, Shiite, Tatar, Turkish, Iranian, reformist, gentleman, socialist revolutionist, or one of the Muslim servants of the Tsar (Shissler, 2002: 62-63). In fact, for Ağaoğlu, the question “what am I?” will occupy his mind throughout his life and all of his contradictions will evolve around this problem. Ağaoğlu is the first youngster to go to Europe for education in Azerbaijan Turks (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 444; Sakal, 1999: 12). That's why he was alone when he came to Paris. There was nobody he knew that he could get help from. Moreover, he did not know French either (Shissler, 2002: 64). In order to learn French, he began to memorize a book of Alfred de Musset which was translated to Russian. He tried to learn French by comparing the memorized sentences with the Russian. He had no choice, because as he had a relatively economically comfortable childhood, his education years in Paris were very difficult with the death of his mother, father and uncle while he was in Paris (Sakal, 1999: 12). Ağaoğlu improved his French level to a point that he could understand the lessons at the University in about six months after arriving in Paris (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 445). Later he both enrolled in *University of Sorbonne Law School* and *Collège de France*. Not satisfied with these he attended courses he was interested in. He took “*History of Oriental People*” lesson from James Darmesteter, who is renowned for his Iranian language and culture studies, and living Eastern language lessons such as Arabic, Persian and Turkish from Charles Schèffer and Barbier de Meynard. However, he closely followed the work of such important French intellectuals as Ernest Renan and Hippolyte Taine (Akçuraoğlu, 2009: 445; Özcan, 2010: 20-21). Especially his teacher Darmesteter supported Ağaoğlu in France. Ağaoğlu became both a good student and an academic colleague of him. Through Professor Darmesteter, he soon found the chance to become acquainted with the intellectual circles of Paris. He again

was introduced to Professor Ernest Renan's²⁶ and Madam Juliette Adam's salons through him (Shissler, 2002: 66). At these salons, he met very important people like Tranie, Gaston Paris, Jules Lemaitre etc. (Soysal, 1995: 18, Georgeon, 2013: 105).

Ağaoğlu was accepted by a very high-level intellectual circle in France in a very short time but it would be a mistake to explain this situation just by Ağaoğlu's success, intelligence and hard work. Likewise, we can easily say that also these circles showed interest in Ağaoğlu. To be more specific, this circle contributed significantly to the academic maturation of Ağaoğlu. Although they work in different areas, they constitutes an important epistemic community²⁷ that is concerned with the Islamic world in general, and especially on Iranian religion and culture. This community consisted of persons like Darmesteter who were important contributors to the French Orientalism, advocating positivist historiography (Özcan, 2010: 21). These solid relationships that he established in France have paved the way for perhaps his most important ability, the authorship profession (Shissler, 2002: 66). Madame Juliette Adam was publishing a bimonthly magazine called *La Nouvelle Revue*. He regularly wrote for this magazine between 1891 and 1893. He also wrote for Paris magazines like *Reveu politique et littéraire'e* and *Journal des Dèbats* (Georgeon, 2013: 105). In 1892 he attended the 9th Congress of the Orientalists in London and presented his paper *Les Croyances mazdèennes dans la religion chiite [Mazdek Origins of Shiism]*. The point that should be mentioned at this point is that; Ağaoğlu has addressed the issues related to the Iranian society both in the *Mazdek Origins of Shiism*²⁸ paper he presented in London and in the numerous articles he wrote for magazines (Georgeon, 2002: 105; Shissler, 2002: 66). In other words, Ağaoğlu due to the environmental influence focused his interest on the

²⁶ Some examples of his works, see: *De l'Origine du Langage* (1848), *Averroës et l'Averroïsme* (1852), *De Philosophia Peripatetica, apud Syros* (1852), *L'Âme Bretonne* (1854), *Histoire Générale et Systèmes Comparés des Langues Sémitiques* (1855), *Études d'Histoire Religieuse* (1857), *Le Livre de Job* (1858), *Essais de Morale et de Critique* (1859), *Le Cantique des Cantiques* (1860), *Vie de Jésus* (1863), *La Réforme Intellectuelle et Morale de la France* (1871), *Qu'est-ce qu'une Nation?* (1882). For more information on Renan and his works, see: William Francis Barry, *Ernest Renan* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1905), Lewis F. Mott, *Ernest Renan* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1921).

²⁷ *Epistemic community* is "a network of professionals with recognised expertise and competence in a particular domain and an authoritative claim to policy relevant knowledge within that domain or issue-area." (Haas, 1992:3).

²⁸ For original, see: Ahmed Bey Agayeff [1892] 1968. *Les Croyances mazdèennes dans la religion chiite*. (In E. Delmar Morgan (Ed.). Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists. Vol: 2, Reprint. London: Kraus Reprints, 1968).

Persian-Shiite culture; he made his studies in these fields and deepened his knowledge on these subjects during his student years in Paris. When we look at the writings published in this period, we can see that the identity that Aḡaoḡlu expressed himself was formed with three concerns which are the Muslim world, Iranian society and Shiism respectively (Georgeon, 2002: 106). At first it may sound strange that Aḡaoḡlu saw himself as a full Iranian during his education life in France and expressed himself with his Iranian identity, if we think Aḡaoḡlu as one of the leading intellectuals of Turkish Nationalism and his pioneering role he played during both the Turkish and Azerbaijani nationalization process. But this is a common situation for the Azerbaijani Turks at that time. The most important reason for this is that even when Azerbaijan was under the Russian occupation, the dominant character of the Persian culture and the influence of the Shiite sect on Turkish society have continued in Azerbaijan. In addition, the language of education and culture in the Caucasus is Persian. However, the fact that Aḡaoḡlu felt himself belonging to the Iranian society and the Persian-Shiite culture and the motive to protect his community against the West in this period does not mean that he unconditionally defended this identity. He also criticizes the community which he belongs to from various sides, with inspiration from the West. He especially in his early French writings put some social problems such as pressures on women in society on his agenda. He complains about the low value of women in his own community. However, he also mentions that the responsibility cannot be put on Iranians for these problems. The reflex to protect the community he comes from and the desire to show how valuable it is to the Westerners was so overwhelming that he did not hesitate to put the responsibility of the problems of the Islamic world and Iran on Turks and to criticize them harshly. The following finding of Shissler is important at this point:

[...] in these French essays he not only praises (and criticizes) many things Persian, he absolves Persian society of the responsibility for some ‘negative’ characteristics, such as the oppression of women, by laying the historical blame on the Turks. This would seem to indicate a lack of sympathy or identification with Turkish culture and would tend to discount the idea that he ‘really’ saw himself as a Turk or Azerbaijani and was adopting another, ‘Aryan’, identity for the purposes of gaining prestige in the European cultural environment in which he was moving. (Shissler, 2002: 83)

Again, according to Aġaoġlu, Turks are responsible for the great collapse of Islam. They led to the ultimate destruction of Iran. The terrible invasions of Genghis Khan and Timur Khan constitute the content of some of his writings. He stated that; even when they took over the Islamic world Turks were not a civilized society; they were barbaric, which in turn made life conditions difficult especially for women and caused them to be pushed into the background. But it is not true to say that his views mean a particular hatred and hostility towards the Turks. As mentioned before, he spent his years in Paris to overcome the prejudices in Europe against Iranian society, giving accurate information about the Iranian society and overcoming various negative judgments (Georgeon, 2013: 106-107). Therefore, while establishing his own Iranian identity, he never stops blaming and criticizing other identities negatively. This situation will interestingly reverse in the following years, both in the last period of the Ottoman Empire and in the first years of the Republic, to the reflex of protecting and sublimation of Turks. In other words, he is doing everything he can to protect himself and the community against the West and to find a place in the modern world for himself and his community.

While in Paris, Aġaoġlu also met Young Turk Ahmet Rıza Bey²⁹. As Akçura narrated, Aġaoġlu respected Ahmed Rıza, who opposed Abdulhamid's oppression (Akçuraoġlu, 2009:446). “Ahmet Rıza had come to Paris in 1889 and had begun publishing the *Union and Progress organ Meşveret (Consultation)* in 1895, while also writing articles which appeared in the French positivist periodical *Le Journal occidental*.” (Shissler, 2002: 116). Ahmet Rıza was interested in the philosophical movements of the time in Paris, especially influenced by Auguste Comte positivism. He continued the courses on Natural History at Sorbonne University and in the meantime Pierre Lafitte's Positivism courses and became a member of the French positivists' association. He is committed to “ordre et progrès” (order and progress) principal which is also the association's motto (Gündüz and Bardak, 2010: 11). Actually, positivism is appealing to him because it both provides a ground for participating in Western progress for his society and a teaching that absolves Ottomans of barbarism. Moreover, the tolerant attitude positivism showing towards Islam made it possible to benefit

²⁹ For more information on Ahmet Rıza Bey, see: Erdem Sönmez, *Ahmet Rıza: Bir Jön Türk Liderinin Siyasi-Entelektüel Portresi* (Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2012).

from the existing belief in the Ottoman Empire (Mardin, 2008: 223). Some articles of Ahmet Rıza in which he introduced and presented the supremacy of Islam in the *La Revue Occidentale*, the magazine of the French positivists, reveal the correctness of this view (Gündüz and Bardak, 2010: 11). According to Şerif Mardin, “*Ahmet Rıza Bey gave no value to Islamic dogma as a divine revelation, but regarded it as extremely important social cement and found it more convenient for social development than Christianity by its nature.*” (Mardin, 2008: 187). Undoubtedly Ağaoğlu should have been influenced by Ahmet Rıza, who considers religion as social cement in the conversations he has made with Ahmet Rıza on the Turkish world. This is the main reason why he gives importance to religion.

When Ağaoğlu got the news of his father's death he took the decision to return to the Caucasus, he chose Istanbul as the route. He stayed in Istanbul nearly for four months, during his stay he came together with Young Turks whom he met in Paris and even flirted with the Union and Progress movement (Shissler, 2002: 116). As it is clear from these relations, the problem of identity confusion was growing. But this situation does not mean that Ağaoğlu who is keeping and defending Iranian identity, even criticizing the Turks for damaging Islam and Iran, lives as he wants or a man without a stance but these are merely the reflections of his identity problems. His only purpose is to strengthen the position of his -ever-changing- society which he feels included in against the West. At this point, there is another important person whom he met while he was in Paris. This name is Sheikh Cemaleddin Afghani³⁰, one of the important thinkers of the Islamic world. According to Akçuraoğlu, Afghani has stayed a couple of weeks with Ağaoğlu (Akçuraoğlu, 2009:448). But Niyazi Berkes says that this claim is fictitious when considering the historical process (Berkes, 2014: 387). Unlike Berkes, Özcan say that this claim could be true based on some information³¹ (Özcan, 2010: 34). In this thesis, it is accepted that the information Ağaoğlu expressed in the memoirs is correct.

³⁰ For more information on Şeyh Cemaleddin Afgani, see: Nikki Ragozin Keddie, *Sayyid Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani: A Political biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972).

³¹ For details of this discussion, see: Niyazi Berkes, *Türkiye’de Çağdaşlaşma* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2014), Ufuk Özcan, *Yüzyıl Dönümünde Batıcı Bir Aydın Ahmet Ağaoğlu ve Rol Değişikliği* (İstanbul: Kitapevi, 2010). Yusuf Akçura, *Türk Yılı 1928* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2009).

2.2.1. French Years' Influence on Ađaođlu's Ideas

To understand the ideas Ahmet Ađaođlu defended in France and the changes and transformations he underwent in this world of ideas, to present the belongings that Ađaođlu used in defining himself and the values he defended and to show the dilemmas he has, his years in France where he completed his higher education need to be looked at in more detail. In Paris Ahmet Ađaođlu took courses from important lecturers such as Ernest Renan, Barbier de Maynard, Schaffer and James Darmesteter and established various relationships. However, he met Young Turks, especially Ahmet Rıza, and made a good friendship. He also participated in scientific and literary talks under the auspices of intellectuals like Marry Robinson and Madame Adam (Sakal, 1999: 13). In order to discover the effects of French relations on Ađaođlu, it would be useful to look at briefly the thought life, and the ideas of people he associated with. Certainly, the first address we will look at this point is James Darmesteter, who is also his protector and teacher. After Darmesteter, it is necessary to look diligently into Ernest Renan. It is also necessary to pay attention to the Paris intellectual environment and the political, social, scientific and cultural factors that affect this environment, which Ađaođlu is quickly included into. Again, to understand Ađaođlu, it would be useful for us to know the thoughts and the goals of the Young Turks such as Ahmet Rıza Bey, whom he met in France. Although there are different views on the correctness of this, Ađaođlu met Afghani in France and even stayed together (Akçuraođlu, 2009:448; Özcan, 2010: 34). Regardless of whether this assertion is true or not, we can see that Ađaođlu was highly influenced by Afghani's views.

James Darmesteter (1849-1894), an important French orientalist (Özavcı, 2015:46), became the professor of Ađaođlu in Persian in College de France and École Pratique des Hautes Études. What makes him important is his work on ancient Persian philology, history of religion especially on Zoroastrian and Mazdek texts. Moreover, being a representative of the 19th century historical linguistic approach, Darmesteter, saw the loopholes of the pure philological approach and he included historical knowledge, local traditions and customs and cultural heritage in his analysis. Darmesteter was a religious man and conservative liberal. He was deeply committed to the ideals of the French Revolution, but at the same

time gave great importance to tradition and continuity. He believed in the ideals of liberalism, acquiring a profession through merit and equal political rights given to citizens. His commitment to the ideals of the revolution was due to see himself as a true French citizen, even though he was Jewish. He was deeply influenced by the French-Prussian war which was resulted against France in primary school years; he even published a book about patriotic stories under pseudonyms. According to Shissler, Darmesteter:

In fact, though a liberal in a certain political sense, his was a nationalist not internationalist liberalism. Darmesteter felt there was such a thing as a 'national mentality' (though he thought it a product of historico-cultural, not racial, processes) and for France he identified its roots already in medieval literature. He viewed the maintenance of this national spirit and mentality as being of primary importance. Still, for all that, Darmesteter remained a true liberal in that he believed in a nation of citizens, not blood. In his essay 'Race and Tradition', he carefully debunks the notion of race and racial mentalities and says that while religious and linguistic affiliation may indeed represent a World-view, these are learned, not biologically inherited. (Shissler, 2002: 79)

From this evaluation, we can easily see the clues that some important values Ağaoğlu acquired during Paris years and defended till the end of his life which we will examine later in detail were acquired by the influence of Darmesteter.

Another important name that influenced Ağaoğlu is Renan. With the intention of being a priest, Renan continued his education in the monasteries in Bretagne and Paris until the faith crisis he experienced in the 1840s. During his education in the monasteries, he had a tremendous accumulation in mathematics, physics and natural sciences, philosophy, metaphysics, Greek, Latin, Hebrew and interpreting the Bible. After leaving the monastery, he entered Paris University. His doctoral thesis on *Averroes and Averroism* was published in 1852. As it can be understood from here that he was a good expert in Arabic language and philosophy (Shissler, 2002: 67). His other famous work is the *La vie de Jesus*, in which he examined Jesus' life only as a person in the historical context (Renan, 1890). Due to this work Renan faced with the intense opposition of the church. The same work has caused the government to pressure Renan to resign from his post. The beginning of Renan's reputation as an infidel and a liberal is also started with this work. Renan, however, always insisted that the church and the state must be precisely separated from each other. This caused his

reputation to spread rapidly (Shissler, 2002: 67). Another important work of him is *Qu'est-ce qu'une Nation?* which delivered in a lecture the Sorbone University in 1882, and published in the following years. Thoughts in this text have intensely influenced the next generations and have provided a fundamental source for nationalism studies. In this work, which was also translated into English, Renan opposed to objective definitions such as race, religion and language that describe nation (Özkırımlı, 2010: 30). Renan claimed that the nation was not eternal and suggested that nations will have their ends as well as they have a beginning:

A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle. Two things which, properly speaking, are really one and the same constitute this soul, this spiritual principle. One is the past, the other is the present. One is the possession in common of a rich legacy of memories; the other is present consent, the desire to live together, the desire to continue to invest in the heritage that we have jointly received. Messieurs, man does not improvise. The nation, like the individual, is the outcome of a long past of efforts, sacrifices, and devotions. Of all cults, that of the ancestors is the most legitimate: our ancestors have made us what we are. A heroic past with great men and glory (I mean true glory) is the social capital upon which the national idea rests. These are the essential conditions of being a people: having common glories in the past and a will to continue them in the present; having made great things together and wishing to make them again. One loves in proportion to the sacrifices that one has committed and the troubles that one has suffered. One loves the house that one has built and that one passes on. The Spartan chant, "We are what you were; we will be what you are", is, in its simplicity, the abridged him of every fatherland (Renan, 1882).

Renan moved the subjective preferences to the foreground in the definition of nation. According to him, the nation requires the continuous approval of the individuals who make up it. In fact, the nation is a plebiscite that is held every day. "*A nation's existence is, if you will pardon the metaphor, a daily plebiscite, just as an individual's existence is a perpetual affirmation of life.*" (Renan, 1882). Here it is essential to mention Shissler's important finding about Renan. According to him, between 1880 and 1890 there was a Renan who defended different ideas. Shissler said that between these years there were three different Renans and all three had separate effects on Ağaoğlu:

Thus we see that there were three 'Renans' active in France in the 1880s and 1890s, all of whom must have had an important impact on Ağaoğlu. First, there was the serious and respected Orientalist, noted especially for his philological prowess with

respect to Hebrew and for his penetrating discussion of the development and spread of Christianity in its early centuries. Second, there was the increasingly conservative commentator on modern French politics and society, against the legal enshrinement of any church, or indeed any return to absolutism, but also convinced of the natural inequality of man and opposed to democracy of the 'one-man, one-vote', 'majority rule' variety. Third, there remained, almost in contradiction to the second personality, a 'liberal' Renan, a man still convinced of the rationality and perfectibility of mankind and dedicated to the notion of individual liberty, at least in such arenas as religious conscience, intellectual life and education; a fierce defender of the critical faculty as mankind's highest and distinguishing trait (yet also convinced that the spiritual, the 'longing for the divine', is an innate and irrepressible human impulse). (Shissler, 2002: 72).

Another person who influenced Aġaoġlu's identity and world of thought was Madame Adam. When Aġaoġlu was introduced to Juliette Adam's salon, he was also introduced to one of the most important intellectual circles of French society in Paris. Here Aġaoġlu got to know France's brightest cultural and political circles. He met an extreme genre of classical liberalism in the French intellectual circles. This understanding of liberalism; is an understanding that defends; safety of life and property, sharing of opportunities based on merit and emphasis on civil rights but instead of acting alone the masses should be managed, people that more common interests in society have more say in government. This understanding naturally is an opinion that disapproves intervention in the economy (Shissler, 2002: 77). The effects of the intellectual circles in which these thoughts prevail on the identity and world of thoughts of Aġaoġlu can be seen at his writings on Madame Adam's publications through Renan even in his years in France (Shissler, 2002: 82-102).

One of the most important people that Aġaoġlu was in communication with in Paris was the famous Young Turk Ahmed Rıza, one of the prominent leaders of the Union and Progress party (Aġaoġlu, 2011:7). Ferruh Bey who was the Ottoman counselor mediated Aġaoġlu's meeting with Ahmet Rıza (Akçuraoġlu, 2009: 446). Aġaoġlu not only met with Ahmet Rıza but also met other Unionists Dr. Nazım and Esat Pasha who were exiles or fugitives in Paris. It is known that he had has long talks about Turkey and the Turkish World with Ahmet Rıza (Sakal, 1999: 13). The Young Turk movement is a social and political movement that marked the Ottoman Empire's final stages. Young Turks is a different generation between the New Ottomans and the Unionists. It is difficult to say that the members of the movement constitute

a whole. However, different groups forming the Young Turks united to form a constitutional monarchy and to shape the future of the country through the deputies to be elected by free elections. They couldn't provide a noteworthy theory, a unique political formula, or a constant ideology (Mardin, 2008: 24). Ahmet Rıza is one of the most important names in this generation, even the head ideologist of the Young Turks. Ahmet Rıza, during his studentship, saw the poverty of the peasants in Anatolia, and he was very affected by this and racked his brain about what could be done for the peasants in misery. As a result, he thought that the reason for this misery in Anatolia was that old-fashioned primitive methods were used in agriculture. He found the solution in going to France and studying agriculture. After finishing his agricultural education in France and returning to Turkey, he started to work as a civil servant in the Ministry of Agriculture. But Ahmet Rıza could not find what he was looking for, and he grasped that the institution he was in was not a place to work for the development of Turkish agriculture and the peasantry. So, he thought that the solution of the backwardness in basic agriculture would be teaching directly the peasants modern farming methods. For this reason, he passed to the Ministry of Education from the Ministry of Agriculture and rose to the position of education director. But here, again he realized that he couldn't do anything for Anatolia which was in misery and went to Paris (Berkes, 2014: 394). After he went to Paris, Ahmet Rıza began showing interest in the philosophical movements of the period, especially interested in Auguste Comte's positivism³². He continued the courses on Natural History at Sorbonne University and in the meantime Pierre Lafitte's Positivism courses and became a member of the French positivists' association. He is committed to “*ordre et progrès*” (order and progress) principal which is also the association's motto. Despite this, Ahmet Rıza has written some articles in the *La Revue Occidentale* magazine of the French positivists to present and praise the glory of Islam. Again, he gave some answers to the articles about the Ottoman State in the French press (Gündüz and Bardak, 2010: 11). This is like Ahmet Ağaoğlu's defense of his Iranian-Persian identity in France, to praise Shiism through deep meanings he attributed to it. Both Ağaoğlu and Ahmet Rıza were worried about defending their societies against the West and finding

³² For more information on Auguste Comte, Ahmet Rıza and positivism, see: Z. Fahri Fındıkoğlu, *Augusto Comte ve Ahmet Rıza* (İstanbul: Fakülteler Matbaası, 1962).

a place for their societies in the West. Ahmet Rıza, in 1895, began publishing *Consultancy* (*Meşveret*) magazine in Paris. The magazine was published in Turkish as well as French supplement. Ahmet Rıza published a program that emphasizes the blending of Eastern culture with knowledge and culture to be taken from the West, and raising the education level of the people from the first issue of *Consultancy* (Gündüz and Bardak, 2010: 13). The common element of all ideas of Ahmet Rıza is his desire to put Turkey in the Western movement by getting them to accept the idea that Turkey is equal to other states. Education was a tool for Ahmet Rıza to demonstrate an individual the tasks they have in society. Positivism appeals to him because it provides both a ground for participating in Western progress and a teaching that absolves Ottomans of barbarism. Moreover, the tolerant attitude positivism showing towards Islam made it possible to benefit from the existing belief in the Ottoman Empire (Mardin, 2008: 223). “*Ahmet Rıza gave no value to Islamic dogma as a divine revelation, but regarded it as extremely important social cement and found it more convenient for social development than Christianity by its nature.*” (Mardin, 2008: 187). The common points of Ahmet Rıza and Ağaoğlu are their interest in the West, their embracement of the Western way of life, their efforts to create a position for the society they belong in the West and their attitudes towards religion.

Afghani, who had an important place in the thought and politic life of the Islamic world in the nineteenth century with his travels in the West and the East, important people and groups he influenced, events and movements he has contributed to various works left behind and his followers, came to the world and continued his life in an environment in which Westerners established an undisputed domination all over the world, especially in Islamic countries. In this period, the West influenced Muslim countries politically and culturally. This period, when the West’s superiority was felt over the Islamic geography, was concurrently a time that ignorance, bid'ah and superstition were moving Muslims away from the essence of religion. The world of belief and thought of Afghani has grown and developed in this climate. He has taken courses from various teachers in the major enlightenment centers. According to Afghani, there are four important conditions for people to reach an advanced level in science, morality and civilization, and to be happy both in the world and in the afterlife. First of this four condition is that the human mind should be free from all

prejudices, delusions, and various superstitions that prevent accurate thinking and finding the truth. Another condition is the need for individuals and societies not to be carried away by despair and defeat. In other words, Afghani underlines the necessity that an individual or a society should believe that any individual or a society is no less capable than any other individual or society; they can also realize good and beautiful things themselves, they can even reach all perfection except for the prophecy. The next condition is that knowledge and belief should be based on serious, sound and unquestionable definitive proofs and not to be content with imitation. The last condition is about education. Here, Afghani expresses the necessity of having specialized people and institutions in each society, of which their only job should be education and training (Karaman, 1994: 456-466). As it can be understood from the part until here that Afghani just like Ağaoğlu, pondered how to strengthen the position of his community/religion he lives in against the West. Afghani is looking for a way of salvation for Muslim nations, and the first institution to be looked into is the effect of religion. According to him, Muslims made enormous breakthrough immediately after the emergence of Islam, Muslims made huge progress. Numerous examples that were presented in the fields of conquest, science, culture and civilization are clear evidence that a well-understood and practiced Islam is not effective in the decline of Muslims. So, what is the cause of this stagnation and regression? According to him, the reasons for stagnation and regression are:

a) turning of caliphate into sultanate, moving away from the knowledge and the ideology and content with the title and ceremony of the so-called caliphs, division of Muslims due to the administration of more than one caliph b) while religion and nationality are two important forces that keep a society alive, weakening of both, caliphs employing foreigners in the public service c) Superstitious beliefs and casuistries spread by atheists and esoterics in III ve IV. (IX-X) centuries d) Force belief spreading and stopping the excitement and moves of Muslims e) the introduction of false hadiths which are attributed to the Prophet and the Isra'iliyyat by the traitors under the guise of religion into the books, and thus the tarnishing of the clean beliefs of Muslims f) The fact that education and training do not have the strength and prevalence for these negative, stopping and regressive effects g) damages, destruction and weariness brought by the Mongol invasions from the East and Crusader invasions from the West h) division and disintegration of Muslims moving away from Islam in terms of knowledge and practice, split up of the scholars, communities abandoning the solidarity and assistance based on sense of brotherhood (Karaman, 1994: 462).

According to Afghani, in order to find solutions for the development and progress of Muslim nations, the conditions that caused them to be in this position should be taken into consideration. After summarizing the political and intellectual position of Afghani, it is necessary to mention the relation between Afghani and Aḡaoḡlu which is important in terms of the subject of the thesis. According to Aḡaoḡlu, Afghani came to Paris where he met him and even hosted him for a while. We can easily say that Afghani has influenced Aḡaoḡlu as Afghani being one of the pioneers in bringing a modern interpretation of Islam and emphasized the importance of reasoning while Muslims positioning themselves against the West. Besides, both are interested in the future of Iran. There are many similarities in the way they view Iran. At the point where Iran was shared by Western imperialists, they opposed the British and took a stand in favor of Russia. They also stood at the same point on the need for reform and renaissance, as there was a need for a new resurgence in Islamic societies. Both of them – even though Aḡaoḡlu then changed his mind - took a dim view of the union of the Islamic societies under the leadership of the Ottoman Caliphate (Özcan, 2010: 33-34).

2.3. Azerbaijan Years and National Struggle Period in Caucasus (1894- 1909)

2.3.1. Current Situation of Caucasia

As we mentioned earlier, when Aḡaoḡlu went to Paris for higher education he left behind many changes, transformations and various problems in the political, social and cultural area in the Caucasus. Russia was increasingly its pressure about these areas on Azerbaijan these problems. The most important problems left behind were that modern industry and trade began to grow in Caucasus, that landlords began to loose their power and that the effect of reform waves all over Russia were greater on Caucasus. Because of this, the wave of reforms and revolutionary ideologies that emerged among the Caucasus Muslims has caused the Caucasus to face new challenges far beyond its current state. All of these influenced the thought of how and where the position of his community should be in the world during the higher education of Aḡaoḡlu. The contradictions in describing his identity whether he is a Russian Muslim, Shiite, Turkish, Iranian, reformist, gentleman, socialist or loyal Muslim

servants of the Tsar on the way to Paris was eliminated with his Iranian identity being accepted by Parisian orientalist he was influenced by and had contact with even for a short period of time. But as we have mentioned before, this identity which is full of contradictions, meant only salvation for him during his higher education. As a matter of fact, life of Ağaoğlu after returning to the Caucasus displays this view. The solution that Ağaoğlu found for the ongoing identity problem in the Caucasus was to acquire a new identity. This new identity process can not be understood by ignoring the events, social and economic changes, transformations and problems in the Caucasus at that period. When he returned from Paris, Ağaoğlu had encountered bigger problems than he had left in the Caucasus, and had to reevaluate his and his community's position he was in, and had to redefine his identity. The main factor in the formation of this new identity is undoubtedly nationalism. Instead of the Iranian identity he used in France, he would now adopt the Turkish identity. At this point, we should have a look at the nationalist movements in the Caucasus and the factors that have paved the way for the birth of nationalism in the Caucasus. It is possible to evaluate the emergence of nationalism in the Caucasus by various political and social foundations. In the first half of the XX century two major events, which triggered the other, led to the rapid spread of nationalism in Asia. The first of these events was the conclusion of the Russo-Japanese War³³ of 1904-1905 (8 February 1904– 5 September 1905) in favour of Japan. War was a complete disappointment for Russia. The Russian army received a definitive defeat on every front. What lay behind Russia receiving such a defeat was that, Japan was organized better in the war and turned the war in its favor by more modern practices. Russia, on the other hand, was a country that could not be organized, struggled with great troubles internally and deprived of the support of its people. In addition, Japan also got the support of Great Britain, one of the most powerful states in the period (Riasanovsky and Steinberg, 2011:416-418). It can be said that challenged to the supremacy that Christian Europe established over Asian societies. Asian societies could clearly see that thanks to the Japanese victory Europe was not invincible. This, in Asia, prepared a suitable environment for the nationalistic

³³ The war developed out of the rivalry between Russia and Japan for dominance in Korea and Manchuria. For more information, see: Geoffrey Jukes, *The Russo-Japanese War 1904-1905* (Osprey Oxford: Publishing, 2002), Rotem Kowner, *The Russo-Japanese* (Lanham, Maryland, Toronto, Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, 2006).

movements and nationalistic pursuits. Another important event triggered by this development was the revolution of 1905 in Russia, which thoroughly increased the expectations of getting rid of the pressures of Tsarist ruling (Özcan, 2010: 35). This Revolution was a result of social and ideological developments that took place throughout Russia. The opposition to the Tsarist ruling had begun to organize considerably right before the Revolution. Liberals who were playing a dominant role, especially among opponents have various common purposes like the reforms, particularly; rule of law, fundamental social rights, elected parliament, local government, public education and labour law to ensure stability and social justice. The socialists shared these democratic goals of the liberals and the fundamental philosophy of liberal democracy. The rise of liberalism in Russia, the development of Marxism and the rapid growth of the workers' movements laid the groundwork for the realization of the revolution (Riasanovsky and Steinberg, 2011:420). Just as in the Japanese-Russian war of 1904-1905, the 1905 Revolution resulted in the empowerment of nationalist movements, especially in the Caucasus. This was the most important reason for the Tsarist administration to provide a relatively atmosphere of freedom for the local forces.

In this context, it is necessary to look at the Cedidism movement, which developed rapidly until the 1905 Revolution and spread among the Turks of Russia. Cedidism is a social movement directed towards reforming an archaic and traditional education system which also does not fit the spirit of modern times in the field of culture and civilization (Yuzeyev, 2014: 241). These movements have not started on the same dates and conditions in all the Turkish homelands occupied by Russia. Some Turkish homelands have absorbed and applied these movements very quickly, but in some of them these movements have not been realized until very late (Akyol, 1993: 211-213). The 1905 Revolution influenced Cedidists positively, and the reform movement that was led by the Cedidists showed itself in the fields of education, press and literature where the atmosphere of freedom can be used most effectively. Unlike the Ottoman Empire, where reform was initiated in administrative and military areas, reform was initiated in the areas of education, press and literature as Russian Turks did not have the power to reform at administration and the possibility of a confrontation with the Russian administration. Centers affecting Cedidism were Russia,

West and Turkey (Maraş, 2002: 64-70). Although this reform movement in the Russian Turks started a little late compared to the Ottoman Turkey, it was accepted very quickly among the Russian Turks, especially in the Crimea, Kazan and Caucasus regions and spread rapidly (Devlet, 1999: 10).

At this point, it is also necessary to talk about İsmail Bey Gaspıralı, who has influenced many Turk-Muslim intellectuals ranging from the Ottoman Empire to Turkistan. Gaspıralı emerged as a spiritual leader and a reformist chief among all the Russian Turks. He played an important role in the national revival of all Russian Turks. The motto “Unity in The Language, The Idea and the Work” he put is a trinity that Turkists believe even today. İsmail Bey Gaspıralı had his education in Russian schools in Moscow, and was in France and Turkey. In 1875-1881, he first worked as a teacher in Bahçesaray, later as a deputy mayor, and eventually as mayor. Even if he attempted to publish a newspaper in 1879, he could not obtain the necessary permits from the Tsarist administration. In 1881 he proclaimed his program in an article he wrote in Russian. Gaspıralı stated in his article that; national schools should be created and developed and education should be reformed, the national education centers should be supported financially, a national press, which can address the whole Turkish world on a common language should be launched, Muslim lifestyles should be modernized, Muslim woman should have freedom and national intellectuals should be trained (Devlet, 1999: 17-18). Gaspıralı also benefited from the partial liberty that the Tsarist administration had adopted compulsorily as a result of the Russian revolution of 1905, and began publishing the newspaper *Tercüman (The Interpreter)*³⁴ in 1883. *Tercüman* reaching from Cairo to Kashgar, from Kazan to India and the Ottoman Empire, which has many members, especially intellectuals and reformists in these countries, was an instructive newspaper with a main objective of producing the common Turkish language, the idea and the work. Gaspıralı was an intellectual who puts his thoughts into practice and activate them. In this context, he opened a primary school which gave education using contemporary

³⁴ *Tercüman* newspaper of Gaspıralı İsmail Bey has a very wide coverage. Many articles have been written about religion, education, politics, economics, diplomacy, literature, art, music and so on. Writings from the Turkish world, samples from their literature such as Kyrgyz, Uzbek, Kazakh, Kazan, Tatar, Crimean Tatar, Bashkir, Turkmen, and Azeri and so on appear in the *Tercüman*. Along with these, current news and evaluations of the period from the United Kingdom, US, Balkans, Sudan, Egypt, Bashkortostan, Russia, Dagestan and so on have a wide coverage in the newspaper.

methods (*Usûl-i Cedid*³⁵) in Bahçesaray in 1884. He served his cause he believed in throughout his life. The writing “*İsmail Bey Gasprinski*”, which Ağaoğlu wrote after the death of Gaspıralı in the *Türk Yurdu* (*Turkish Homeland*) magazine, is important as we can see the influence of Gaspıralı İsmail Bey on Ağaoğlu’s world of ideas.

[...] The aim that İsmail Bey pursued consisted of introducing the Turks to themselves and by developing their consciousness of nationality to suggest that they are one and united. A nation feeling the unity of ideas, languages and feelings, has already felt the unity of spirit. And to reach that aim, first he fought with ignorance where it strangled the Turks everywhere, separate them from each other and deprive them of their consciousness of nationality and for this he used the most effective ways; press and school. School and press: Two weapons that will save the Turkishness! And İsmail Bey dedicated his entire life to equip Turks with weapons (Agayef, *Türk Yurdu*, 1330 [1914]: 2405-2409).

Like the way Gaspıralı pointed out, Ağaoğlu throughout his life, shaped his aim to guide the society he lived in to the right course through the media and education. There is another important reason in addition to the above-mentioned reasons underlying the rapid and strong growth of Turkish and Muslim nationalist movements and various organizations in the Caucasus. The new population balance caused by the increasing political, economic and commercial pressures of Russia in the Caucasus which was working against the locals of Caucasus, caused the remarkable decrease of the political power of the Muslims in the region. This situation brought the counter-reactions of Turkish and Muslim groups of the Caucasus’, especially Azeri’s’. Turks and other Muslim groups understood that they have lost their influence on the administration of Caucasus and that they can not regain these influences by traditional methods. In this case, they felt the need to make a rapid inner evaluation and they thought that they could improve their influence power by modernization. This can be explained by Miroslav Hroch's approach to the formation process of the nation. Hroch's approach establishes a direct link between the formation process of nations and the broad social changes. It evaluates the changes taking place in the process of nation formation together with the capitalist industrialization processes and national market relations. In addition, thanks to the link between social change and nationalism studies, it shows a social

³⁵ *Usûl-i Cedid* (new education methods) describes the method of innovative education that started in the Crimea before İsmail Bey Gaspıralı and then spread among all Russian Muslim-Turkish subjects (Kınacı, 2016: 172).

and cultural change model that reveals how national cultures are shaped (Hroch, 1993: 3-20). According to him, there are two models in the nation-building. These are the ruling nation model and the small or subject nation model. When the conditions of Russian Azerbaijan are taken into consideration, the process of nation building in Azerbaijan suits the second pattern. There are three preconditions for the small or subject nation model to be valid. These are; the absence of a ruling class of the same ethnic group, the absence of an administrative unit coincident with the extent of their ethnic population, the absence of cultural production in their own literary language (Shissler, 2002: 121). Under these circumstances, capitalism and modernization tend to result in the group's being dominated by the bourgeoisie of another ethnic group. Because of this in groups like these there is a struggle to provide the missing attributes of full national existence like equal rights, national language and culture, fair economic share and political autonomy. But the success of this movement depends upon the presence of a nationally relevant conflict of group interests and its appeal to masses. Therefore, the struggle must take place within the framework of an ethnic nationalism (Hroch, 1900:108-110). Indeed, all of these criteria were met in that period of Russian Azerbaijan. Economically, Turkish and Muslim communities were weak, and the oil industry, the most important industrial line of Azerbaijan, were in the hands of Russian, Armenian and other foreign bourgeois. In addition, the major institutions of government, public and educational institutions were closed to Muslims. When censorship was applied to Muslims in reaching and reading their religious texts Armenians were free from this censorship. Education and publications were limited in Azerbaijani Turkish. This situation brought a Turkish-Armenian conflict with it on the national scale. Therefore, in that period Azerbaijan both met the criteria for Hroch's small or subject nation building model to be valid and having an ethnic conflict for the success of it (Shissler, 2002: 121). The aim of the Cedidists to establish a common language and a cultural union through the education, press and literature in the beginning, led to the establishment of various political parties in the Caucasus, the emergence of the workers' movements and the building of a new identity-nation. This process is also the process in which Ağaoğlu acquires a new identity blended with nationality.

2.3.2. Activities at Caucasia

Ağaoğlu was on his way to return to the Caucasus after studying in Paris. Ağaoğlu chose the itinerary through Istanbul and had various meetings with Müfit Pasha and Mizancı Murad Bey in Istanbul. When he left Istanbul in 1894 and arrived in the Caucasus, he first settled in Tbilisi and was assigned to French teaching in Tbilisi Gymnasium in other words Tbilisi High School (Sakal, 1999: 14). In this period, he had written in the newspaper *Kafkas (The Caucasus)* to which he also sent his writings during his years of education in France (Akçuraoğlu, 2009:449). Ağaoğlu went to in 1896, also his birthplace and continued to teach French here as well. Ağaoğlu wanted to get married during his stay in (Sakal, 1999: 14-15). But it was not that easy to make his wish come true as the Western way of life and the thoughts he defended without compromising caused him to be rejected by the public and to be known as “*Frenk Ahmet*” among the people in particular (Özcan, 2010: 41). Because of this, the way to marriage with Sitare Hanım was very difficult and long. Sitare Hanım's family did not want to give their girl to *Frenk Ahmet* and they prevented this marriage by various excuses. Even after the family accepted to give their daughter, through some friends intervened, the wedding was delayed for a long time. Finally the marriage was possible in 1902 (Sakal, 1999: 15). In 1898, with the efforts of Zeynelabidin Taghiyev³⁶, one of Baku's famous oil riches, he started to publish a Russian-language newspaper called *Kaspi (The Caspian)* in Baku. Ağaoğlu was brought to the head of this newspaper, which served to defend the rights and the interests in all areas of the Azerbaijani Turks and published in Russian by Taghiyev. Even, Taghiyev and Ağaoğlu also applied for a Turkish newspaper. But the pressures of the Russians, who had thought that the permission granted to Gaspıralı's *Tercüman* had costed them so much and defended the Russian domination thesis on Turkish societies left this wish without a result (Akçuraoğlu, 2009:449). At that time, the Azerbaijani Turks were economically, politically, and culturally one of the most backward communities in the Caucasus. Ağaoğlu supported that this situation should be corrected, the society should be illuminated and a new awakening should be realized. For this, he thought that the path of Gaspıralı should be taken; he called the people, especially the rich, for some sort of

³⁶ For information on Takiyev, see: Okan Yeşilot, *Hacı Zeynelabidin Tagiyev* (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2015)

educational campaign. He institutionalized the campaign by establishing an association called *Neşr-i Maarif*. Zeynelabidin Taghiyev was also the president of this association. In this context, he opened branches and made propaganda in many cities in order to disseminate the idea of Usûl-i Cedid schools of Gaspıralı. The goal that the Neşr-i Maarif Association would like to achieve through the Usûl-i Cedid schools was that the Azerbaijani Turks would turn from community society to the nation society. Without a doubt, to resolve the Shia-Sunni dispute between the Azerbaijani Turks was necessary in order to achieve this purpose (Sakal, 1999: 16-17). Ağaoğlu was fighting with the domination policies of Russians in Azerbaijan, was battling for resolving the sectarian dispute which caused the Turkish nation to disintegrate. At this point we see that there is no bond with the Shiite-centered Iranian identity that expressed him when Ağaoğlu was in Paris, and even now he is nurturing enmity towards it. “*Sectarian contradictions have separated Azeri Turks from Ottoman Turks, Crimea, Volga and Central Asian Turks for a period longer than five hundred years.*” (Özcan, 2010: 45). By taking advantage of this dispute both Iran could Persianize Azerbaijan Turks and Tsarist Russia could easily control Muslim population by taking the Muslims under domination through sectarian dispute as Muslims were not united. Taking all these reasons into account, it was unthinkable for Ağaoğlu not to wage war on this issue in the process of nationalization of Azerbaijani Turks. It is necessary to talk about his famous work *Islam and Ahund* (1990), which was taken written in this context. This unpublished work which passed from hand to hand claimed that the ahunds were the man who weakened Islam, this also being the main thesis of the book, attracted considerable attention among the Azerbaijani Turks (Akçuraoğlu, 2009:451). In 1901, again in this way, Ağaoğlu wrote a book named *Woman in Islam (Woman According to Islam and Woman in Islam)* in Russian. In this work, Ağaoğlu said that although the Islamic religion protects women's rights much more than other religions, it is clear that the problem of women in the Islamic world has arisen due to the superficial and superstitious beliefs which entered the religion later, because of this women were pushed backwards in the family and in the social life, this being one of the most important reasons of the collapse of the Islamic nation (Ağaoğlu, 1959). The main point to be emphasized here is the negative perception that is being created against the Shiite-Persian tradition. Ağaoğlu, contrary to what he claimed in his years in France, which was to

say that the Turks pushed the women backwards in the social life, thus spoiled Islam, now put the blame on Iran and Syria. According to him, the adverse effects of these civilizations' customs and traditions have left our women uneducated and brought an understanding that does not involve them in social life. This understanding believed to be an Islamic rule over time had harmed Islam (Ağaoğlu, 1959: 42). Azerbaijani enlightenment, which had been initiated by intellectuals such as Feth Ali Ahundzade³⁷, Seyyid Azim Şirvani and Hasan Zerdabi, and which developed mostly through culture and art, proceeded to a new stage in this period headed by Ağaoğlu and Hüseyinzade Ali. During that period, among the Azerbaijani Turks the targets intended to establish consciousness in terms of economy, to found culture and education institutions, and to claim their rights by organizing politically and legally began to grow. Ağaoğlu and Hüseyinzade Ali were also people who openly defended the cultural unity with the Ottoman Empire (Sakal, 1999: 17-18). As previously stated, the Tsarist administration, which suffered a heavy defeat in the 1905 Russian-Japanese war, had to allow a partial liberty. In this environment, important names such as Hüseyinzade Ali, Ali Merdan Topçubaşı and Zeynelabidin Taghiyev were able to get permits for various newspapers that they could not get before. Since the early 1900's, Ağaoğlu has penned important writings about the problems of Caucasian Muslims and especially Azerbaijani Turks as writer, editor and newspaper owner in journals and newspapers such as *Kaspi (The Caspian)*, *Şark-i Rus (The Russian East)*, *Hayat (Life)*, *İrşad (Guidance)*, *Terakki (Progress)* (Özcan, 2010: 53, Sakal, 1999: 18). *İrşad*, financed by a rich Azeri, is the most important of these newspapers. *İrşad*, published by Ağaoğlu, continued his publishing life on a constitutional-democratic and liberal line. This newspaper is the most powerful newspaper in Azerbaijan, a newspaper that gives priority to social issues for the first time and differs in its publication targets compared to other periodicals. In *İrşad*, unlike the usual, he was dealing with politics, not the literary and cultural problems. Throughout his publishing life in the Caucasus, he has struggled to establish national identity against both Iran, which has long been a powerful sovereign over Azerbaijan through sectarian conflicts and Russian government (Özcan, 2010: 55-56). He and his friends through the

³⁷ For more information on Feth Ali Ahundzade, see: A Vahap Yurtsever, *Mirza Fethali Ahuntzadenin Hayatı ve Eserleri* (Ankara: Yeni Cezaevi Matbaası, 1950).

press, publicized ideas like reforming the religious education and worship, opening up the Usûl-i Cedid schools, giving education in Turkish, the need for Muslims to be on equal terms and conditions with the Russians and the Armenians in the political, military and economic areas and made these issues spread to the masses possible (Sakal, 1999: 18). Ağaoğlu and Hüseyinzade Ali also have established close ties with Young Turks in this period, and it is necessary to say that he established a connection between Young Turks and Caucasian intellectuals through the press. In fact, both intellectuals defended the adoption of the Ottoman Turkish language as the official language in Azerbaijan (Özcan, 2010: 56-57). Briefly, Ağaoğlu discovered the power of press in the process of building an identity, to undertake the task of this built identity to be adopted, to be able to speak easily to broad masses and to direct them early and used it skillfully. This journalistic skill caused him to take on a wide variety of very important roles both in the process of nationalization of Azerbaijan, in the late period of the Ottoman State and in the founding period of the Republic of Turkey. In order to benefit from the relative freedom in 1905, intellectuals agreed on the establishment of an organization called the Alliance of Muslims of Russia. The first meeting of the Alliance was held in Petersburg on April 8, 1905. Abdurreşid İbrahim who was also the host, Ali Merdan Topçubaşı, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, Hüseyinzade Ali and couple of days later Ismail Bey Gaspıralı, attended the first meeting of the Alliance. At this meeting, it was decided to hold the First Congress of the Russian Muslims to make decisions about the fate and the future of the Russian Muslims. Ahmet Ağaoğlu and Hüseyinzade Ali Bey went to St. Petersburg in 1906 and talked about the constitutionalism with Tsarist administration. Ağaoğlu on behalf of Azerbaijan conducted these negotiations very tough. Even Yusuf Akçura, one of the representatives of Kazan delegation, who will also become a friend fighting for the same cause with him in Turkey, said that the most active fighter of Petersburg was Ağaoğlu. Ağaoğlu went to Petersburg again in 1907, defended the Azeri's' rights against Russians and Armenians regarding the issue of Russians pushing back the Azerbaijani Turks from Baku oil region with the help of his legal education and advanced Russian knowledge and shared the rightness of this struggle with public by writings in Russian in various newspapers. There is another organization that Ağaoğlu founded apart from the Neşr-i Maarif Society. This organization, called *Difai*, was founded in 1905, at a time when the

assaults and massacres of the Armenians in the Caucasus, with the support of the Russian authorities, were increasing thoroughly (Sakal, 1999: 19-21). At this point it should be noted that there are different opinions on the establishment of Difai and the person who established it. For example, according to Tadeusz Swictochowski, Difai was founded by Şafi Rüstembekov, İsmail Ziyadhanov, Nesib Yusufbekov, Halil Kesmemedov ve Hasan Ağzade in Gence, Ağaoğlu participated in this group from Baku (Swictochowski, 2004: 43-44). According to Hüseyin Baykara, Difai was founded by Ağaoğlu in Baku. When Ağaoğlu came to Gence to spread the organization, he agreed with the nationalist leaders there and opened a branch here (Sakal, 1999: 21). Whichever one is right, Difai is, after all, a defense organization established by Muslims to respond to the attacks of Armenians (Dashnaks), protected and spoiled by Russians in the Caucasus. Difai's aim was clearly expressed in its manifest:

The Dashnak Party, structured as a military force and at the same time equipped with modern arms and even cannon, is pressuring all the Armenians on the one hand with armed force and the Caucasian government itself on the other. And it is pursuing its most fundamental goal; and that is, after they have crushed all the Muslims in the Caucasus and finished them off, to occupy their lands. The plan of the Armenians, after achieving their ends, is to create in the Caucasus a national (milli) independent administration for the Armenian people. Our party's goal is to create sincere brotherhood and unity among the separate Caucasian peoples. Any time the Dashnak Party clearly states with honesty and sincerity the real agenda of their movement and activities and if that program does not include points that would violate the freedom and independence of the separate Caucasian nations (milletler), then we will always be ready to extend our own united hand to them. But if, on the contrary, (the Dashnak Party) continues deceitfully and cruelly in its attacks on the Muslims, as it has before, it will get a suitable answer from us and the Caucasus will become the scene of endless, unremitting bloodshed. Let the Dashnak Party be sure that at no time will we give way to the foundation of the happiness and well-being of the Armenian nation (millet) on the ruination and ashes of our own nation (millet). (Shissler, 2002: 127-128)

Difai held Russia responsible for the bloody incidents in the Caucasus. It also stated that the Armenians would get the same response if they cooperate with the Russian administrators and resorted to violence. It punished the Azerbaijanis who were collaborating with Russian and Armenians, especially the state officials who work against the interest of Azeri's with death. The important Russian administrators that Difai killed were General Galashchapov,

Governor Counselor of Gence Kreshcinski, Police Director Bannikov, Prosecutor Cunyakin and Felikinski, another police chief. In addition, many Russians have been held responsible for various incidents and were killed (Sakal, 1999: 22, Shissler, 2002: 127). It was unthinkable for the Russian to be just an onlooker to these important actions carried out by Difai. In 1908 Ağaoğlu was started to be followed due to the organization of Difai, his books and writings were banned as 'Pan-Turkist' and had to hide in his friends' houses for months. Just when these pressures started to increase, constitutional monarchy was declared in Turkey, and a lot of his friends whom he had contact with came to power. Upon this, Ağaoğlu decided to escape to Istanbul and came to Istanbul in late 1908. His family could come to Turkey only after two years (Sakal, 1999: 22). Difai's program, which had been effective until the end of 1908, was implemented by Musavat Party and Mehmet Emin Resulzade³⁸, leader of the party. Difai played an effective role in the independence of Azerbaijan and formed the basis of the modern Azerbaijan Army (Sakal, 1999: 22-23). In short, in a time when political events, revolts and rebellions, mutual ethnic violence eruptions were taking place in the Caucasus and Baku, Ağaoğlu existed with a nationalist line in this geography with liberal rhetoric in almost every area in his struggle with Russians and traditional Shiite-Iranian identity as well as Armenians spoiled by Russians.

2.4. Ottoman State Period (1909- 1921)

The thoroughly increasing impact of the pressures of the Tsarist Russian administration in the Caucasus' after 1908 made it impossible for an actively fighting Azerbaijani Turks in every area like Ağaoğlu to stay in the Caucasus. The increase of the influence of the Young Turks with the declaration of the constitutional monarchy in the Ottoman Empire and his friends whom he had contact with coming to power made Istanbul attractive to him. "Ottoman revolution attracts those who want to work for the Turkishness to Istanbul from the whole Turkish world" (Akçuraoğlu, 2009:457). According to Akçura's unpublished

³⁸ For more information on Mehmet Emin Resulzade, see: Sabahattin Şimşir, *Mehmet Emin Resulzade Hayatı ve Şahsiyeti* (İstanbul: Doğu Kütüphanesi, 2012). Nesiman Yaguplu, *Mehmet Emin Resulzade Ansiklopedisi* (Ankara: Azerbaycan Kültür Derneği Yayınları, 2015).

autobiography of Aġaoġlu, Aġaoġlu's situation in the Caucasus before arriving in Istanbul is as follows:

I was among those who were zealously followed. Matters came to such a point that not only my own peace of mind and repose, but that of my family as well, began to be compromised. In 1908 a revolution had taken place in Turkey. Some individuals I knew had risen to its head. At the same time Count Vorontsov-Dashkov, who had been appointed Viceroy of the Caucasus, had decided to seize and banish me no matter what. As soon as I learned this I decided to escape and I fled to Istanbul towards the close of 1908. (Shissler, 2002: 157, Akçuraoġlu, 2009:457)

Aġaoġlu right after coming to Istanbul from the Caucasus, with the help of Dr. Nazım and his friend Ahmet Rıza Bey from France he easily found a place in the social life that emerged after the declaration of constitutional monarchy in the Ottoman Empire. He worked as an inspector of education for his first job in Istanbul. Later, he was appointed as the director of Suleymaniye Library. At the same time, he continued to write in newspapers and magazines that he had successfully done in both France and Azerbaijan. He was a writer and editor in the most important publications of the period like *Le Jeune Turc*, *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*, *İslam*, *Sebilü'r-Reşad*, *Sırat-ı Müstakim* and *Türk Yurdu*. Since 1909 he has taught Turkish-Mongolian history and Russian language at the Istanbul Darülfünun. He left the office in 1912 and was appointed as a member of General Assembly (Meclis-i Umumi) of the Union and Progress, then elected to the parliament. Between 1917 and 1918 he represented Afyon Karahisar in the parliament. It is known that in the Ottoman Parliament he spoke of liberal discourses such as national sovereignty, immunity of deputies, not exiling the deputies and providing the right to speak to every member of parliament (Sakal, 1999: 24). In 1911, Ahmet Aġaoġlu joined the establishment of the *Türk Yurdu*³⁹, a very influential and important magazine with the Turkish intellectuals like Yusuf Akçura and Hüseyinzade Ali coming from Russia. The aim of the *Türk Yurdu* magazine, the publication organ of the *Türk Yurdu* Society, which was founded by Turkist intellectuals, is “to serve Turkishness and help the Turks” (*Türk Yurdu*, 1911: 1). Among the founders were Hüseyinzade Ali and Yusuf Akçura along with Aġaoġlu. These are the Turks who came to Istanbul in the wake of the

³⁹ For more information on *Türk Yurdu*, see: Mehmet Özden, *Türk Yurdu Dergisi ve İkinci Meşrutiyet Devri Türkçülük Akımı (1911-1918)* (Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü/Tarih Anabilim Dalı, Unpublished PhD thesis, 1994).

increasingly severe conditions in Russia and the constitutional monarchy declared in Turkey (Shissler, 2002: 158). Aġaoġlu was also the founder of the *Türk Ocađı*⁴⁰, which was founded in 1912 and played an important role in the realization of the national struggle and in the establishment of the Turkish Republic (Shissler, 2002:158). The *Türk Yurdu* Society was closed after a while and the *Türk Yurdu* magazine began to be published by the Türk Ocađı (Sarınay, 2004: 124; Üstel, 1997: 34). Türk Ocađı and its publication organ *Türk Yurdu* became two important institutions in the development of the idea of Turkism and Turkishness consciousness in the Ottoman Empire. Türk Ocađı, rapidly organized all across the empire, especially in Anatolia, opened branches in many cities. When it came to 1914, there were 3000 members of the Ocak, and in 1920 this number increased to 30,000. Türk Ocađı is one of the most important institutions in which the National Struggle Movement is organized after the First World War. Atatürk trusted the most in the Türk Ocađı in the national struggle (Hacaloġlu, 1993: 10). Continued to be published until 1931, *Türk Yurdu*, also, was an intellectual magazine with thousands of readers among Turks and captive Turks under Russian rule and turned into a school (Dumont, 1998)⁴¹. During his time in the Ottoman Empire, Aġaoġlu established close relations with the most important intellectuals and politicians of Istanbul. He took part in the administration of the Ottoman State, assuming duties such as civil servant, member of parliament, membership of the ruling party. While carrying out these duties, Aġaoġlu was not only interested in the Ottoman State's problems but also of all the Turkish nations' problems. Especially he never gave up on his homeland Azerbaijan which was under the Russian rule. Aġaoġlu brought Azerbaijani Turks to the agenda in his writings. He was striving for the development of mutual interest and relations and the placement of consciousness of fraternity with the Ottoman Turks. With the outbreak of World War I the Ottomans became one of the parties to this war. By the leadership of Enver Pasha the policies of the Ottomans related to the Ottoman authority over the Caucasus started to be implemented (Shissler, 2002: 160-161). In line with the Caucasus policies of

⁴⁰ For more information on Türk Ocađı, see: Yusuf Sarınay, *Türk Milliyetçiliđinin Tarihi Gelişimi ve Türk Ocakları* (İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat, 2004), Fusun Üstel, *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliđi Türk Ocakları (1912-1931)* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1997).

⁴¹ In this thesis, the translation of Saime Selenga Gökgöz was used, for the original, see: The thesis has used to Paul Dumont, "La revue *Türk Yurdu et Les Musulmans de l'Empire russe*", *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique*, XV (3-4), 1974: 315-332.

the Ottoman State, intellectuals such as Yusuf Akçura, Hüseyinzade Ali and Abdurresid İbrahim established the *Rusya'da Sakin Müslüman Türk Tatarlarının Haklarını Müdafaa Cemiyeti* (Society for the Defense of Rights of the Muslim Turkish-Tatar Peoples of Russia). Ahmet Ağaoğlu was also in this Society. The Society undertaken various studies to protect the rights of all Russian Turks. This society, also known as the Turkish-Tatar delegation, operated not only in Turkey but also in Central Europe by making various meetings and conferences and penning various writings against Russia to make their cause known to the world. It is also known that the Delegation sent a telegram to the US President Wilson on March 18, 1916, an appeal for the protection of the rights of the Muslims of Russia (Sakal, 199: 26). National movements strengthened by the 1917 Revolution, which occurred towards the end of World War I, led the Russian Empire to enter a new process. In this process, countries attached to the Tsar declared their independence one by one, and the Russian Empire gradually disintegrated. The fate of the Turkish people under Russian domination and the Ottomans being able to realize their policy of establishing dominance in the Caucasus under the influence of Enver Pasha were closely related. In the first years of the revolution (May 1917), Turks who took a definite decision of independence in the congress which took place in Moscow, started their struggle for independence with the support of the Ottoman Empire. In 1917-1918, the Ottoman State planned a military campaign to liberate Azerbaijan from Russian domination. For this operation, it was considered to establish an army consisting of Muslims of Russia and to establish a Caucasian Islamic Army in Turkey to support this struggle for independence. The Caucasus Islamic Army was formed in a short time and Nuri Pasha⁴², brother of Enver Pasha⁴³, was put in charge. Ağaoğlu was appointed as political adviser to Nuri Pasha in order to accommodate him with the local forces (Sakal, 1999: 26; Ülken, 2014: 604-605). The established army advanced to Baku and took it over. A parliament was established here shortly. Ağaoğlu became one of the most important members of this new parliament. Thus, Ağaoğlu also became the first and only person who

⁴² For more information on Nuri Paşa, see: Atilla Oral, *Kafkasya'da İslam Ordusu Kumandanı, Haliç'te Silah ve Cephane Fabrikatörü, Enver Paşa'nın Kardeşi Nuri Killigil* (İstanbul: Demkar Yayınevi, 1972)

⁴³ For more information on Enver Paşa, see: Nevzat Kösoğlu, *Şehit Enver Paşa* (İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat, 2013), Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *makedonya'dan ortaasya'ya Enver Paşa Vol: I-II-II* (İstanbul: Remzi Kitapevi, 1970-1971-1972)

sits in the parliament of two separate Turkish states. The period when Ağaoğlu served here was actually very tough because there was a struggle for power between Nuri Pasha on one side and Azerbaijan's local authorities on the other. Nuri Pasha wanted to establish a new *Azerbaijani People's Republic*⁴⁴ with Pan-Islamist and Pan-Turkist people in accordance with the Caucasian policies of the Ottoman State, not with the leftist and pro-Russian Azeri's. For example, in June of 1918, Nuri Pasha caused a serious crisis by not approving the Hoylu cabinet which has high social democratic tendencies because he did not like some of its members (Swictochowski, 2004: 131; Sakal, 1999: 27). For resolving the crisis, Azeri leaders went to see Ağaoğlu, but Ağaoğlu said that the views of Nuri Pasha, not the Azeri leaders, were correct and that it would be more useful to establish the new cabinet in accordance with his wishes. Although such problems continued for a while, the administration was formed in the way Nuri Pasha wanted, with the influence of important names such as Resulzade. After the crisis environment had been overcome, the Caucasian Islamic Army and Azerbaijani volunteers began to work together to save Azerbaijan. On September 15, 1918, Baku was liberated from Russian and Armenians. On May 28, 1918, Azerbaijan declared its independence so that the region up to Dagestan in the north and South Azerbaijan (Iranian Azerbaijan) in the south entered the Ottoman domination. Although Azerbaijan had gained its independence, these years had been the period of defeat and withdrawal for the Ottoman Empire and the allied forces it joined the World War I with. The Armistice of Mudros⁴⁵ was signed with the Ottoman Empire after the loss of the war. It was ordered that the Ottoman soldiers should also evacuate the Caucasus under the Treaty. During this process, a group also including Ağaoğlu met with British general W. Thomson in Enzeli. According to Ağaoğlu, it was not possible for Azerbaijan to be a separate state on its own. Because of this reason he thought that he had to agree with the British, and he was taking various initiatives to get British support. He was even heading the delegation which

⁴⁴ For more information, see: M Rıhtım, M. Süleymanov, *Azerbaycan Halk Cumhuriyeti ve Kafkas İslam Ordusu* (Bakü: Nurlar, 2008).

⁴⁵ The Armistice of Mudros (Oct. 30, 1918) was "pact signed at the port of Mudros, on the Aegean island of Lemnos, between the Ottoman Empire and Great Britain (representing the Allied powers) marking the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in World War I (1914–18)." ("Armistice of Mudros", 2003). For articles of The Armistice of Mudros, see: Sir Frederick Maurice, *The Armistices of 1918* (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford: University Press, 1943).

met General Thomson, with full powers looking for the conditions for Azerbaijan to form an alliance with Britain. But Britain did not respond positively to these quests, and even asked the Azeri's to leave Baku with the Ottomans (Sakal, 1999: 28). Therefore, Ağaoğlu met with members of the Russian National Council, especially Russian liberals and non-Bolshevik Kadets. He began saying that it is not possible for Azerbaijan to survive on its own; the best solution would be a Russian federation to be built on democratic values (Shissler, 2002:164). Ağaoğlu's attitude which can be called as submissive especially annoyed Mehmet Emin Rasulzade and his supporters who wanted to establish fully independent Azerbaijan. Even Resulzades made his famous speech about these events: "If a flag will once rise it will not come down again! (Sakal, 1999: 29). But it is impossible to say here that Ağaoğlu is submissive. Also, by making the most rational choice he was the one who had no other goal but save Azerbaijan. The negative attitude of the United Kingdom towards the Republic of Azerbaijan had softened over time. Behind this softening there were reasons like Bolsheviks winning the struggle for power in Russia and the need for a Muslim buffer state that could hinder Russia's demands on India and Afghanistan (Shissler, 2002:165). The People's Republic of Azerbaijan had been in a very difficult situation, because of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire which he leaned on, the change of power in favor of the Bolsheviks in Russia, and the increase of political, economic and social influences of Armenians and Georgians in the Caucasus. Then, taking into consideration that the UK softened due to its wish of a buffer state, the Azerbaijani Democratic Republic decided to send a delegation to the Paris Peace Conference for recognition. Ağaoğlu was also in this delegation which was headed by A. Merdan Topçubaşı. Getting a letter of recommendation from the British general Thomson, delegation left the Azerbaijan Republic on January 7, 1918, also and arrived in Istanbul on January 20, 1918. When the delegation arrived in Istanbul, it was delayed by the French authorities for 3 days for visa procedures. But there was another problem for Ağaoğlu. The conclusion of World War I by the defeat of the Ottoman State brought with it the purge of the Unionist cadres and the important members of the Union and Progress were arrested in line with the demands of the British. Ağaoğlu on his way through to Paris was detained in Istanbul, and then sent into exile first to Limnos then to the island of Malta (Sakal, 1999: 29). The Malta exile aimed at the purge

of the Unionists, most of them were pro-German, by the British. With these arrests, the British had been trying to control Turkey's post-World War I political movements by keeping the intellectuals and administrators of different opinions of the Ottoman State under custody for a period of two years (Ağaoğlu, 2010: 9). In this period, besides the purge of the Unionist cadres by the British, it was ensured that the Entente cadres were free and active. Prince Sabahattin was one of the leading one. Limnos and Malta's exiles created various changes over his identity and personality like he experienced during Paris and the Caucasus periods, caused him to defend new views on the West, the Ottomans and the future. According to Ertan Eğribel and Ufuk Özcan, in order to enlighten dark periods such as the Armistice and Malta exiles, Ağaoğlu's armistice and exile memories shed light on four important points. First one is submissive and irresponsible relations between the government responsible for the Armistice and the British. According to Ağaoğlu, these relations are at the level of betrayal and dishonour. The second important point is that memories tell us about the different aspects of Limnos and Malta exiles. It is possible to see a lot of details, from the conditions of exile to the psychological conditions of detainees, the ideas and mentality transformations they have experienced from the memoirs. Third, memoirs include some examples of parallel and similar data's between the armistice and the occupation period and the present situation of Turkey. Finally, Ağaoğlu witnessed the double standards of the West, its hypocritical attitudes. After The Armistice of Mudros, Ağaoğlu as a result of British pressure was arrested along with many senior Unionists, and spent four months in the Bekirağa Division where the interrogations took place and was first sent to Limnos then to Malta as a political prisoner (Ağaoğlu, 2010:9). All who went to exile in Malta had not been tried for the same crimes. Three different lists were made by Admiral De Robeck. The 16 people who were in the A list in which Ağaoğlu was included were accused as British prisoners, and people who persecuted Christians in Turkey. Ağaoğlu was at the top of the list while Ziya Gökalp was sixteenth (Sakal, 1999: 31). Journalists and writers like Ahmet Ağaoğlu, Ziya Gökalp, Süleyman Nazif, Hüseyin Cahit, Ebüzziyade Velid, Ahmet Emin, high ranking soldiers like Fethi Okyar, Ali Çetinkaya, Abdülhalik Renda, Ali İhsan Sabis,

bureaucrats like Said Halim Pasha⁴⁶, Abbas Halim Pasha ve Şeyhülislam Hayri Efendi and other important party members were kept at Malta. Some of them adopted the Panturkist view during World War I like Gökalp and Ağaoğlu while others were defenders of Panislamist views such as Said Halim Pasha and Ubeydullah Efendi (Ağaoğlu, 2010: 11). These arrests and accusations were very hard for Ağaoğlu to bear. Although he tried to make a close relationship with Britain, the British had accused him of cooperating with the Germans and participating in Armenian incidents (Armenian Deportation). The exile of Malta had left a deep influence on Ağaoğlu, just as it was in Petersburg, Paris, Baku and Istanbul. Ağaoğlu wrote his famous work called *Üç Medeniyet (Three Civilizations)* here. In this work, Ağaoğlu examined the concept of civilization, defined civilization as a lifestyle and talked about the existence and present conditions of three important civilizations. According to him, the first of these three civilizations is the Buddha-Brahman, and the second one is the West and the third one is the Islamic civilization. Both the Buddha-Brahman civilization and the Islamic civilization were defeated in the face of Western civilization. Defeat is two sorts, material and moral. According to him, material defeat is clear, as it can be seen from the miserable state of the Ottoman Empire which is the strongest among Islamic States, and the spiritual defeat is our effort to imitate the characteristics and attributes of the Western civilization (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 19-23). Based on these thoughts, under the captivity psychology, he found salvation in Westernization.

Western life completely prevailed over our lives. Therefore, if we want to be saved, to live, to continue our existence, we have to comply with it with all our lives - not only with our clothes and some institutions - with our mind, our heart, our way of thinking, our mind. There is no salvation except this. (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 25).

Ağaoğlu, who developed Iranian identity in France, Turkist identity in Azerbaijan, Turkist and Islamic identity in Istanbul, now has a new identity. Now he is proposing to obey the

⁴⁶ Said Halim Pasha's who is one of the most important representatives of the Islamist idea movement, works *Meşrutiyet, Taklitçiliğimiz, Fikir Buhranımız, Cemiyet Buhranımız, Taassup, İslâm Dünyası Neden Geri Kaldı?, İslâmlaşmak, İslâm Devletinin Siyasi Yapısı*, a part of his *Hâtrât* and *Cevaplar* which explains the reason of the Ottoman's entering into the World War I were combined and published under the title of "*Buhranlarımız ve Son Eserleri*". For this book, see: Said Halim Pasha, *Buhranlarımız ve Son Eserleri* (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2016).

Western civilization, a complete Westernization. These views will become even more apparent after the announcement of the Republic.

2.5. New Turkey Period (1921- 1939)

After surviving from Malta exile Ağaoğlu went to Istanbul. But it was impossible to live there, because Istanbul was very dangerous for him as it was for other Unionists. The fact that he was both an Azeri and a prominent member of the Unionists could have caused him to be a victim of an assassination in Istanbul. In addition, he was struggling to make a living in Istanbul. It was very difficult especially for people like him whose only capital was mind and pen to make their livings in Istanbul without having a government job. Since there was no apparent state, he could not find a government job. Therefore, it was impossible for him to live in Istanbul because of his safety and economic problems. In fact, it is possible for him to go to Azerbaijan and get important positions. President of the Azerbaijani Soviet Republic and an old friend Neriman Nerimanov invited him to Azerbaijan after he returned from Malta. But he did not accept this offer. He explained the rejection of this offer by these three principles:

1. I do not agree with the system of ideas you represent.
2. As known by you, my old idea and conviction is that the only salvation for the Turks is in the Ottoman Turkishness.
3. The conviction that it is a debt of honor for me to run to Ankara who saved me from captivity and revived me (Sakal, 1999: 38)

As it can be understood from the principles that Ağaoğlu is against the system of communism settled in Azerbaijan, believes in the potential for the development of Turkey Turkishness and has a deep respect for the government of Ankara, who saved him from captivity. All of this caused him to move towards Ankara. But when Ağaoğlu was on the move to go to Ankara, he was flat broke. He then informed the Minister of National Education, Hamdullah Suphi Bey⁴⁷ about the situation, Hamdullah Suphi Bey sent some money immediately. Having left most of the money to his family in Istanbul, Ağaoğlu moved to Ankara with a

⁴⁷ For more information on Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, see: Mustafa Baydar, *Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver ve Anıları* (İstanbul: Menteş Kitabevi, 1968), Fethi Tevetoğlu, *Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1986)

small amount of the rest. He found peace as soon as he took the road as he was always afraid during the days he was in Istanbul. Ağaoğlu entered Ankara with a feeling of a believer entering a sacred city. He saw Ankara as a Kaaba and as a Jerusalem for all Turkishness. He entered Ankara with a deep gratitude, a sincere faith and a high level of hope. Ankara was a temple that saved Ağaoğlu from the enemy's hand. Here is the land of heroes who fought for the homeland and the families of the Turks who had no homeland and family. Here is the land of knights fighting the fortune and destiny for the honor and dignity of the humiliated Turkishness (Sakal, 1999: 39). When he arrived in Ankara in June 1921, he saw that the Unionists were not very popular in Ankara, and that there was a negative atmosphere forming against them. This made him very confused. While still confused, Hamdullah Suphi Bey presented him to Mustafa Kemal Pasha. In those days, the battles that took place on the Kütahya-Eskişehir line began to work against the government of Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA). Even moving the capital to another city was discussed in the Parliament. Faith and determination of nation had decreased due to adverse situation. In order to prevent all this, it was necessary to develop new policies. *Matbuat and İstihbarat Müdüriyet-i Umumiyesi (The General Directorate of Press and Intelligence)*, which undertook this task, was working to strengthen the Anatolian press, to better explain the national cause to the people and the international arena. In addition, for this task, *İrşad Heyetleri (Guidance Committee)* would be formed in Anatolia and these delegations would carry out their irşad (guidance) mission. According to Hamdullah Suphi Bey, Ahmet Ağaoğlu was one of the delegates. Even under the tyranny of Tsarism, he was one of the few intellectuals who cultivated the Turkish print tradition in Azerbaijan. For this reason, Hamdullah Suphi Bey requested Ağaoğlu to take a trip in the Black Sea and eastern provinces, and to go to Kars to establish a daily newspaper and build a school for teachers there and manage both. Ağaoğlu immediately accepted this offer and left Ankara in late July of 1921. Ağaoğlu, who reached his final stop in Kars by fulfilling his duty of guidance along the outbound route, he did the work there which he was asked for, and tried to tell the grassroots about the national cause by writings and giving conferences. He received the appreciation of Mustafa Kemal Pasha during his guidance duty which lasted for four and a half months and Mustafa Kemal Pasha sent encouraging telegrams to Ağaoğlu. This appreciation was concluded with appointment

of Ađaođlu to the Directorate of Press and Intelligence on 29 November 1921 when he was still in Kars. Ađaođlu's first settled mission in Ankara was the Director of Press and Intelligence. At this time, the Guidance Committees were also abolished and the duties of these delegations were undertaken by the Directorate of Press and Intelligence. Anadolu Ajansı (Anatolian Agency), whose programs were created by Halide Edip and Yunus Nadi previously was affiliated with this directorate. While Ahmet Ađaođlu was in charge of these two merged institutions, he also assumed the editor-in-chief position of the *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye* newspaper. He defended the Ankara government's cause and the reforms it made in the newspaper. The famous *İhtilal mi Inkilap mı? (Revolution or Reform?)* article is one of these writings. The writings in this newspaper have attracted the reaction of some groups in the parliament and the various opponents outside. For this reason, Ađaođlu in a short period of time became an intellectual who caused great uproars. Serious accusations like corruption, betrayal and misconduct was directed towards Ađaođlu by many important names during the First Assembly period. Despite all these accusations and reactions, he continued his duty thanks to Mustafa Kemal Pasha's support. In the Second Assembly period he was both a Kars deputy and a lecturer at the Ankara Law School. The membership of parliament of Ađaođlu started on August 11, 1923 and ended on 26 June 1927. Ađaođlu was a member of the Parliament in the second and third period (Sakal, 1999: 38-44). Ađaođlu was an intellectual who had important services during the establishment of the new Turkish state. Mustafa Kemal took Ađaođlu's views on the regime of the new Turkish state and Ađaođlu described liberalism to Mustafa Kemal (Ercilasun, 2000: 867).

Ađaođlu has asserted that unity of powers in the system of the First TGNA (TBMM) government will be the dictatorship of the national assembly seemingly but in reality dictatorship of a person on behalf of the national assembly. He defended that even the type of republic and the principle of political responsibility are not enough, and that the principle of balance of power must be explicitly put in to the constitution. It was benefited from Ađaođlu's deep knowledge, experience and thought also after the proclamation of the Republic. He played an active role in the preparation of the Constitution of 1924 with his lawyer identity, which gave wide range of authority to executive body. In an argument on how to separate the powers in the parliament, Ađaođlu stated that the 1921 Constitution

granted absolute authority to the legislative body and criticized the understanding of the gathering of all powers in the parliament. He has advised Atatürk on revolutions and the reforms leading to westernization, particularly in matters related to secularism and he has contributed at the point of ensuring their legitimacy. Ağaoğlu was in the Republican People's Party (RPP) (CHF) in the third period and succeeded in important activities. He has been an advocate of individual freedoms within the party, and has very harshly criticized some policies of the party. For all these reasons Ağaoğlu stood out with his opposing personality in the second and third periods of the Parliament. During parliamentary sessions he spoke on many topics, expressed his views on the subjects he participated in or opposed, and frequently asked for detailed information from the speakers at the rostrum. Because of his opposition, most of his speech was interrupted by sarcastic laughs and unreasonable objections. In fact, insults have been made to his personality. For example, the Azeri accent that Ağaoğlu spoke was mocked (Cengiz, 2008: 10). This opposing personality of Ağaoğlu brought him to be influential in the establishment and rise of the Free Republican Party (FRP) founded by Ali Fethi Okyar. During this period, Ağaoğlu expressed more clearly his liberal and libertarian views and harshly criticized the policies of the RPP (CHF)⁴⁸.

2.6. Ağaoğlu's Main Works

Ahmet Ağaoğlu is a person who contributed to Turkish thought life as a journalist, an intellectual and a parliamentarian. He left behind an enormous corpus consisting of tens of books, hundreds of articles, and a huge collection of newspaper writings⁴⁹. The content of this sizable corpus which is very different from each other and sometimes contradictions is also vast. It may even cause researchers who have conducted or will conduct a study on him to make an incomplete or incorrect comment while evaluating him. When his life which started in 1869 is examined until it ended in Istanbul in 1939, it is seen that Ağaoğlu constantly changed his identity. Iranian, Turkish, Russian Muslim, Turkish Muslim, Pan-Islamist, Pan-Turkist, pro-western, Kemalist and liberal definitions are all identities –with

⁴⁸ Until 1924, the party's name was Halk Fırkası (People's Party), between 1924 and 1935, it was changed as CHF (RPP). The name of the party has been CHP (RPP) since 1935 when it was renamed for the last time.

⁴⁹ Ahmet Ağaoğlu used to sign different names such as Ağaoğlu, Ağaoğlu Ahmet, Ahmet Ağayef, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, A. etc. in his works. Therefore, His Books and Articles subheadings of the references section in the thesis have used to solve this confusion.

contradictions- he had in a period of his life. Therefore, if Aġaoġlu is not addressed in a holistic approach, we can evaluate him by easily including him in any of these identities. As a matter of fact, Aġaoġlu has been studied and interpreted many times as “liberal that included positivism, solidarity and secularism characters” (Kadioġlu, 1998: 63), “economic liberal, Turkish-Islamic synthesis, traditionalist-conservative, enlightened liberal” in Turkist circles (Cošar, 1997: 156).

In this section we will introduce the main works that will enable Aġaoġlu to be evaluated in a holistic manner and reveal his liberal identity and the contradictions in this identity. In addition to these, we will also mention his other works, also, newspapers and magazines that host many articles he has written.

Aġaoġlu's first work in academic terms is the *Les Croyences Mazd enes dans la religion chiite (Mazdek Origins of Shiism)* (1892) paper he presented at the Ninth Congress of Eastern Scientists which was held in London in 1892. In this paper, which reveals the traces of pre-Islamic Persian beliefs in Shiism, Aġaoġlu claimed that Shiism is a separate and a national religion and that Persian identity is fundamentally different from the Arabic identity ( zcan, 2010: 28). Here what is important to us is that Aġaoġlu interpreted Iranian history and Shiism from an orientalist point of view ( zcan, 2010: 32). This is also important as it shows that his area of interest was Iran and Shiism in his years in France. After Aġaoġlu completed his higher education in Paris and returned to the Caucasus, first work he wrote is a play named *İslam ve Ahunt*⁵⁰ (*İslam and Ahund*) (1900). This work is a satire⁵¹ written in Persian. In the work, Aġaoġlu criticized the ignorance of the lower class *ulema*, by using the conversations between the fat and stylish Ahund and the Islam characters who are about to die of starvation and Vicdan (Conscience) characters who are sometimes involved in these conversations and make comments similar to the chorus of Greek tragedies (Shissler, 2002: 134). *İslamlıkta*

⁵⁰ This work was published with the title Hadim-i Millet (Servant of the ‘Nation’, or ‘Servant of the Community’) later. For information, see: H. A. Shissler, *Between Two Empires Ahmet Aġaoġlu and the New Turkey* (London: I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd., 2002, p. 244).

⁵¹ “satire is a technique employed by writers to expose and criticize foolishness and corruption of an individual or a society by using humor, irony, exaggeration or ridicule. It intends to improve humanity by criticizing its follies and foibles. A writer in a satire uses fictional characters, which stand for real people, to expose and condemn their corruption.” (*Satire*, 2016).

*Kadın*⁵² (*The Woman in Islam*) (1901) was published in Tbilisi in Russian. Aġaoġlu deals with the issue of women in the Islamic world in his work. The book in general, is written against Western theses (Aġaoġlu, 1959: 19), as the backwardness of Islamic societies in general, in particular the low position of women in Muslim nations, originated directly from Islam itself, Islam restricted women and kept them away from social life. Contrary to these theses, according to Aġaoġlu Islam in essence gives great importance to woman. Aġaoġlu, defending his thought by referring to the Qur'an and the practices of the Prophet, held the Muslims who spoiled the religion because of their old beliefs and traditions responsible for the woman's bad position in Muslim societies (Aġaoġlu, 1959: 28-35). *The Woman in Islam* also is an important work for Aġaoġlu as an intellectual, tells about his tendencies of various subjects through women. Here, the elements that prevent the emergence of the free individual were criticized through the theme of women (Aġaoġlu, 1959). *Üç Medeniyet (Three Civilizations)* (1920), one of Aġaoġlu's most well-known works, was written under captivity in Malta. The author advocates that Western civilization and Western values have established an undisputed authority over other civilizations (Islamic civilization and Buddha-Brahman civilization). Aġaoġlu, who said that resistance against this civilization is meaningless, claims that the Turkish and Islamic nations will be able to save themselves only by being a part of and accepting all the elements of Western civilization (Aġaoġlu, 2013). In this work, which was first published in 1927, the author compared Western and Eastern civilizations and criticized the Eastern societies by saying that the West was progressing by means of liberal thought and individual freedom which do not exist in East (Aġaoġlu, 2013). The struggle to prove the rightness of the new Turkey tendency towards the West and to explain the necessity of reforms is felt in the book. One of Aġaoġlu's well-known works is his liberal and democratic utopia⁵³ titled (1930) *Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde*

⁵² Translated by Hasan Ali Ediz in to Turkish and published in Istanbul in 1959. In our thesis this translation was used.

⁵³ The literary term utopia denotes an illusionary place that projects the notion of a perfect society to the reader. Here, the “perfect society” refers to ideal conditions achieved within the material world as opposed to the expected idealism of afterlife in Christianity or other religions. Further, the citizens presiding in such utopias are bearers of a perfect moral code, or at the least, every violator of the moral code is harshly punished. A utopian society is one where all social evils have been cured.” (*Utopia*, 2016).

(*In the Land of Free People*). This work is allegorical⁵⁴. The aim of the writing was determined by Ađaođlu himself as “to establish the ideology of the Republic from the moral front” (Ađaođlu, 1930: 2). In this work which is in the form of a story, Ađaođlu sent a Turkish individual freed from captivity for a visit to a free country. The guides of this country are working for the improvement of the Republic as Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's aims and wants. The Turkish individual meets with the guides called ‘*pir*’ in the country and learns how free citizens should be in the Republic (Ađaođlu, 1930: 2). This work titled, together with *Devlet ve Fert (State and the Individual)* (1933) in which the concepts such as individual, democracy, solidarity and national will are discussed is the work that Ađaođlu's liberal attitude can be observed with utmost clarity. *Devlet ve Fert* was written at a time when due to the effects of the Great Depression⁵⁵ in the 1930s, a strict statism throughout the world began to influence politics, society and economic models (Özcan, 2010: 193). In the 1930s, when classical liberal values lost their values especially in the economic sense, protective economic policies became popular in the world (Özcan, 2010: 193-194). In Turkey, the intellectual representative of this view is a group known as the *Kadroists*⁵⁶. The main ideological argument of the Kadroist's is statism. *Devlet ve Fert* is the book of Ađaođlu, in which he defends liberal values against statism, including his discussions on the individual, democracy and statism with the Kadroists. *Ben Neyim? (What am I?)* (1939) is a work combining five articles published in the *Cumhuriyet* Newspaper together with four articles that he published later and two unpublished articles. In his work, Ađaođlu tells the struggle between “inner me” which represents altruism⁵⁷ and “outer me” which represents egoism in the form of dialogues. On the whole of the work the author's basic view is that development can be achieved by escaping egoism and achieved by altruism (Ađaođlu, 1939).

⁵⁴ “Allegory is a figure of speech in which abstract ideas and principles are described in terms of characters, figures and events.” (*Allegory*, 2016).

⁵⁵ “Great Depression, worldwide economic downturn that began in 1929 and lasted until about 1939. It was the longest and most severe depression ever experienced by the industrialized Western world, sparking fundamental changes in economic institutions, macroeconomic policy, and economic theory.” (Romer and Pells, 2014). For more information on The Great Depression, see: Robert S. McElvaine, *Encyclopedia of the Great Depression* (New York: Macmillan Library Reference, 2003),

⁵⁶ For more information on Kadroists, see: Mustafa Türkeş, *Kadro Hareketi, Ulusçu Sol Bir Akım* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1999). Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *İnkılâp ve Kadro* (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1990), Naci Bostancı, *Kadrocular ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Görüşleri* (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1990).

⁵⁷ “Altruism means that its mean that unselfishly concerned for or devoted to the welfare of others.” (*Altruism*, 2016).

This work is an important source for our thesis as it presents the liberal attitude of Ađaođlu regarding the individual and some of the contradictions of this attitude. His work *Tanrı Dađında (In the Mountain of God)* (1939), was composed of four articles published in the *Cumhuriyet* newspaper. This work is also allegorical and just like *Ben Neyim?* emphasizes the importance of moral values as in his work. Works *Ben Neyim?* and *Tanrı Dađında* were combined and published as one book (Ađaođlu, 1939). *Mütakere ve Sürgün Hatıraları (The Memories of Armistice and Exile)* (1933) like his work *Üç Medeniyet* emerged at Ađaođlu's Malta exile. This work is comprised of the daily notes kept by Ađaođlu throughout his exile life. As it is known, after the Armistice of Mudros (30 October 1918), the British arrested the Unionist leaders and some officers they thought might create problem for them (Ađaođlu, 2010: 20). Ahmet Ađaođlu was among those arrested. This work of Ađaođlu is very important in terms of telling the situation of the Ottomans' in the Armistice years, and the exile conditions of the people in Limnos and Malta who were arrested by the British firsthand. Ađaođlu's memoirs help us to see the political, social and economic aspects of the Armistice and the occupation period (Ađaođlu, 2010). *İhtilal mi İnkılap mı? (Revolt or Revolution)* (1942) consists of the articles published in the newspaper *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, even before the Republic had been declared. In these writings, Ađaođlu defended the Ankara government's cause and supported the reforms that the government had made at a time when the official goal of the National Struggle seemed to be only saving the sultanate and caliphate (Ađaođlu, 1942). *Serbest Fırka Hatıraları (Free Party Memoirs)* (1942) is the work of Ahmet Ađaođlu, one of the leading figures of the FRP which is the first controlled opposition test of the Republican era, in which he told about the founding and the closure of the party, the important events that took place during this period and the background of the power-opposition relation of the Early Republican Period. This work has an important place in the literature since it is the primary source for revealing the opposition view of the Kemalist regime and its power on the opposition. Regarding our thesis, it is of great importance as it includes liberal attitudes and contradictions of Ađaođlu. Ađaođlu has many other books besides the works we have mentioned above. Among them; *Türk Teşkilat-ı Esasiyesi Şerhi (Interpretation of Turkish Constitution)* (1925), *Hukuk-i Esasiye Ders Notları* (1926 –

1927)⁵⁸ (*Lecture Notes of The Foundations of Law 1926-1927*), *İngiltere ve Hindistan (England and India)* (1929), *Serbest Laik Cumhuriyet Fırkasının Yasası (The Law of the Free Secular Republican Party)* (1930), *Etrüsk Medeniyeti ve Bunların Roma Medeniyeti Üzerine Tesiri (Civilization of Etruscan and Etruscan on Influence of Roman Civilization)* (1933), *1500-1900 Arasında İran (Iran between 1500 and 1900)*, *İran ve İnkılabı (Iran and The Iranian Revolution)*, *İran İnkılabı (The Iranian Revolution)* (1941), *Ne İdik Ne Olduk? (What Were We, What Did We Become?)*, *Hukuk Tarihi (History of Law)* (1931-1932), *İlk Roma Ailesiyle İlk Türk Ailesi Arasında Mukayese (The Comparison of First Roman Family and First Turkish Family)* (unpublished) we can count. In addition to these works Aġaoġlu also made some translations like *Etika* (1934) from Kropatkin, *Yakutlar* from Seretkovski (unpublished) ve *Milletlerin Serveti (The Wealth of Nations)* from Adam Smith (with Hüseyinzade Ali Turan-unpublished) (Sakal, 1999: 218).

Aġaoġlu's articles which he wrote during his journalism, which started in Paris, advanced in the Caucasus and the Ottoman years and eventually peaked in the Republic of Turkey occupy a great place in his corpus. It is impossible to share all of the writings of Aġaoġlu who penned numerous writings for newspapers and magazines on many different topics. Instead of this we will just say the important magazines and newspapers on which his writings were published. In France *La Nouvelle Revue*, *La Revue bleue politique et littéraire* and *Journal des débats* published Aġaoġlu's articles (Shissler, 2002: 258-271). The struggle period in the Caucasus, then in the Ottoman state important journals and newspapers he wrote articles for were *Kaspi*, *Sark-i Rus*, *İrşat*, *Terakki*, *Hikmet*, *Hayat*, *Ateş*, *Le June Turc*, *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*, *Sirat-ı Müstakim*, *Sebilü'r Reşad*, *İslam Mecmuası*, *Türk Yurdu*. His writings were published in *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, *Cumhuriyet*, *Hilafet ve Milli Hâkimiyet*, *Yeni Mecmua*, *Hayat Mecmuası*, *İkdam*, *Vatan*, *Akın*, *Son Posta*, *Ülkü-Halkevleri Mecmuası*, *Kültür Haftası*, *İnsan* during national struggle and early republican period (Sakal, 1999: 218-224).

⁵⁸ This work was edited by Boġaç Erozan and was published in 2012. For this book, see: Boġaç Erozan, *Ahmet Aġaoġlu ve Hukuk-ı Esasiye Ders Notları (1926-1927)* (İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2012).

3. LIBERALISM AS A POLITICAL THOUGHT

3.1. Historic Roots of Liberalism

The word 'liberal' has been used in various meanings since the 14th century. In Latin the word *liber* refers to the class of free people, that is, people who are neither serfs nor slaves. At the same time the word liberal was also used for generosity. It also meant openness or open-mindedness to express social attitudes. Political use of the term liberalism started in the second half of the 19th century. The concept was first used in Spain in 1812 (Heywood, 2012: 24). By 1840s the term began to be accepted as a separate set of political idea in Europe. As a political belief, liberalism was based on the incidents, ideas and theories that emerged due to these incidents before the 19th century. Liberal ideas emerged as a result of the collapse of feudalism in Europe and the developing capitalist society instead of it. Liberalism expressed the aspirations of the right and the law of the middle class, which grow by clashing with the established order of the absolute monarchs and aristocrats. Liberal ideas required fundamental reforms and sometimes even revolutionary changes for many issues. The British Revolution in the 17th Century and the American and French Revolutions in the 18th Century included liberal elements, although the 'liberal' word did not have a political meaning yet. The liberals opposed the absolute monarchical power, which was accepted to be given by God. They defended first the constitutional then representative democracy against absolutism. They criticized the unfairness of the aristocracy and by supporting the freedom of conscience in religion they questioned the authority of the church (Heywood, 2012: 25).

The intellectual foundations of liberalism began to be laid in the 17th century. Classical liberalism developed in the 17th and 18th centuries as a political theory on the one hand and enriched by the contribution of economics as a science on the other. This development is basically based on the theories of natural law and human rights, social contracts and constitutional theories. The economic side of classical liberalism was shaped by market economy and freedom of contract. Another element that fostered this tradition was the philosophy of enlightenment and the rationalism movement (Erdoğan, 1998:4). Thinkers

like Locke, Hume, Smith, Mill, Bentham, Spencer, and Constant had built the philosophical foundations of liberalism. John Locke by saying that the purpose of the states was to secure freedoms stated that the source and legitimacy of the state should be sought in the social contract. David Hume mentioned that the utilitarianism and freedom were part of human nature by defending that the mind pursues self-interest, spontaneous order was the most just order and that this order should never be interfered with by the state. A famous Professor of Moral Philosophy Adam Smith argued that human pursuit of self-interests in fact promoted social benefits, that natural order was the most free and best order, and that the state should not engage in anything but to provide security (Çetin, 2015:220). The views of other thinkers such as Jeremy Bentham, J. Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, Benjamin Constant and Alexis de Tocqueville on issues such as natural law and human rights, social contract and constitutionalism, market economy and contractual liberty have contributed to the formation of philosophical grounds of liberalism. It is also possible to establish liberalism on a philosophical level with a Kantian approach. The categorical imperative at the center of Kant's moral philosophy commands the individual to be treated not only as instruments but also as a purpose at the same time. Human being as an individual is a creature that can manifest its own moral law. This ability expresses his freedom and the value of his freedom as human (Erdoğan, 1998:3).

The rapid increase of industrialization in the Western countries in the 19th century led to an increase in the strength of liberal ideas from day to day. The liberals advocated an economic order that operates within a free market, independent of the interventions. This order would allow the business world to pursue profit and allow countries to trade freely with each other. Such an industrial capitalism began to develop in the United Kingdom from the middle of the 18th century and was fully implemented at the beginning of the 19th century. Then it spread rapidly to North America, to Western Europe and finally to Eastern Europe (Heywood, 2012: 25). During this spread, the liberal political theory developed together with social political practice and was seen as a result of the economic-social transformations of Western, especially Western European societies (Erdoğan, 1998:2). This is not exactly the case; even if this point of view associates it with “laissez-faire” understanding and “brutal capitalism”.

According to Heywood “*While liberalism undoubtedly favours openness, debate and self-determination, it is also characterized by powerful moral thrust. The moral and ideological stance of liberalism is embodied in a commitment to a distinctive set of values and beliefs.*” (Heywood, 2012: 27). At this point, different views are expressed within the framework of its own set of values and beliefs arising from the moral and ideological attitude of liberalism. We can give many examples of these different views on what the basic principles of liberalization are. For example, George H. Sabine states that the three basic principles of liberalism are limited state, free enterprise and regulations made by contracts in the widest and free form (Sabine, 1973: 103). Mustafa Erdoğan says that importance given to individualism and human rights, free market economy, limited minimal state, law-abiding state and liberal rationalism are the basic principles of liberalization (Erdoğan, 1990: 20). According to Yayla, liberalism also has four main elements. They are individualism, freedom, spontaneous order, market economy and limited state (Yayla, 1992: 137). Popper also defines liberalism as open society. According to him, the duty and goal of the state should be the protection of the freedoms of its citizens. Freedom not slavery, an abstract society not an organic social structure, a society based on voluntary togetherness and cooperation not the mandatory tasks and the division of labor should be the basic principles of social liberalism (Popper, 1967: 186). Despite all these different opinions, we can see an agreement on certain principles. In this study, the basic principles of classical liberalism and the basic values emerging from these principles will be interpreted in accordance with Mustafa Erdoğan's quadruple classification. But before that, looking at the factors that influenced the maturity of the basic principles and values of the classical liberal concept is necessary for a clearer understanding of these principles and values.

3.2. Sources of Classical Liberalism

As mentioned before, the most important dimension in the development of classical liberalism is the theories of natural law and human rights, social contract and constitutional theories. The economic dimension of classical liberalism is based on market economy and contractual freedom. Other elements that foster tradition are the philosophy of enlightenment and the flow of rationalism movement. It is also very important to look at these sources

briefly, to make sense of liberalism and to understand Ahmet Ağaoğlu's concept of liberalism which is the subject of the thesis.

The doctrine of natural law can be traced back to Greek philosophy and Roman law. Stoic philosophy, in the thought of Roman law, forms the basis of a natural law view which is universal in character and suitable for human nature. According to this philosophy, reason which is the common feature of human beings is a guide which will lead them to virtue. Human beings are respectable just because they are human beings. It can be argued that, in the Middle Ages, St. Thomas and Christian religion thought supported this view with the equality and fraternity of the people theme. In the New Age, thinkers such as Althusius, Grotius, Locke and Puffendorf have variously contributed to this tradition. The two basic concepts in the emergence of natural law are reason and human nature. Reason is the fundamental value that separates human beings from other creatures and is based on human nature. Here, what is meant by human nature is the ideal nature of human. The reason must be a source of natural law and therefore a regulatory principle of a positive legal system. Immanuel Kant has an important place in the development of the natural law. Kant, defined the law in accordance with the universal law of freedom, as a whole formed by the conditions in which everyone's will can compromise with others will (Erdoğan, 1998: 5)⁵⁹. That is to say, the main purpose of the law is the realization of freedom. This, as expected in a sense is the reflection of idea of law as expected (Erdoğan, 1998:4-5). Natural law theories come in two forms. First one is the abstract and rationalist theories. According to them, human beings reason must dominate all the social, political and personal relationships and this must be determined by the moral principles of universal validity. Other forms of theories argue that societies spontaneously develop rules that protect personal and property rights, and that positive law must be regulated by these natural rules. The doctrine of natural law is also forming the basic foundation of human rights understanding of today's world.

⁵⁹ For more information on Kantian Legal Theory, see: I. Kant, *Kant's Critic of Practical Reason and Other Works on the Theory of Ethics* (Trans: Thomas K. Abbott, London: Longman, Green, and Co., 1909), *Critic of pure reason* (Trans: Paul Guyer & Allen W. Wood, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), Jeremy Waldron, "Kant's Legal Positivism" (Harvard: The Harvard Law Review Vol. 109, No. 7, 1996, pp. 1535-1566). For studies of Kant's anthropology and theory of human nature, see: Patrick Frierson, *What is the Human Being?* (London: Routledge, 2013), Alix Cohen, *Kant and the Human Sciences: Biology, Anthropology and History* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Traditional contractual theorists, such as Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau, have created various social contractual assumptions in order to explain the basis of political obedience and the pre-constitutional state of the modern state based on the natural state people have lived before building a political society. The main aim of these assumptions is to show that the source of political power needs to be sought in the freedom of individuals and thus limit political power. It is useful to look at the essence of John Locke's theory of social contract, which is one of the most important of these theories and which is also linked to the subject of our thesis. According to him, people are equal and free when living in nature. They could fulfil their own wishes and goals easily. They could own property, which was the result of their labor, and they were saving with these. In this life, everyone was bound by laws of nature and was not trying to destroy each other. Still, even in this system in which the rights were dominant, contrary to reason some violated these natural laws. Therefore, these people living in nature felt the need to live in a safer way and with guaranteed rights. Thus they felt the need to move towards civil society and made contracts for this purpose (Erdoğan, 1998: 7). This contract resulted in the establishment of a political administration, with peoples natural rights reserved (Locke, 2002: 81) In other words; the purpose of existence of political administration is the protection of these naturally emerged rights. These natural rights of individuals are life, freedom and property and their derivatives. As the duty of a political administration is to protect these rights and ensure public security, if a state uses a power other than this purpose it will lose its legitimacy and the citizens will have the right to resist it. (Erdoğan, 1998:7).

This contract theory, which Locke presented as a historical fact, has been criticized by other social contract theorists especially in the context of the right to resist. For example, Kant said that citizens should only complain to the government in case that the state acts unjustly about the tax or military obligation issues. In fact, it does not matter whether the social contract, which is the product of a liberal point of view, is a historical fact or a methodological assumption. The idea which is the essence of the social contract is important. According to the idea that constitutes this essence, individuals existed before the society, in other words, they are independent of it. As a consequence of this situation, it is accepted that

individuals cannot be deprived of their rights by society or its representative, state. This is also the basis for the liberal approach (Erdoğan, 1998: 7-8).

Adam Smith, professor of moral philosophy and a famous Scottish thinker, was the pioneer of liberal economy and laid the foundations of laissez-faireis political economics. Foundation of laissez-faire concept, the consistent theoretical framework of free market economics was first laid down in 1776 at Smith's famous work *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* is both the first book in which liberal ideas are systematically addressed at the economic level and the founding work of economics (Smith, 1776). Quesnay's works and David Ricardo's *The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* have also contributed to the laissez-faireis political economy in this context (Ricardo, 1871). As it emerged in these publications, classical economics was saying that a non-monopolistic free market is a process which is both effective and serving the long-term interests of everyone. The market mechanism in which the people acted freely without any intervention to improve their own interests, with the help of an invisible hand, in fact is enabling the realization of public benefit. In other words, free individuals who would protect their own interests in a market where there was no intervention in the competitive environment, either knowingly or unknowingly through an invisible hand would have served themselves, society and their nation. Any interventions made to this process from the outside means that the freedom and equality existing in the nature of the system will disappear. In short, classical economics suggested a simple, harmonious and useful market order (natural order) (Erdoğan, 1998: 9). Adam Smith had studied the source of wealth in terms of the individual. According to him, wealth is not coming from the accumulation of precious metals, as in Mercantilist opinion, but from the goods produced by one's own skill and labor. In an environment in which the state does not place any restrictions on trade and provides justice, with efficient production techniques that emerge through the division of labor and freedom of enterprise, countries meet each other's needs and take the first step on the way to richness (Skousen, 2003: 16-34). The working of the market was dependent on the internal and external peace provided and the establishment of fair rules by the state. This is important because it shows that the state is included in the self-working order. But this inclusion is only limited to the parts of

the market that require state intervention. Although the market is generally based on efficiency and benefit arguments, another dimension of the market is that it is the extension of individual freedom. In this context, the market is an order created by an endless number of agreements based on the free will of individuals who want to realize their own goals and interests. In this case, the freedom of contract has represents itself as the continuation of individual liberty in the economic area and as the mainstay of free market order (Erdoğan, 1998: 9). The term Enlightenment as generally accepted is used to express the West' 18th century thought or culture of philosophy and social and political processes in the same period in Europe and the modern West. At the core of the idea of enlightenment is to make reason work and to sublime it. In a broader perspective, the Enlightenment was a new world view after the end of Middle ages which put reason against the view that put traditional static life style and scholastic thoughts in the center, the importance of knowledge and science and universal humanity perception. In fact the Enlightenment process is a continuation of the Renaissance. The Renaissance aimed to make itself independent of the historical authorities until that day, the world and life could only be understood to the extent of the possibilities provided by experiment and reason and by destroying the scholastic scheme of the Middle Ages to reach freedom in thinking and evaluating. In this context, it can be said that the Enlightenment philosophy is the peak of this consciousness which started with the Renaissance in the 18th century. The thinkers of the age of Enlightenment believed in the reason, the idea of the development of knowledge and science and the idea of a universal humanity and saw them as the basis of progress and civilization. The obstacle in front of this development is undoubtedly religious bigotry. They adopt a secular and humanist worldview, and they see these as a sine qua non for the emergence of reason and science. In fact, philosophy of Enlightenment emerged against the medieval Christian scholasticism. Reason-centered Enlightenment has made the human being, the only being with reason its focal point. This contributed to the secularization of the law and politics theory. The secularization of political thought has also increased the interest in liberal demands. Already one of the themes of liberalism has been shaped around religious tolerance and the secularization of political power. The secularization process, which has developed rapidly with the Enlightenment, has contributed to the development of individualism which is the

base of liberalism (Erdoğan, 1988: 10). All these developments eventually shaped classical liberalism's human vision, political and economic dimension in the 19th century. Classical liberalism was now a holistic ideology with four basic principles that can be expressed as individual rights and political freedoms, limited government based on the representational system, rule of law and contractual freedom and market economy (Erdoğan, 1998: 10)

3.3. Principles of Liberalism

In the 19th century with its four basic principles that can be expressed as individual rights and political freedoms, limited government based on the representational system, rule of law and freedom of contract and market economy, classical liberalism was now a holistic ideology (Erdoğan, 1998: 10). This ideological attitude of liberalism has made it possible to establish its own system of values and beliefs. Although there are different opinions at the point of determining these values, individualism, freedom, reason, justice and toleration are the common summary of the different views mentioned as Heywood classified (Heywood, 2012: 27). The use of this classification in this study was deemed appropriate because it will be comfortable in terms of the subject of the research and its examination.

While the liberalism's basic principles were sorted both in Erdoğan's classification and other views individualism and human rights were put on the first place. As the basis of liberalism is its claim that human personality is the most important value. Therefore, the existence of a human being and his or her orientation towards purposes should be the starting point of any social and political regulation. As a rational being, a human being determines his or her own purpose and realizes this purpose, trying to obtain what is good for him or her. In the whole process, there should be no obstacles. This can only be achieved with individual freedoms and rights. As human being already being a purpose, and because he can freely choose what is good, another social partner independent of his values and aims, which ignores the individual, will not be good. In this context, the state cannot impose a common good understanding on the individuals and force them accept. Organizations like state, society, nation, community are of secondary importance compared to individuals.

The state, which is the largest of these organizations, carries only the attribution of instrument against individual purposes. Society is not a different entity than the individuals

who make it, and it cannot have its own purposes. Liberalism is based on a Kantian approach in a philosophical sense. It is expressed in the moral philosophy of Kant that individuals should be regarded not only as an instrument but also as a purpose. However, the definition of freedom in Kant's political writings constitutes another starting point for liberal political theory. According to this, freedom can be the case when compatible with others' areas of freedom. According to the definition mentioned here, freedom is foreseen in society and with society. But this does not mean a social freedom. What is mentioned here is that, freedom with harmonious relations of individuals to each other. Liberalism is opposed to the imposition of a certain lifestyle on individuals, as opposed to freedom (Erdoğan, 1998: 2-4). Individual freedom for liberals is a supreme political value and has a unifying role in liberal ideology. Classical liberals saw freedom as a natural right, a necessary requirement to maintain a human existence. According to them, freedom provided the opportunity to the individuals to take care of their own interests through the power of choosing. The free individual is the person who can make his own choices himself. Subsequent liberals also saw freedom as the most basic condition for people to develop their skills and talents and realize their potential. In the light of Kant's definition of freedom, liberals do not accept the right of freedom in an absolute sense. For when freedom is limitless, it is incompatible with the freedom areas of others. In other words, unlimited freedom can turn into the maltreatment of others (Mill, 1972: 73).

Although liberals agree on the value of freedom they have different thoughts about what it means to be free for the individual. In his work *Two Concepts of Liberty*, Isaiah Berlin argues that liberty does not denote a single concept, but two different concepts, negative and positive liberty (Berlin, 1969). According to him, negative liberty is the area which is or should be left to the individual to do or be without being interfered or limited by other persons (Berlin, 2002: 169). Freedom in this sense means the freedom from external interventions and restrictions of an individual seeking to fulfill his wishes (Berlin, 2002: 169). According to Berlin, positive freedom means "self-mastery". He explains self-mastery as the self-origination of a person's life and decisions, not hinging on whatever kind of external forces. In this way, a self-master individual is an instrument of his own will but not someone else's' (Berlin, 2002: 178). In this context, positive freedom is about "what" or

“who” is the source of the control which can determine an individual to be or do in one way not another (Berlin, 2002: 169). Self-mastery makes the individual a subject, not an object, of the causes that affect him externally. Classical liberals say freedom is based on leaving the person on his own devices, the ability of a person to act in the direction of his preferences free of interference. The concept of liberty here is negative; that is, when there is no external pressure or restriction on the individual. Modern liberals advocate a positive concept of freedom. In other words, freedom includes the individual's development, self-realization, and use of his potentials (Heywood, 2012: 30-31). What the concept of freedom means for the individual is an important element in influencing the liberal attitude in the context of individual-state. Liberal understanding, which draws attention to individuality and freedom, is firmly attached to reason. As mentioned above, liberalism is an integral part of Enlightenment. The main theme of the Enlightenment is undoubtedly the desire of man to get rid of superstition and ignorance and to walk in the direction that only the reason shows. Enlightenment has affected rationalism, liberalism in many ways. The belief in the individual and the freedom is strengthened by the importance given to reason. As people are rational thinking beings, they have the ability to determine what is best for their own interests and the ability to struggle for achieving it. One of the effects of rationalism on liberalism manifests itself in the tendency of liberal's belief in progress. Progress means continuous improvement and forward movement. In particular, the increase in knowledge that emerged through the scientific revolution not only allowed people to understand and explain their world, but also made it possible to construct this world in a better way. In other words, the power of reason has given man the capacity to take responsibility for his own life and to determine his own destiny. Besides these, reason serves as a shield against violent irrational cases such as use of force, aggression, even war with resources like judgment, discussion, debate and argument. Liberals justify the use of force only in case of self-defense or resistance to oppression (Heywood, 2012: 31-32). Another value of liberalism is justice.

Justice itself is the libertarian environment in which the individuals who are not prevented from being able to freely realize their purposes and to participate in activities that they choose freely, not being subject to any discrimination in this respect and do not use others only as instruments. (Erdoğan, 1998: 88-89).

Although it seems to be social, justice is actually a concept related to individual attitudes and behaviors. Justice itself is being able of an individual to claim the rights of all the values he obtained in economic and social activities without violating others will or with their consent and the demand for the protection of this right (Erdoğan, 1998: 89). The theory of liberal justice is based on the belief in equality in many different areas. Individualism, which is the first of basic values, is important as it expresses submission to a basic equality. It is assumed that every individual is equal, that all people are born equal. This is also the starting point of natural rights or human rights theories. Basic equality also includes the formal equality. According to this, all individuals should benefit from the same formal status in terms of rights distribution in society. Rights should not be given to any privileged race or class, and no individual should be excluded because of religion, race or social group he or she belongs. In this context, the most important ones of the formal equality are legal equality and political equality. While legal equality underlines equality before law, political equality is a sign of liberal commitment to democracy. Along with all these, liberals also embrace equal opportunity. The main point here is that every individual has equal chances of rising or falling in society. But this should never mean that social equality is defended. It is because people are not born the same. Each person may have different abilities and skills, and some others work harder. Liberals believe in the need to appreciate merit, skills and desire for work. To put it more clearly, *“Equality for a liberal means having equal opportunities to develop the unequal skills and abilities that individuals possess.”* (Heywood, 2012: 33). The last distinctive feature of liberals is their positive attitude towards moral, cultural and political differences. In fact, apart from the convenience of accepting differences, they have a habit of praising differences to the sky. Liberalism often associates pluralism or diversity with tolerance. Tolerance requires winking at what other people think, talk, and act whether we approve it or not. The liberal interpretation of tolerance emerged in the seventeenth century, with thinkers like John Milton and John Locke advocating freedom of religion. According to Locke, as the main function of administration is to protect life, freedom and property, such an administration does not have the right to interfere in the protection of the souls of the people. This view is also important for liberals to shed light on the distinction between public and private spheres. Tolerance should be expanded in every sphere that is

seen as private and ethical issues such as religion must be left totally to individuals. Therefore, tolerance is the guarantee of negative freedom.

3.4. Liberal Nationalism

Liberal nationalism is, to a large extent, an interesting articulation emerged with the influences of the American and French revolutions. Political reasons played a vital role in the emergence and development of the characteristics of nationalism. Indeed, the emergence of nationalism in Europe and the development of a liberal discourse and the execution of liberal practices continued together historically. It is therefore seen that liberal values and nationalist goals are affecting each other and even intertwined. Liberal nationalism, for example, attaches great importance to popular sovereignty, because in the Europe, nationalists struggled with the multinational empire's autocratic and oppressive governments. The main theme of this kind of nationalism is self-determination. This nationalism, which emerged in response to foreign sovereignty or colonial rule, was in search of national liberation and self-determination through concepts such as freedom, justice and democracy. This kind of nationalism, therefore, was described as liberal nationalism, as it also contained liberal values (Erdoğan: 1999: 93). National feelings and natural reflexes which are the basic catalysts of reason and nationalism are synthesized with independent individual, progressive and enlightened reason in liberal nationalism. At the same time, liberal nationalism, which advocates that the government should be both constitutional and representative, is republican. It emphasizes the fact that the republic will develop with citizen-individuals, and the importance of citizenship. In this context, liberal nationalist understanding gives importance to the democracy, the collective participation of the people, individual liberty and democratic governance against the forms of governance such as the monarchy and the aristocracy (Erdoğan: 1999: 93-95). At the roots of the liberal nationalist tradition that brings together liberalism, rationalism, enlightenment and republicanism are political thinkers like John Stuart Mill, Ernest Renan one of the mentors of Aḡaoḡlu and Giuseppe Mazzini⁶⁰.

⁶⁰ For more information on relationship between Mill, Renan and Mazzini and liberal nationalism; see: Gita Srivastava, *Mazzini and His Impact on the Indian National Movement* (Allahabad, India: Chugh, 1982); Jorge

Liberal nationalism theory tries to reconcile liberal thought and nationalist theories, which are regarded as opposing and incompatible ideologies within the field of political theory (Tamir, 1993; Miller, 1997, 2000; MacCormick, 1999). In liberal nationalism theory, culture is considered to be an important element of individual identities, and it is thought that democracy can only take place within national boundaries (Karabulut, 2014: 873). According to this theory, national and cultural identities do not harm liberal values such as individual autonomy, equality and freedom, against to the idea of classical liberalism (Tamir, 1999:6). When we focus on the thesis-related parts of the theory of liberal nationalism, we must compare the basic values of classical liberalism and the attitude of liberal nationalism to these values. The main political subject of liberalism is the individual. According to it, the existence of a human being and orientation towards purposes must be the starting point of any social and political regulation.

In liberal political thinking, the individual has the ability to identify and realize his or her own interests and benefits independently of any external force and intervention. In other words, a human being who is rational determines his or her own purpose and realizes this purpose, trying to obtain what is good for him or her. In the whole process, human being should not face any obstacles. This is achieved only with individual freedom and rights. Liberalism's understanding of individual has also set its point of view about society. Here society is a community formed by the union of equal and free individuals. As the liberal society foresees the coexistence of different interests and benefits, the basic principle of social life is to ensure that the interests and benefits of the individual can be realized without conflict. Therefore, the political space is organized according to individual freedoms. According to this organization, an individual as a right owner subject finds his or her place in the political space. In this context, the function of the liberal state also arises. The task of

Myers, *Giuseppe Mazzini and the Emergence of Liberal nationalism in the river Plate and chile, 1835-60* (in Giuseppe Mazzini and the Globalization of Democratic Nationalism, 1830-1920 (C. A. Bayly and E. F. Biagini (ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2008), Denis Mack Smith, *Mazzini* (New Haven and London: Yale university Press, 1994), Paul Kelly, Liberalism and nationalism (In: Wall, Steven, (ed.) The Cambridge Companion to Liberalism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), Rosario López, *John Stuart Mill's Liberal Nationalism: Revising Contemporary Interpretations through Contextual History* (In Alnes, Jan Harald and Toscano, Manuel (ed.) Varieties of Liberalism: Contemporary Challenges Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014).

the liberal state is to stand against the possibility of any external interference against the freedoms of the individual. However, the role assigned to the state is to resolve the conflicts with consensus that can arise between right owner individuals and to establish order. In the process of establishing this order, the concept of liberal justice emerges. According to this, individual freedoms must be guaranteed by the state through laws. This individual-centered point of view of liberalism is also the basis for defining citizenship. Liberal citizenship has a legal character. Citizenship is about being a member of a community formed and defined in a legal framework and the rights obtained from it (Karabulut, 2014: 876).

It can be said that there is a tension between the community concept which liberalism shaped around values such as individual freedom, equality and pluralism, and a community concept that nationalism defines regardless of whether it is on an ethnic or cultural basis as exclusive and closed (McCarthy, 1999: 175). In other words, liberalism gives individual freedom and human rights a tremendous advantage over the collective entities like state, nation, people etc. From this point of view, all humanity irrespective of its race, beliefs, social origins and nationalities has equal moral values. Liberalism is therefore basically universal. On the contrary, liberal nationalist theory argues that the tension between liberalism and nationalism is not a necessity, arguing that liberal principles historically have been validated in the nation-state model. From this point of view, there is a close connection between political legitimacy and the concept of nation in liberal societies. Therefore, liberals who have the idea that only respecting human rights and acting equally for all of their citizens is enough for the legitimacy of a state are mistaken (Karabulut, 2014: 876-877).

Liberal nationalists emphasize the importance of national culture and identity in terms of both the modern individual and democracy. According to them, national identities played an important role in the social integration of citizens from the beginning of the modern age. For liberal nationalists, the concept of “nation” has been defined by common culture, history and language rather than reference to a common lineage and ethnicity. Liberal nationalist theory criticizes classical liberalism because it neglects the role played by the culture in the life of individuals as it considers individuals as abstract and uncommitted beings (Karabulut, 2014: 877). Liberal nationalism rearranges classical liberalism's individualism, which emphasizes

individual freedoms and rights, along with the nationality principle. In this arrangement, citizens' communities, which are united by national identity and culture and have a strong solidarity among them, are needed in order to determine values such as public participation and common goals in the context of democratic citizenship. Renan's definition of nation summarizes these views:

A nation is therefore a large-scale solidarity, constituted by the feeling of the sacrifices that one has made in the past and of those that one is prepared to make in the future. It presupposes a past; it is summarized, however, in the present by a tangible fact, namely, consent, the clearly expressed desire to continue a common life. (Renan, 1882)

Nationalist liberalism in this respect claims that the atomistic individual of liberalism pursuing his or her own interest and benefit will not be the subject of the bonds of social solidarity and belonging required by democratic politics. The link between citizenship and nationality principle should be established. As, in the concept of the liberal society, idea of a nation makes it possible to create trust and loyalty among the alienated citizens. By the expression of Miller;

Liberal nationalists claim not only that national self-determination can be pursued consistently with liberal principles, but also that liberal values themselves can only be realized in a political community whose members share a common national identity. (Miller, 2006: 535).

Therefore, nations appear as the basic areas in which democratic institutions can become functional (Miller, 2006: 532). As it is understood from this, nationalist liberalism regards the concept of nation as an integral part of the democratic system. This point of view is closely related to the concepts of democracy, national sovereignty and self-determination. National communities with a common culture as collective subjects have the self-determination right in the political arena (Karabulut, 2014: 877). To summarize, the central point of liberal nationalism is the idea to accept that demos which is the subject of democracy, is synonymous with the notion of 'nation' and that being a member of a nation is the condition of democratic citizenship. Liberal nationalism seeing the nation as the unchanging political unit and the idea that the effective citizenship can only be realized in the communities having a national identity and in a nation-state is different from the meaning

that classical liberalism attributes to individual and state. Liberal nationalism gives priority to social unity and homogeneity.

3.5. Liberal Thinking in Turkey

3.5.1. Liberalism in Ottoman

Liberal ideas began to be effective from the second half of 19th century in Turkey. Actually, existence of liberal political institutions at the basis of the Western political models and practices that the Ottoman-Turkish modernization followed, led to the understanding that the modernization efforts of the Ottoman State were also liberalization efforts at the same time. In particular, the efforts to move to a constitutional administration, which means that the Sultan is bound by a written constitution, supports this view. But it is not true to assume that modernization is identical to liberalization. From an intellectual point of view, in the background of the establishment of Kanun-i Esasi, the first constitution in Turkish history in 1876, there were New Ottomans led by Namık Kemal, Ziya Pasha and Ali Suavi. Namık Kemal (1840-1888) was under the influence of a liberal doctrine not because they defended a constitutional administration and because they the thought that political liberty could only exist with such a government, but also because they defended free trade.

It would not be wrong to say that the Ohannes Pasha from Chios, who thought economics in the Mekteb-i Mülkiye, laid the foundations of economic liberalism in Turkey during this period. In his work *Mebad-i Ilm-i Servet-i Milel (The Sources of the Science of the Nation's Enrichment)*, Ohannes Pasha claimed that the Ottoman Empire could make economic development possible with a clear and competitive market based on the right of ownership and freedom of enterprise. Ohannes Pasha did not hesitate to say that in accordance with his claim, economic protectionism, statism and monopoly are wrong. Another economic liberal is Mehmet Cavit Bey (1875-1926). Cavit Bey put his views in his four-volume work under the title of *İlm-i İktisat (Science of Economics)*. At the same time, between 1908 and 1910, he was one of the publishers of the journal of *Ulum-i İktisadiyye ve İçtimaiyye (Journal of Economics and Social Sciences)*. In his writings, Cavit Bey stated that for the development of the Ottoman State, the Ottoman economy had to integrate with the world economy and

therefore foreign capital should be encouraged. He defended free trade, opposed to economic protection, underscored the need to support private enterprise. The name who emphasized the liberal values of the Constitutional era is Prince Sabahattin (1878-1948). One of the basic views he defended in his book *Türkiye Nasıl Kurtulur?* (*How Can Turkey Be Saved?*) is the importance given to private enterprise. The main point that distinguishes Prince Sabahattin from other liberal writers is his explanation of economic views through a theory of individualism. According to Prince Sabahattin, individualistic societies have a more productive, entrepreneurial and independent character than communitarian societies. Therefore, Ottoman State can get rid of the depression only by the development of individualism in the social structure. To abandon the centralization that leads to inefficient, cumbersome bureaucratic processes and to reorganize the administration in a decentralized structure is also essential for getting rid of this depression. The Prince, who was a member of the Union and Progress Society in the beginning, left the society in 1902 due to his liberal ideas, first founded the *Osmanlı Hürriyetperveran Cemiyeti* (*The Ottoman Liberals Association/Party*), then the *Teşebbüs-i Şahsi ve Âdem-i Merkeziyet Cemiyeti* (*Private Enterprise and Decentralization Association/Party*) in 1906. Immediately after the declaration of the second constitutional period, in September 1908, Prince Sabaattin and his like-minded colleagues founded the *Osmanlı Ahrar Fırkası* (*Ottoman Liberal Party*).

3.5.2. Liberalism in Early Republican Period

Between 1924 and 1946, the Republic of Turkey was under one-party rule, with some exceptions, such as the Progressive Republican Party (PRP) and the Free Republican Party (FRP). It is clear that this period is not a favorable environment for liberal ideas and movements. On the contrary, the most influential intellectual movement of the period is the Kadro movement which represents a statist interpretation of Kemalism. In fact, Atatürk moved with Fethi Bey, who represented the relatively liberal wing of the Committee of Union and Progress during the Constitutional period. Even from the foundation of the Republic, he has taken the liberal-democratic Western model as an example. However, we can see that this model has been abandoned for various reasons during actual practices of the One Party period. Especially the political views of İsmet İnönü and Recep Peker are opposite

to liberalism. Nevertheless, we see that Atatürk is at least close to economic liberalism until 1930. The first opposition party of the Republic of Turkey, founded in 1923, was the Progressive Republican Party established in November 1924. Six months after the Progressive Republican Party, which was closed after the Sheikh Said Rebellion, which began in February 1925, the second opposition party of the Republic, the Free Republican Party, was established in August in 1930. This party which was founded directly by Atatürk's instruction and received a great interest in a short time dissolved itself with the decision of Ali Fethi Bey, -on Atatürk's request-, on November 17, 1930. Thus, the experiments of the multi-party system of the Atatürk period ended. It is necessary to take a closer look at the PRP and FRP opposition tests in the first years of the Republic in order to better understand the situation of Turkish liberalism and Ahmet Ağaoğlu's position.

3.5.2.1. Progressive Republican Party (PRP)

The first political opposition test that could be described as liberal of the Republican era is the Progressive Republican Party (PRP), which was established in November 1924 but was closed by the government in June 1925. The most important event that emerged after the removal of the Caliphate was the adoption of the new Turkish Constitution in place of the 1921 Teşkilat-ı Esasiye law (Constitutional Law). This situation is the point of dispute between those who are around Mustafa Kemal and those who will later establish the PRP. With the new Constitution, Article 25, which gives the President the power to dissolve the Assembly, has been established. In the voting taken after a great deal of discussion in the parliament, a significant majority opposed the granting of this authority to the President. The majority of the parliament was entirely ready to realize Mustafa Kemal's will, if necessary by force; but when it came to the removal of their authority, the majority of the parliament was entirely against it (Zürcher, 2010: 62). In fact, in this period the news that the People's Party could no longer protect its unity and would be divided into two were in the newspapers (Ekincikli, 2012: 158). Mustafa Kemal and his radical supporters did not seem to get what they wanted at this point.

On October 29, 1923, the Turkish Parliament declared the Republic of Turkey. The declaration of the Republic revealed the reasons one after another behind the foundation

process of the PRP. Actively participated in the National Struggle, the well-known figures entered into a fierce debate in the People's Party against the manner in which the republic's declaration was made. Even Atatürk declared the republic on 29 October when Rauf, Refet, Adnan Bey and Ali Fuat Pasha whom he thought would oppose the declaration of the republic were not in Ankara. He had not exchanged any ideas with the important names mentioned before this date (Zürcher, 2010: 53). These names were in opposition to Mustafa Kemal Pasha's demand for full authority in the revolutionary movements as well as in the war. In short, Rauf Bey, Refet, Ali Fuat and Kazım Karabekir Pasha's would not walk with Mustafa Kemal Pasha after the declaration of Republic. In fact, this is not surprising, the similarities between Mustafa Kemal Pasha and others were very few. Only until they were victorious, they delayed their disagreements. Mustafa Kemal had set a democratic order to bring his country to an equal level with the West. He believed that it would work over time. He respected the parliament, but this parliament needed a president who would use his authority during the transition period. Gazi Pasha, who took his loyal aides to his side especially Fevzi and İsmet Pasha, would enter a war of power against his friends and his enemies. This war will be between a completely interpreted liberal democracy, and a democracy linked to single party government and even personal governance (Kinross, 2006: 459-460). In the summer of 1924 although PRP had not yet emerged, it became clear that an opposition would appear soon. During this process presidents party membership was criticized and it was emphasized that he should remain neutral. However, Mustafa Kemal Pasha rejected the proposals of neutrality at the dinner given in his honor by the *Halk Fırkası Heyet-i İdaresi (Board of Administration of the People's Party)* on 16 September 1924 on his Trabzon tour. Ali Fuat Cebesoy in his memoirs, states the facts that they agreed with their friends before the foundation of PRP in five articles:

1. Under suspicion we cannot stay as army inspectors
2. It is not right to resign from parliament under any circumstances (Rauf Bey made Refet Pasha took his resignation from the parliament back). The news that the doctor Adnan Bey had joined the parliament by preferring to be a member of parliament rather than being a delegate was welcomed.
3. Although we have supported all of the reforms, we have agreed that the purpose of these reforms were not to give privileges to a person or a class but to all of the

nation and people. By the way, we recalled the following remarks by Ghazi in the liberation festivals of Bursa on September 10: “The reforms we have made are enough for the welfare and happiness of Turkey for centuries. It is our duty to work for guarding this with appreciation. “

4. We would work as much as possible to ensure that the republic which is the form of our state will not become an instrument of an administration of a person or a class.

5. We have agreed that gathering in the parliament and working there with all of our ability for the benefit of our country would be the most appropriate solution for the situation that we were in. We were convinced that we would be able to make our voices heard by our friends who would agree with us in the parliament (Cebesoy, 2011: 496)

After a series of successive events, a new political party under the name of “Progressive Republican Party” was finally founded on 17 November 1924, by Ali Fuat (Cebesoy), Kazım Karabekir, Rauf (Orbay), Refet (Bele), Adnan (Adıvar), and İsmail (Canbulat). Kazım Karabekir, who has performed very important duties in the National Struggle, became the head of the party. When we look at the declaration and the program of the PRP, we can see that a party with liberal characteristics unique to Western Europe is tried to be formed. He favored secular and nationalist politics like the People's Party, but he was adamantly opposed to its fundamentalist, centralist and authoritarian tendencies. The PRP was advocating for decentralization, division of powers and evolutionist change, not revolutionary. It also has a more liberal economic policy that finds foreign borrowing necessary (Zürcher, 2014: 250).

The first two articles of the PRP program are:

Article 1- State of Turkey is a republic based on the sovereignty of the people.

Article 2- Liberalism and sovereignty of public (democracy) are the Party's main occupation (Akyol, 2012: 449).

In addition to these basic principles, there are also principles such as direct election, legal guarantee of judges, non-partisanship of the president, and administrative decentralization in PRP's program. The article 6 of the party program states that “the party respects religious ideas and beliefs”. But this article, which was put in terms of freedom of religion and conscience, caused the closure of the party after the Sheikh Said rebellion. The founding of the Progressive Republican Party in the process of the development of both Turkish democracy and Turkish liberalism is an important experience. Conservatives and liberals

concern about the dictatorship led to the emergence of this experience. On the other hand, the Kemalist government feared that the conservatives and the liberals would harm the republic which the Kemalist government thought as still weak. Until the 1950s, the Republic of Turkey was ruled by Kemalist power and politics of the country was shaped by its worries. The PRP emerged as opposition to the monopolistic attitude of power, which concentrated around Mustafa Kemal and Ismet Pasha, did not stand against this attitude and took its place in history.

3.5.2.2. Free Republican Party (FRP)

When we look at the development of Turkish liberalism, it is necessary to talk about the Free Republican Party (FRP), which was set up as an ostensible opposition in 1930 five years after the closure of the PRP and closed the same year as it has turned in to a real opposition. FRP, like PRP's emerging, it is not a spontaneous opposition movement to the practices of Atatürk and the People's Party. Ahmet Ağaoğlu who is the leading figure due to one of the ideologue of the party, confesses that the party does not entirely have the characteristics of a real opposition party as; "[...] the name of the party, was decided by the leading figures of the Republican People's Party before it was founded." (Ağaoğlu, 2011: 41). Indeed, at the request of Atatürk, FRP was founded by his close friend Fethi Okyar Bey, and as Ağaoğlu mentioned, Atatürk himself decided which member of parliament would be the member of the party.

It is necessary to evaluate the establishment of the Free Republican Party in the context of various problems that the government has faced in the national and international arena in the Early Republican Period. The political system that settled well after 1925 allowed neither the leader team that ruled the War of Independence to express their views nor the public to express social discontent. In addition, the fierce attitudes of the Republican People's Party's and the regional and local representatives of the Party, the corruption and favoritism that emerged with it, and the lack of consideration of human rights, government's reform policies were causing a lot of fury. When the world economic crisis, the Great Depression, that shook Turkey towards the end of the 1920s as well as many agricultural countries, was added to this, the fury of the people was exponentially increasing day by day. Since the authoritarian

structure of the RPP responded to this reaction of the people and was not in a communicative way, the gap between the people and the government was increasing day by day. In fact, İsmet İnönü who made a speech in 1931 party congress did not make a single sentence about the economic crisis that swept the whole world. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, even though had not guessed the size of these discontents but realized it in 1930, has decided to establish a loyal opposition party with the aim of resolving these discontents as a result of both the reports and the investigative visits to different regions of the country and the relieving PRP of its lethargy. Then, Mustafa Kemal offered to establish a new party to his former friend Fethi Okyar, who had just returned from Paris where he served as Ambassador, and who submitted a report to Mustafa Kemal seriously criticizing about İsmet İnönü and the situation of the country. Fethi Bey and Mustafa Kemal discussed this proposal for several days. In these discussions Fethi Bey asked the government to allow the newly formed party to work comfortably and Mustafa Kemal for the guarantee of equal treatment of both parties. Atatürk wanted the new party to be firmly attached to the principle of republicanism and secularism in return. When they reached an agreement Fethi Bey embarked on establishing FRP. Mustafa Kemal supported the party by directing both his colleagues and his sister Makbule Hanim in the process of the establishment of FRP (Zürcher, 2014: 236-264).

Ahmet Ağaoğlu in his memoir titled *Serbest Fırka Hatıraları* mentions that Mustafa Kemal expressed his objections to his opinion on the establishment of the party. Mustafa Kemal was angry at these objections, even called Ağaoğlu “the provocative man” (Ağaoğlu, 2011: 36). Finally, the Free Republican Party was officially established on 12 August 1930. The party issued an 11 article declaration containing the views they defended. According to this declaration:

1. The Free Republican Party depends on the principles of republicanism, nationalism and secularism. The purpose is to eternalize these principles within the nation.
2. Taxes will be reduced to the level which will not harm the individuals’ ability of enterprise and will not exceed citizens’ ability to pay it. Imposition of taxes will be based on more sound principles and the corruption in its collection will be eliminated.

3. Party, will pay attention for the productive spending of the state income and refrain from putting all the expenditures of the public works on one generation.

4. Party is bent on taking measures to determine the value of our money immediately and by doing this, leading foreign capital which wants to do business in our country.

5. Party does not accept government interventions that hamper the financial and economic enterprises of its citizens. Party is the helper of any entrepreneurs in the development of the economic life of the country.

The State will directly undertake if the power of individuals seemed not enough for the economic affairs to be undertaken for the interests of the Republic

Port monopoly will be abolished.

6. One of the most important purposes of the party is that; peasants and the farmers being able to find money with very low interest and easily, and to be saved from usury which weakens our economic structure.

It is a principle that the Ziraat Bank (Agricultural Bank), which was established with the generosity of the farmers, will be transformed into an institution that will satisfy the agricultural credit requirement of the country.

7. The revival of the domestic businesses and the easy development of them is an important goal that the party wants to achieve. The Industrial Promotion Law will be properly applied.

The protection and facilities granted by this law will be extended if necessary. Sanayi ve Maadin Bank's (Industry and Mines Bank's) capabilities and activities will be increased.

Measures will be taken to protect the home-grown products and to ensure their exports. Transport and port tariffs shall be arranged to serve these purposes.

8. The businesses of the people in government offices will be taken care of with maximum speed and ease. It will be fought against bribery and abuses without mercy.

9. Courts will be subject to rigorous and continuous inspections for quick work completion. The shortcomings of the courts organization will be taken care of according to this purpose.

10. Party in its foreign policy, will give importance to; carrying out and reinforcing its relations with the neighbouring and all of the states within the framework of friendship and sincerity and close collaboration with the United Nations.

11. Party will advocate the establishment of direct election method and the extension of political law to Turkish women (Tunaya, 1952: 633-634).

As can be seen from these articles, the declaration has similar characteristics to the Declaration of the Progressive Republican Party of 1924. Likewise, defended values such as advocacy of the liberal economy, promotion of foreign investment, freedom of expression and direct elections are similar. The FRP was met with great excitement by the public, beyond the expectation of the government. Branches of the party, especially branches in the big cities of the Aegean region, were invaded by the people trying to be a member. When he visited Izmir in early September, Fethi Bey was welcomed with such an enthusiastic crowd that it scared the government. The Izmir rally was subjected to various obstacles by the government. In this rally, a turning point for FRP, the people-police encountered, there were various conflicts, and many people were injured while one child was dead in these conflicts. People's reactions and the increasing favor shown to the new party so frightened the leaders of PRP that they asked Mustafa Kemal to clearly state that he was the leader of the PRP and that he would always remain as the leader. Mustafa Kemal, despite the promise he gave to Fethi Bey, did what he was asked on 10 September and broke his impartiality.

Municipal elections were held in October 1930. FRP won only 30 municipalities out of 502. But even this success achieved in a short period of time has surprised the ruling party and thoroughly increased its fuss. Fethi Bey accused the ruling party of a massive corruption in a parliamentary debate just after the elections. This led to a stiffer attitude towards FRP, party and party leaders began to be accused of treason. Mustafa Kemal informed Fethi Bey that he could not remain neutral in this environment. Fethi Bey, who saw the meaninglessness of opposing the president, had no other choice than to close the FRP. FRP was abolished on November 16, 1930 (Zürcher, 2014: 265). Ağaoğlu, the ideologue of the party's with a liberal-nationalist line tried to explain the reasons of failure as, the mistakes in the formation of the party, the troublemaking role of Arif Oruç who was the friend of Fethi Bey in the newspaper *Yarın* (Tomorrow) which was the unofficial body of FRP and the early and unprepared entry into the 1930 municipal elections (Ağaoğlu, 2011: 35-51). According to Erdoğan, in Turkey, where this multi-party life experiment failed, the only thinker who could be described as a liberal in the single-party period was Ağaoğlu (Erdoğan, 2013: 34). Zekeriya Sertel says only Ağaoğlu was a sincere liberal, the one who knew what he wanted among the FRP members (Sertel, 1968: 193).

4. AĖAOĖLU, LIBERALISM AND CONTRADICTIONS

We can say that AĖaoĖlu's ideas as we have expressed until this part, even though containing many different contradictions, liberalism, nationalism and democracy were his unchanging ideas, but even these ideas also differ according to time, place, and developing conditions. AĖaoĖlu is separated from the leading thinkers of the nationalist movement in which he was included, as well as from the Kadroists, who were the Early Republican Period intellectuals, with his attachment to liberalism and liberal values. In this part, firstly, the views that led to the definition of AĖaoĖlu as “a consistent and honest liberal” (Timur, 2001: 178) in the Early Republican Period will be examined. Then the liberal opposing *Akın* journal which AĖaoĖlu published after being excluded from the state mechanism due to the closure of FRP will be examined. At the end of this part, the contradictions of AĖaoĖlu’s liberal attitude will be also examined.

4.1. Traces of Liberalism in AĖaoĖlu

The liberal attitude of AĖaoĖlu will be expressed through his thoughts on individual, state, government, economic freedom, democracy and parliamentary multi-party system, society, religion and secularism, women, and family.

4.1.1. Individual

When liberalism is mentioned, the first concept that comes to mind is the individual. Liberalism is separated from other ideologies with its emphasis on individuality. According to liberalism, human personality is the most important value. Starting from this it is necessary to look at AĖaoĖlu’s thoughts on individuals in order to present his liberal attitude. From the beginning of the Republic, especially in the 1930's, AĖaoĖlu was seen as an uncompromising advocate of liberal ideas. The construction process of the New Turkey has also been the process of creating a new ideology for the Republic. During this new construction, certain political and intellectual groups or persons have engaged in an idea struggle to give a direction to the Republic’s way. Kadroists, which is one of the intellectual movements to

create ideology for the Turkish revolution, consists of names such as Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Vedat Nedim Tör, Burhan Asaf and İsmail Hüsrev Tökin gathered around the Kadro Magazine published between 1932 and 1934. Şevket Süreyya Aydemir was the ideologue, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu was the publisher, and Vedat Nedim Tör was the editor of the magazine (Türkeş, 1999: 47). In the writings of the Kadro magazine, which was published with permission from Atatürk and continued for three years and thirty-six issues, formed the ideology of the Turkish Revolution with a strict understanding of statism. The discussions between Kadro Movement and Ağaoğlu were under the titles of individual, democracy and statism (Ertan, 1994: 170-172).

Ağaoğlu who rejected this kind of statism was undoubtedly one of the important ideologues of the new Turkey. But he believed that the Turkish Revolution was made to be a solution to the individual was under pressure in the Eastern world, and defended that the purpose of the revolution was to save the individual from all repression, not to enslave him or her to a new power-state. According to him, the new regime will enable the emergence of individual as citizen, by removing all the obstacles that hinder the free development of the individual (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 74).

In this period he wrote his book *Devlet ve Fert* composed of his writings containing rebuttals against the Kadroist's and his book *Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde*, a liberal utopia attempt. Other than these books, in which he defended individual citizenship rights, especially his book *Üç Medeniyet* in which he showed the superiority of the West and Western values over the East and Eastern values, his own liberal newspaper *Akın* and numerous newspaper and magazine writings are filled with emphases on the priority and importance of individual. Especially after the closure of FRP, it was seen that he strongly opposed the one party system, oppressive and totalitarian regime, injustice, lawlessness and irregularities. He attempted to maintain this opposition in difficult conditions in his journal *Akın*.

Ağaoğlu thought that the empowerment of the individual would facilitate the movement of the society and strong individuals would be able to expand their freedoms by assuming more responsibility. Ağaoğlu, who regarded the individual as equipped with broad rights and responsibilities, saw his own society as well as all the Eastern societies as backwards in this

regard. According to Aġaoġlu “*unlike the West, individual was strangled in the East, the individual was compressed, weakened, emaciated, and finally put into his narrow and suffocating sheath under the pressure of the increasingly furious despotism.*” (Aġaoġlu, 1933: 27). In the West, however, individuals have struggled to fight for their liberty and little by little got it and by continuously developing they have enjoyed living and working. Therefore, the Eastern societies which have individuals who are introverted and subdued have declined. However, Western communities opened the way for and strengthened individuals continuously (Aġaoġlu, 1933: 27).

According to him, Renaissance and Reform movements, religious conflicts, peasant uprisings freed individual from the oppression of the church and feudal lords, led the free thinking and free work of individual. This brought many innovations with it and many technical and scientific developments emerged thanks to this. Even Western nations have progressed in proportion to the importance they gave to individual among themselves. For example, the success of Britain in the fields of invention and discoveries before the East and other Western countries, advances in positive sciences and discovering values that had important effects in the progress of mankind such as water and steam machines can be directly linked to Charta Magna Libertatum⁶¹. The liberties that British citizens got were the basis of great achievements. On the contrary, the reason for the oppression of the individual in the East was not to allow independent thinking and move (Aġaoġlu, 1933: 28-29). Aġaoġlu sees the main cause of progress in the expansion of individual freedoms. According to him, there are some conditions for achieving a high individuality. In *Üç Medeniyet*, he summarizes this situation as follows: “*High individuality is based on free-field work, free partnership and free competition. These principles were first applied to the Great French Revolution, and since then the family, state,*

⁶¹ “Magna Carta, English Great Charter, was a charter of English liberties granted by King John on June 15, 1215, under threat of civil war and reissued with alterations in 1216, 1217, and 1225. By declaring the sovereign to be subject to the rule of law and documenting the liberties held by “free men,” the Magna Carta would provide the foundation for individual rights in Anglo-American jurisprudence.” (Stenton, 2016). For more information on Charta Magna Libertatum, see: James Clarke Holt, *Magna Carta* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), Sir Ivor Jennings, *Magna Carta: And Its Influence In The World Today* (New York: H.M. Stationery Office, 1965), *The Roots of Liberty: Magna Carta, Ancient Constitution, and the Anglo-American Tradition of Rule of Law* (ed. & Introduction by Ellis Sandoz, Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2008).

and society organization in the West have all been inspired by these principles” (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 64). According to Özcan, “*These views of Ağaoğlu are one of the liberal versions of the theories which defend that the superiority of western societies is a product of the inner dynamics.*” (Özcan, 2010: 205).

Ağaoğlu emphasized that for the development of the Republic and the society, individuals should be provided the opportunity of development and progress and also he considered that the development of the society is directly proportional with the individual who gained the ability to move. Nonetheless, in his work titled *Devlet ve Fert*, he mentioned that he has remained loyal to the principles of Kemalism, revolutionism and statism, like all intellectuals of the Republic. However, he indicates that his perception of these principles is different from and totally opposite of other intellectuals, in particular from the Kadroists (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 56-57). Even he establishes a connection between statism which Kadroist’s perceive and backwardness (Özcan, 2010: 205). According to Ağaoğlu, the Turkish Revolution was made to be a remedy for suppression of individual freedoms in the Eastern communities. The purpose of the revolution is not to enslave individual to any power again, but to save it from all oppression. The new regime will ensure the emergence of the citizen individual by removing all the influences that hinder the free development of the individual (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 74).

The Republic; will develop by means of modernized state structure, national sovereignty and citizen individual whose rights are protected by constitution. At this point, the separations between Ağaoğlu and RPP ideologues and bureaucrats - especially Kadroists– become clear. While the Kemalist bureaucracy forces the individual to conform to a standard of living it has designed, to comply with a social identity in a defined framework, Ağaoğlu by putting forward the citizen-individual principle gets reactions. He even criticizes Ziya Gökalp's views on this issue, who is among the leading thinkers of the nationalist movement to which he belongs. He in fact harshly criticized the socialist mentality that Gökalp defended and formulated as “there is no individual but society, there is no right but duty” (Filizok 2005: 268). According to him, this view is same as “[...] “*There is no one but the sultan, there is*

no right but pleasure” principle - it should now be ended. Thinking a society without individual is to think of a person without hands, feet, head and trunk.” (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 68).

Kadro movement is against individualism. According to them, the individual can find meaning and place in statism. According to Tökin, *“social and economic movements of Individuals are tied with norms, rules and measures in the name of national interests within national unity. Individual is free with the society and will be prosperous with the nation.”* (Tökin, 1933:30-31). The statism of the Kadroists is the 'strict statism method' with the expression of Ağaoğlu (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 30). As this phenomenon of statism is defined by Kadroist's as a social, political, economic unified system, an individual can only be mentioned within the scope of statism. Kadroists rejected the individual freedom which Ağaoğlu and some liberals defended because it narrowed the boundaries of statism. According to them, *“the real statism is the expression of a system which contains the change within the society.”* (Tökin, 1933: 25-26). In other words, the limits of statism must be kept wide, and must be so comprehensive as to shape the whole society and its future. For this reason, they do not accept the concept which assigns certain duties to the state and asks the state to stay within these boundaries as statism; they describe these views as the state policy only. Şevket Süreyya, an important representative of Kadroists, said that *“statism is a national and social order, in which all the areas of the national life and the framework of the national body are hold above the common and high interests and tendencies of the nation are regulated in an organized national harmony.”* (Aydemir, 1934: 10). This rhetoric assumed that all areas of society could be planned and regulated by statism. Ağaoğlu, on the other hand, considered that the fundamental condition for the communities to move forward and develop is the movement and development of the individual who is regarded as a dynamic force (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 35).

4.1.2. State

Ağaoğlu's attitude toward regime differentiated in a period when the Republic of Turkey was founded and the Turkish reforms were realized one after another in the 1920-1930 period and the period that will last from 1930 to the end of his life. The first of these periods was when he came to Ankara with excitement caused by the love of Turkishness after his

captivity in Malta and actively played a part in the state both as a politician and journalist and ideologist intellectual which lasted until 1930's (Özcan, 2010: 192). During this period Ağaoğlu played a very important role in the founding of the Republic and in the construction of the Turkish identity (Shissler, 2002:185). Ağaoğlu, who came to Istanbul from Malta then to Ankara, soon met Mustafa Kemal and entered the service of the national movement. This service consisted largely of the propaganda of national struggle and Turkish revolution. In addition to this, Ağaoğlu served as a member of parliament, has contributed to the revolutions by influencing Mustafa Kemal with some of his thoughts like the establishment of national sovereignty, the abolition of sultanate, the passing of the Latin alphabet, translation of the Qur'an into Turkish, and economic freedoms (Shissler, 2002: 186-299). In this process corresponding to the 1920s, social and economic modeling had not yet been decided in the country. We see that liberal and capitalist development models were preferred in decisions taken at the Izmir Congress of Economics⁶² which was organized in this context. But in the 1930s a strict statism with the effect of the Great Depression began to influence political, social and economic model (Özcan, 2010:193). This period, in which Turkey adopted statism as a principle, was also constituted the second period of Ağaoğlu's attitude towards the regime. In this period, Ağaoğlu, who became completely ineffective in political life due to the establishment and the closure of FRP incident which we have examined in detail in the second part, criticized statist policies with his writer and commentator identities (Shissler, 2002: 197). The Turkist ideas that he had defended resolutely since the last period of the Ottoman's were no longer the central issue of that time period. After the 1930s, especially after the FRP was closed, at the center of his views were the criticism of the regime and the defence of liberalism and its values. Although hardened after the 1930s, Ağaoğlu's liberal views emerged mainly in Paris years, put the idea of individual to the forefront in his thoughts which was the main element of liberalism (Özcan, 2010: 192). In the first period Ağaoğlu put forward his views within the framework of state-nation, in the second period he put forward a state-individual centered interpretation. He was the first person who

⁶² For more information on İzmir İktisat Kongresi, see: Afet İnan, *İzmir İktisat Kongresi 17 Şubat-4 Mart 1923* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1989), Kazım Karebekir, *İktisat Esaslarımız Hatıra ve Zabıtlarıyla 1923 İzmir İktisat Kongresi* (İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 2001), Yahya, S. Tezel, *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisat Tarihi (1923-1950)* (İstanbul, .Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2002).

resolutely defended the liberal theses against the Kemalist mindset that put the state in front of the individual in the individual-state relation.

In this part, Ağaoğlu's state concept will be examined in the context of nation-state and individual-state relations. Although having some contradictions the main sources to be used here when presenting the liberal attitude of Ağaoğlu are his works titled; *Devlet ve Fert* comprising his discussions with Kadroists, *Üç Medeniyet* claiming that West and Western values have superiority over all other civilizations, *Serbest Fırka Hatıraları* in which he tells about the incidents happened between the establishment and the closing of the FRP which was established against the one party regime and *Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde* which is a democratic and a liberal utopia. Besides, parliamentary minutes and his articles published in various journals and newspapers also constitute our main sources.

We see that Ağaoğlu's approach to the state was Turkism centered until the 1930s. In this period, Ağaoğlu who explained the concept of state by using the concept of nation criticized the negative attitude of the Ottoman State against the Turkish constituent. He held the sultan and the rulers around the sultan responsible for the collapse of the state.

In *Üç Medeniyet*, Ağaoğlu said that since the early ages the concept of the state has been strangely comprehended in the East. According to him, the state was always confused with the government, the difference between the two was never understood, it was accepted that they have the same meaning. Unfortunately, Turks took this acceptance even further. They have not only confused the state with the government, but also have called the governments and states they have established with the name of a person or a family. Naming like Ghaznavids, Seljuks and Ottomans were the products of this mentality. According to him, it was impossible for the Ottomans to become a superpower from a six hundred-clan tribe. Those who founded Ottoman Empire were millions of Turks who called it as Seljuk's. However, it is impossible to encounter such a situation in the West.

Although England's ruling dynasty has changed four times, England has never been referred to with the names of these dynasties. Ruling dynasty has changed several times in France, but the name of the French State has never changed. For example, when Napoleon invaded all of Europe France did not take the name of him. According to Ağaoğlu, the main element

of the state is the nation that gave birth to that state. Therefore, the name of the state should naturally be the name of the nation that gave birth to that state, as it is in the West. To name the state with the name of a dynasty means that the state is merely regarded as that dynasty. In this case, if the ruling dynasty of the state is subverted or collapses for any reason, this also means the collapse of the state (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 87-88). *“However, the nation which actually constitutes the state is the continuous element and the founder of it. The dynasty is collapsing, but the nation is alive and refreshing the foundations of the state by following more capable, talented leaders.”* (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 88). Those who see the concept of the state in the unity of the nation live and fight in the hope of reviving their state even if they lose their independence. In the history, countries such as India, Italy, Poland, Greece and Serbia are examples for this situation (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 88).

According to Ağaoğlu, the Ottoman state appears to be a single entity in terms of its administrative procedure, its organization and its laws. He explained this situation with the example of Britain. Britain is a state of nations. The Scottish, Irish and English have a role together in its emergence. Though this has changed in favor of the English later, there is still a British state established with the consent of three nations. The Ottoman Empire was a single entity, and it had its own procedure in terms of administration and organization. This procedure did not require any of its elements which were included in the State, consent or agreement. Many of the elements joined the state with the conquered lands. Ottoman’s gave all the rights to Muslims among the elements incorporated through the conquests. Christian and other non-Muslims were not given the right to have equal rights with the founding nation and to join the national sovereignty, but were seen as a part of the state. The foundation of the state was unity, the procedures, permits and privileges imposed on behalf of protecting this unity could never take a form that would disrupt the unity of the state. The government could take all precautions to maintain unity when it wanted and this could not be resisted. This structure of the Ottoman State gradually became a community-nations state like in England, as a result of the neglect of the statesmen, to understand the nature of the state and their lack of foresight. The permits granted to the Christians were constantly increasing, eventually beginning to appear as if they had been earned by an agreement, so that the unity of the state broke down. Every element began to see itself as a private entity within the state,

and privileges against the state and autonomous governments were mentioned. All of these triggered the process of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 90).

According to Ağaoğlu, the leaders of the Ottoman State, in other words prominent figures of the Muslim subjects, had two major mistakes in this process. First one was that, leaders' late understanding that a state could not be ruled solely by the sword. To ensure the security of the state that various nations formed, to develop trade and industry, and to form the administration structure was not enough for the state to survive. It was necessary to gain the heart and minds of the elements that make up the state. It was only during Tanzimat period that this situation was recognized and measures tried to be taken. But the damages tried to be repaired in the Tanzimat period did not work because the foundation of the state was already shaken. The second and biggest mistake was that a special place was not given to the founding element of the state in the state. According to Ağaoğlu, in the states, two kinds of forces take place as usual. These forces are center-directed and non-statist forces. In the Ottoman Empire, the center-directed force was Turk. The forces that moved away from the center were other nations. Despite this, the rulers of the Ottoman Empire did not tried to strengthen the Turkish element had failed to maintain its scientific and economic superiority. However, the Turkish element had to be strengthened consistently, because the state naturally would resort to this force on difficult days, where it would take its strength from it. The notables of the Ottoman Empire made the exact opposite of this, and Istanbul did not make any material or moral investment in Anatolia, even though it took power from Anatolia at all times. Turks scarified their life as well as their economy, knowledge, wisdom and industry to the state (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 91).

According to Ağaoğlu, Turks was expelled from the administration because the principle of personal loyalty in the Ottoman Empire was considered superior to the principle of loyalty to the state. When the rulers of the state for three hundred years were examined, it would be seen that only twenty percent of them were Turks. These administrators were never connected to the Turks by heart. So, when the state was in a difficult situation, they walked away. In fact, this was very normal, because they were not loyal to the state but the sultan (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 93). Ağaoğlu continued to criticize the Ottoman attitude towards the

Turkish element over the National Struggle. After the armistice, the Turks, who were the main founders of the state, gathered around Mustafa Kemal Pasha. While the Turks struggled at the cost of their lives for defending their families, religions and nationalities in Ankara, people from different races around the palace tried to establish an army against Anatolia by cooperating with the enemies. In other words, these people, who were not Turks, have not stopped from surrendering the country to the enemy supposedly on behalf of the Turks. According to him, all of this was a consequence of the misunderstanding of the concept of the state. In truth:

The state is neither the sultan nor the government; the times that Louis XIV said “I am the state” is long past. [...] The state is the nation, the factor that establishes the state. All the sovereignty belongs to it, as well as all rights. Since, Locke, J.J. Rousseau's time, this principle has been a sacred basis for the environment we are in. We [...] have to obey J.J. Rousseau. (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 95).

As it is understood from these words, the statesmen should take the inspiration from the nation which founded the state directly, not from the sultan. The statesman has to think only of the main element of the state, the development of its personality, the material and moral strengthening of it and have to work accordingly. Those who do not think like this cannot participate in state administration. In addition, the state understanding of the age we are living in requires this. In Russia, for example, the Bolsheviks⁶³ impose the soul and the way of administration of the main element, namely Russian, on the elements in Azerbaijan, Ukraine, Georgia, and Turkestan, which are under their rule (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 95).

As we have seen, Ağaoğlu, who we often see changes in his ideas according to time, place and conditions, has suggested nationalist views in the 1920s, in accordance with the founding of the new Turkish state and the construction of the Turkish identity. He stated that the state is formed by the nations, the nation is the main element, and that this element is Turk in Turkey. But this does not show that Ağaoğlu does not have a liberal attitude or this point of view does not mean that Ağaoğlu does not care about liberal values. As it is known, his

⁶³ “Bolsheviks were a member of the extremist wing of the Russian Social Democratic party that seized power in Russia by the Revolution of November 1917” (*Bolsheviks*, 2016). For more information Bolsheviks, see: Alan Woods, *Bolshevism - The Road to Revolution: A History of the Bolshevik Party* (London: Well Red Publications, 1999), Bertrand Russell, *The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism* (New York: Casimo, 2007).

embracement of liberal views started in his years in France. It is true to see these thoughts as the effect of the period and the environment rather than an integrated ideology.

We see a totally liberal stance in Ađaođlu's thoughts after 1930s. The Great Depression of 1929 affected all parts of the world. This global crisis had such great and devastating effects that it brought the regimes of the states not only economically but also politically into the questioning phase. States resorted to economic intervention measures in fighting the crisis. In many countries, adherence to classical liberal principles disappeared. It was a time of struggling with economic and political problems for liberal and constitutional regimes in various countries all over the world. This period brought with it the rise of views like statist, nationalist, totalitarian and militarist in various continents, especially in Europe. Dictators such as Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin appeared in this period. It could not be expected that Turkey would remain indifferent to this situation in this period when the confidence in liberalism was lost in every corner of the world. In this period, the rulers of the state left the liberal capitalist growth model aside in order to protect the Turkish revolution as well as to comply with the new world order. In this period, the new growth model of the state became a strict concept of statism. İsmet İnönü and Recep Peker represented this understanding in the political arena. However, the Kadro movement, led by Şevket Süreyya, left their mark on this period with their unique approach to statism (Özcan, 2010: 193-194).

Ahmet Ađaođlu was the only person who maintained his liberal stance and belief in liberal values till the end of his life, in the political arena against the PRP of İsmet İnönü and Recep Peker and at an intellectual level against Şevket Süreyya and Kadro movement despite the severe conditions of the 1930s. In fact, the explanation of the transition of Ađaođlu who is both a practitioner and a propagandist of Kemalist reforms, after losing this position and becoming a defender of liberal values, should be sought in the process of establishment, development and self-closure of FRP. FRP was established by the order of Atatürk personally, based on Republican, nationalist and secular principles (Ađaođlu, 2011: 31). From the moment that it posed a threat to the PRP, it was closed at Atatürk's request and by the efforts of the PRP. As one of the most colorful opposition figures in the parliament, Ađaođlu, who became a member of the high-level committee of FRP with Atatürk's

instructions, criticized the PRP on corruption, profiteering, monopolies, defects of the current economic system and arbitrary practices of the government with a liberal point of view (Ağaoğlu, 2011:127-132). He went to Istanbul after the FRP was closed and he was politically neutralized in Ankara and continued to defend these values in the journal *Akın*.

Although Ağaoğlu was doing politics in the PRP his views beyond the general conviction of the party, he suited more to the opposition party. While loyal to the values of the Republic, he had struggled with the excessive statist and bureaucratic structure and emphasized the importance of the supervision of the political power. Ağaoğlu, who is loyal to the principles of “republicanism, nationalism and secularism”, seriously criticized PRP on many issues such as worsening condition of democracy in the country, sugar and tobacco monopolies, economic initiatives of the state and corruption (Ağaoğlu, 2011: 125-132).

According to Ağaoğlu, the salvation of states and societies is “freedom of work and capitalism in the field of economics. In the field of politics-parliamentarism and individual liberty.” (Ağaoğlu, 1933:5). But the revolutions, rebellions and crisis that followed the First World War put in mind the idea that states and societies could not be built on these foundations. In fact, it was an opinion defended by the socialists before the war. After the war, it crossed the borders of the Socialist circles and even infected the states and societies which were against the socialist movements. In addition, the establishment of a dictatorship by a group that did not constitute even three percent of the population in a country like Russia, which governed a very large population, and some people easily becoming dictators in developed states such as Poland, Italy and Spain, brought forward the ideas that socialists defended all along. Therefore, the ideas of freedom of work and capitalism, parliamentarism and individual liberty which means the salvation of civilized humanity, started to be attacked. Great states such as Russia, Italy and Germany even though they had no common ground between them and there was a great hostility between the communists and Hitler, the attack on these values was also common. Unfortunately, at the end of the war, these ideas, deeply affecting Europe, finally came to our country by crossing the borders. According to Ağaoğlu, Kadro movement was the pioneer of these ideas in our country (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 1-6).

The main element that Aġaoġlu came up against the Kadro movement was the individual-state relationship. Aġaoġlu sees the individual as a dynamic force and expresses that states and societies can advance through dynamism of the individual. For him, the individual is the one who thinks freely, feels free and acts freely. He accepts that the individual is equipped with broad rights and responsibilities. According to him, the reason for the bad situation of the East against the West is the East's oppressive structure of the individual. In the West, however, the individual has always advanced. The advancing individual has struggled more for rights and law, has constantly increasing liberty, and has enjoyed living and working pleasure. Western societies, which consist of continuously strengthening individuals, are therefore advanced and strengthened (Aġaoġlu, 1933: 27). However, Őevket Sreyya and Kadroists oppose the individual. A freedom cannot be granted to an individual in a society, almost separating the individual from the society is at the center of their thoughts. For them, it is important that people fulfill their jobs and duties assigned to them (Aydemir, 1932: 87). The Kadro movement, which opposes economic freedoms, sees mechanisms in liberal economies as idle economic activities (Sakal, 1999: 183). According to the Kadroist's, "the real statism is the expression of a system which contains the change within the society." (Tkin, 1933: 25-26). In other words, it is necessary for the state to intervene in and plan all political, social and economic issues that have taken place in public life. According to Aġaoġlu, in this understanding of the Kadroist's, the state "*[...] replaces the nation, makes national organization, directs and administers the nation, takes economic enterprises within, creates wealth, builds technic and embraces all of them, in summary swallows the Nation, leaves no function to it .*" (Aġaoġlu, 1933: 59).

In fact, Aġaoġlu said that the state would naturally become a statist. The state has already been established in order to intervene in the social order by nature. France or England, for example, is statist indeed. But the main issue here is to determine the limit of the state's intervention in social order. Aġaoġlu, who thinks that the goal of the Kemalist revolution is to change the individual oppressing nature of the East, says that the Kemalist state should ensure the protection, promotion, development and rise of the individual. According to him, the state should only take on the necessary tasks that the individual cannot make, that he or she is not capable of, or cannot do. The state should only use its authority to overcome social

contradictions and maintain social order when needed (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 30-76). Ağaoğlu's emphasis on Turkish identity in the first period of his anti-regime stance is no longer stands out. There is now an Ağaoğlu who says “to do the work of the country is only the right of the experienced ones and the experts.” instead of his thoughts like the necessity of continuous strengthening of the Turkish element, providing the material and moral evolution of the Turkish people and the special attention given to it within the state (Ağaoğlu, 1930:8). He in this period pointed out that “[...] the regime should be organized on the basis of citizen-individual rather than on the basis of the state” (Özcan, 2010: 192). According to Ağaoğlu, strict statism, which the Kadroist's defended, is nothing but despotism which he perceives it to be the reason of East's declining against the West, prevents the emergence of the individual and oppresses people. There is no democracy in the statism system. Democracy is not the dominion of a person or a small class in the society. Democracy cannot be talked about if the control, criticism and freedom are taken away from the people (Sakal, 1999: 186). “*The Turkish Revolution was made to be a remedy for the pathetic situation of the East. Its last wish is to save the individuals from any domination, not to enslave to any power.*” (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 29). Free-thinking, free-feeling and free-acting individuals with high rights and duty awareness can only express themselves within the parliamentary democratic system.

“The system that the Kadro defends is something incomprehensible, full of strangeness and without an example on earth.” (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 96). According to him, the Kadro ideology has nothing to do with the Turkish revolution. There is neither capital accumulation nor unified working class in Turkey. Therefore there is no class struggle that requires the factors that give rise to social contradictions within European societies and intervention by the state in a wide area. In Turkey, the state should only do what the individual cannot do and leave the rest to the individual (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 105).

4.1.3. Government

One of the subjects that Ahmet Ağaoğlu reflected his liberal stance is the government, although it contains some contradictions. We can see that the concepts that Ağaoğlu uses to express his various views on the structure of the government and the limits of its duties are

such as democracy, national will, free elections, rule of law, central and local governments. In this part, we will examine Aġaoġlu's notion of government he presented by using the above mentioned concepts with the help of his works; *Üç Medeniyet, Devlet ve Fert* and *Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde*.

According to Aġaoġlu, in the East the concept of government was understood very differently from the West. In general, in the East, the government is only one ruler. Because it is believed that the rulers received their power and authority directly from God. In fact, this understanding in the Eastern societies emerged long before Islam, due to the religious and cultural structure of Iran. Afterwards, due to Iran's majesty and greatness spread rapidly and affected all the Eastern people. But when Islam emerged, it put an end to it. Islam that has not excluded even the prophets from committing sin, has never given attributes like innocence or irresponsibility to the ruler (Aġaoġlu, 2013: 97). According to Aġaoġlu, Islam searched the source and the basis of government in society. "The ruler accedes to power with the will of the *ijma-i ummah*⁶⁴ (decision of ummah). Ruler is chosen by the society he manages and after he has been elected he is responsible for two things: materially in the presence of the society and morally in the presence of the God" (Aġaoġlu, 2013: 97). Unfortunately, Islam began to change in the time of the Umayyads while decisions before relied on the principles of Shura⁶⁵ (Council), the *ijma-i ummah* and the determination of the caliphate by elections⁶⁶. In this period, the elections disappeared, sultanate emerged in the government thus the people moved away from the administration (Sakal, 1999: 176). Another reflection of this understanding which dominated Islam since Muawiyah I⁶⁷ is the epithets that the rulers use. Epithets such as Zillullah-i Azam, Müeyyet min Tarafullah, Kaim bi Emrullah, which express holiness and have meanings like God's

⁶⁴ *Ijma-i ummah* is a whole the Muslim community consensus, the universal and infallible agreement of the Muslim community, especially of Muslim scholars, on any Islamic principle, at any time.

⁶⁵ Shura means consultation and consultative committee (Türkan, 2010:230).

⁶⁶ For more information on this issue, see: İhsan Süreyya Sırma, *Hilafetten Saltanata Emeviler Dönemi* (İstanbul: Beyan Yayıncılık, 1995).

⁶⁷ "Mu'āwiyah I, in full Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, Mu'āwiyah also spelled Moawiyah (born c. 602, Mecca, Arabia—died April/May 680, Damascus) early Islamic leader and founder of the great Umayyad dynasty of caliphs. He fought against the fourth caliph, 'Alī (Muhammad's son-in-law), seized Egypt, and assumed the caliphate after 'Alī's assassination in 661. He restored unity to the Muslim empire and made Damascus its capital. He reigned from 661 to 680." (Little, 2009).

shadow, rule by God's command, helped by God, began to be used by these rulers and lasted until the end of the Ottoman period. So whatever the rulers who were carrying these sacred attributes did, they could not be resisted. To oppose them meant not to oppose a human but to Allah and Mohammed. This situation revealed the structure of the East which oppresses the individual and see the society as a herd needed to be shepherded, namely despotism (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 98). He argued that the failure of the constitutionalism was a result of this despotism.

Sometimes you think despotism collapsed [...] but in reality you will find it living everywhere and in everybody! For example, you will see people demanding freedom with foams in their mouth that do not tolerate the freedom of their neighbors [...] The truth is that the throne of the despotism has not yet been broken, eradicated from the souls and the hearts, because of this in such places freedom is often transformed into anarchy (Ağaoğlu, 1930: 14-15).

According to Ağaoğlu the Constitutionalism has two basic elements, first one is the national will and the other one is governing by law (Sakal, 1999: 178). According to Ağaoğlu, formation of the government with the appearance of the national will is one of the basic elements of the government. He expressed this view at every opportunity. We can see that he emphasized on the importance of national will, which is one of the basic elements of democracy in his speeches both in the Ottoman and the Turkish Parliaments. We can see that, Ağaoğlu, who had the courage to say that despite the circumstances of the period in Istanbul, the dissolution of the Parliament was violation of the national sovereignty, without compromising this attitude in Ankara he opposed the arbitrariness of the lifting of the legislative immunity in the parliament and defended that the parliament should not replace itself with the court (Sakal, 1999: 201-207). These topics are examined in detail in the Democracy and Parliamentary Multiparty System part of the thesis.

The issue that should be emphasized here related to the government is the view of Ağaoğlu on the main organs of the state, namely legislative, executive and judicial. Ağaoğlu is against the executive to intervene in legislative and vice versa. He is against the collection of all powers in one hand. He is the supporter of the determination of the duties and responsibilities of these organs and these organs should not leave this determined border. His view is

understood from the following expressions of his work *Üç Medeniyet* where he reveals the causes of the failure of the constitutionalism:

The division of the national powers (execution, legislature, justice) and the division of these powers into many parts, for example, bicameral establishment of the legislative power, clear definition of the authority of both houses, the executive branch consisting of various steps, the determination of their authority and responsibility levels, the village, provincial and municipal organizations, the work of these independent institutions always based on the same point. That is if authorities and activities do not interfere with each other, they do not prevent each other. If the lives of contemporary nations which were prepared for these kinds of instruments are examined closely it can be seen that the duty of the governments' was extremely simplified. Often this task is to control the independent and free operation of the institutions in a harmonious and orderly way, to provide public order (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 99).

During the Constitutional period, the government played a role beyond its duty. When the laws of the municipality and the provincial administration are examined, it is understood that the purpose of these administrations is to ensure that they can work freely in itself within a certain administrative structure and unnecessary interventions of the central government or the local executive power should not be allowed. But in municipal and provincial administrations it was not applied like this. Central government and governors were given so much authority and because of that the liberty of the cities was completely lost. It was passed from the rule of sultan who gathered all the forces to the executive power and governors became dominant. When city and municipal councils gathered and made decisions for them, they could not do anything without the approval of the governor. This situation is the violation of the national will and the law (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 99). But there is a subject that needs to be mentioned here. The freedoms mentioned by Ağaoğlu must not be understood within the framework of decentralization. He only emphasizes here that the legislative, executive and judicial bodies should not go beyond their own limits and that the national will should not be under the domination of any person or institution. According to Ağaoğlu, even if the decentralization is applied in the Ottoman Empire, it can destroy the state. In the Republican period, on the contrary, he advocated decentralization and development of freedom in provincial administration (Sakal, 1999:208). This is only one of the ideas that Ağaoğlu has changed in accordance with the time, place and conditions in his thought on the

government. A similar contradiction is related to the Caliphate. According to him, it was necessary to ensure the spiritual integrity, namely to use caliphate to prevent the plans and projects of British on Islamic world. But once the Caliphate was abolished, he has not mentioned this idea again (Sakal, 1999: 178). In the discussions he made with the Kadroist's he also focused on the concept of government. According to Ađaođlu, the ideas that the Kadroist's have proposed on the functions of the state show that they confuse the concepts of state and government, and even they thought that the state is only made up of government. For Kadroist's state means an executive power that represents the nation, replaces the nation, makes national organization, directs and administers the nation, builds technic, therefore swallows the nation and gives no function to it (Ađaođlu, 1933: 59). Ađaođlu objected to this understanding which ignores the individual, the society comprised of individuals, which is the national will. Although Ađaođlu's views on the government sometimes contain contradictions, it is generally based on the principle of separation of the powers. It should not intervene in the executive, the legislative and the judiciary bodies.

4.1.4. Economic Freedoms

One of the subjects in which Ađaođlu's liberal stance is clearly seen is the issue of economic freedoms. There is the individual-state relationship at the center of this view. He has entered various discussions with the Kadroist's. In fact, he dissented not only with the Kadroist's but also with his friends who fought with for the same cause like Yusuf Akđura because of their tendencies towards the planning and interventionist approach of statism (Sakal, 1999: 189). In this part, *Devlet ve Fert* and *Serbest Fırka Hatıraları* will be our basic resources and economic freedoms will be examined through freedom of enterprise, tax, foreign capital, government intervention in the economic field, monopoly, state economic enterprises, etc. Ađaođlu determined the prescription for the salvation of societies and states as “freedom of work and capitalism in the economic field” and “parliamentarism and individual liberty in the political field” (Ađaođlu, 1933: 5). Ađaođlu believes that the main condition of development is the expansion of individual freedoms, as he believes that the societies formed by powerful and entrepreneurial individuals are also strong. According to him, when contemporary societies and states are examined, it is seen that the development is based on

people with developed awareness for the rights and duty. The emergence of these individuals “[...] is based on the principles of free work, free partnership and free competition. [...] In the West, the family, the state, and the organization of society have all reached this level of development [...]” by taking inspiration from these principles (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 64).

Ağaoğlu who frequently criticized factors like state, society, religion and family structure which strangle, imprison and put obstacles in the way of the development of individuals in Eastern societies, stressed that this situation has not been the same all along. For example, he talked about the existence of entrepreneurial individuals, which Islam promoted in the first years of Islam (Sakal, 1999: 189). In addition, he tells that the Ottoman State in the fifteenth century was in a superior position against Europe both economically and administratively⁶⁸. Indeed, India was ahead of Britain in the field of economics and culture when it was ruled by Ekber Shah. In the East, however, the individual was overwhelmed and squeezed by the pressures of the state and the institutions such as religion and family, and eventually confined itself in a narrow space. “*In the East, individual has gradually taken its liberty thanks to the increasingly weakening of the despotism and by opening continuously has enjoyed the pleasure of living and working openly.*” (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 27). As a result, the Ottoman Empire declined against the West, and India not only declined but also became a colony of Britain, a country that is very small compared to India (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 26-27). An individual who is free not only in the political, social, cultural and religious areas but also in the economic area and can freely enter into competition, will allow the individual to develop and increase his or her abilities and acquire wealth at the end of this race. With these achievements, individual also makes various contributions to the society (Sakal, 1999: 208). The individual, a dynamic force, is in fact the locomotive of societies thanks to his or her entrepreneurship. “All these inventions, discoveries, social and intellectual progress made in the history” have always been made by these free-thinking, free-feeling and free-acting individuals (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 33-34).

⁶⁸ For more information, see: Mehmet Genç, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Devlet ve Ekonomi* (İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat, 2000).

Ağaoğlu has also said that in our country economic and political liberalism is intertwined. He states that economic liberalism put freedom of enterprise at the forefront and that it does not deal with state systems, while political liberalism is entirely related with the form of state. He says that, during the period he lived, the economic liberals in Europe are conservative and the political liberals are progressive. According to him, their common point is the importance that they give to the freedom in the working life of an individual. The state will keep power and freedoms in balance by staying in democracy and trying to strike a balance between these two systems. According to him, the new Turkish state is loyal to democracy and liberal (Sakal, 1999: 189).

We see that Ağaoğlu has entered into discussions on economic freedoms both in the PRP period and in the FRP period. These discussions were against those who fought against the market economy and liberal values after the Great Depression, which took place in the West in the 1930s. Kadroist's were the most important one. According to Şevket Süreyya, liberal countries are busy with idle economic activities and never-ending unmeasured mechanization which they call free competition. Liberalism is on its deathbed, liberal countries will disappear. Therefore, Turkey should pass to statism in order not to be exploited and to progress, and should not let the emergence of contradictions and classes as a result of these contradictions. Other representatives of the Kadroist's defend similar ideas (Sakal, 1999: 183). However, according to Ağaoğlu, when freedoms develop so does the society and with the development of science, knowledge, experience and technique in the society the skills of the individual will progressively increase, because of this social contradictions emerge. In other words, according to him, class struggle takes place between developed societies of developed states and advanced individuals. However, *“there is no class in Turkey, no class struggle, no big capital, no clash between the worker and the capitalist; that is, none of the contradictions that require the maximum intervention of the state in contemporary states exist in Turkey.”* (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 62). So it is meaningless for the Kadroist's to demand the intervention of the state and to try to prevent these cases from emerging already. According to Ağaoğlu, statism can only be harmless when applied in countries such as America and Europe which have already passed the period of democracy and supported the development of individuals and individual abilities. Because

these countries have the possibilities and capabilities to walk without losing their way in a fluid area like the material side of the technique namely industry and factories as well as the moral front namely knowledge, experience and work ethics (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 67).

According to Ağaoğlu, the Kadroist's were advocating state intervention in all areas of life. One of these areas was undoubtedly the economic life. According to them, the state itself had to be an entrepreneur. Thus, the state would obtain the greatest economic accumulation and prevent the formation of classes. The inability of large capital accumulation could protect the country and nation from the troubles caused by the class struggle. According to Ağaoğlu, this understanding was revealing the points that the Kadroist's contradicted themselves who were claiming to be neither communist, socialist nor fascist. Their views overlapped with fascism as they give the state apparatus the authority to organize and control all national activities and with socialism and communism as they defended that the state should carry out all the economic activities and thus prevent the emergence of classes (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 54-55). According to the Kadroist's, the state "*[...] represents the nation, replaces the nation, makes national organization, directs and administers the nation, undertakes economic enterprises, creates wealth, in summary swallows the Nation, leaves no function to it.*" (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 59). But in environments with underdeveloped science, technical and business ethics, a wide range of state intervention cannot develop, and if it develops, it prevents the development of these elements. In fact, a new era of oppression will begin (Ağaoğlu, 1933:104-105).

When we look at the principles of FRP prepared with the contribution of Ağaoğlu, we can clearly see his attitude towards economic freedoms, free market and statism. The four principles of the party, which is a total of eleven principles, are allocated for the views on these issues:

[...] II Taxes will be reduced to the level which will not harm the individuals' ability of enterprise and will not exceed citizens' ability to pay it.

Imposition of taxes will be based on more sound principles and the corruption in its collection will be eliminated.

IV Party is bent on taking measures to determine the value of our money immediately and by doing this, leading foreign capital which wants to do business in our country.

V Party does not accept government interventions that hamper the financial and economic enterprises of its citizens. Party is the helper of any entrepreneurs in the development of the economic life of the country.

The State will directly undertake if the power of individuals seemed not enough for the economic affairs to be undertaken for the interests of the Republic

Port monopolies will be abolished

VI One of the most important purposes of the party is that peasants and farmers are able to find money with very low interest and easily, and to be saved from usury which weakens our economic structure.

It is a principle that the Ziraat Bank (Agricultural Bank), which was established with the generosity of the farmers, will be transformed into an institution that will satisfy the agricultural credit requirement of the country [...] (Ağaoğlu, 2011:229-230).

These principles are a summary of Ağaoğlu's views on issues such as economic freedoms, free enterprise, taxes, foreign capital, and government intervention in the economic field, monopoly, economic enterprises of the state and bank loans. Ağaoğlu and his friends want the state to tax so as not to harm the economic enterprise ability of the individuals, support the investment of foreign capital in the country and advocate the establishment of the appropriate legal ground, say the government should not intervene in economic life, say the state should not establish economic enterprises, defend the abolishment of the monopolies and providing support for entrepreneurs like facilitating bank loans.

4.1.5. Democracy and Parliamentary Multi-Party System

One of the remarkable views of Ağaoğlu is that he has an understanding of democracy ahead of his time. Ağaoğlu, whom many changes in many of his ideas have been observed in different times and geographies, the place where he was standing for democracy has never changed. We see this consistent stance in democracy as well as relatively in his nationalism and liberalism. His ideology consists of a combination of these three elements at different quantities under certain time, geography and conditions. Ağaoğlu approached the concept of democracy through elements such as individual, freedom, right and duty, civil society,

national will, national sovereignty, freedom of thought and press, and freedom of opposition. In this part, Ađaođlu's ideas on democracy will be presented by his works such as, *Devlet ve Fert, Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde, İhtilal mi İnkılap mı?* and various newspapers and magazines writings. Besides, minutes of the Ottoman parliament and TGNA related with the subject are the main sources of our part. Ađaođlu defines democracy as “*The rule of the majority, the mind-set of the majority, value of the way of thinking, the satisfaction of the need of the majority, the effect of the majority's tendencies and desire on the national life*” (Ađaođlu, 1942: 42). However, the existence and the full and complete settlement of democracy is not easy. Because democracy is the regime of developed individuals and the communities they constitute (Sakal, 1999: 201). The emergence of a democracy, full and complete settlement of it, is possible only if the individual has reached the right and duty consciousness as it is in Europe. This can only develop as a result of the expansion of freedoms, disappearing of the oppression on the individual. Democracy and freedom are essentially a matter of culture. For example, even if the sultanate and despotism are abolished in a society, it is not possible to reach the freedom and establish democracy if the people forming the society are uncultured and ignorant.

Sometimes you think despotism collapsed [...] but in reality you will find it living everywhere and in everybody! For example, you will see people demanding freedom with foams in their mouth that do not tolerate the freedom of their neighbors [...] The truth is that the throne of the despotism has not yet been broken, eradicated from the souls and the hearts, because of this in such places freedom is often transformed into anarchy (Ađaođlu, 1930: 14-15). Because oppression, who had been gathered in a person before, starts to show itself with its traces on everyone. Everyone tries to bully everyone on behalf of freedom [...] Finally, the need to silence everybody on behalf of freedom and put everyone into their own sheath emerges (Ađaođlu, 1930: 14-15).

The realization of democracy depends on the existence of an individual who is loaded with broad rights and responsibilities. The individual is the person who is able to think free, to feel free and to act free. According to him, it is not only democracy, but humanity as well is deficient, without these three qualities (Ađaođlu, 1942: 71-72). Ađaođlu says that democracy and freedom are directly proportional to culture and that people will have democracy to the extent of their culture. Freedom is achieved and improved through education. Therefore, a free and well educated individual is the basis of democracy (Sakal, 1999: 202). However, in

our country, the individual is suffocated, trapped under the pressure of the oppression and imprisoned himself in a narrow and stifling area. According to him, the reason for East's condemnation against the West is the oppression of the individual and the disabling of the individual from free thinking and free acting. The Turkish Revolution was made to save the individual from the individual oppression in the Eastern community (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 27-29).

We see that Ağaoğlu defended democracy and democratic values in the Ottoman Empire even before the establishment of the Turkish Republic. For example, he mentioned the significance of national will both in the Parliament and in the newspapers and magazines of that period. In a post he wrote about the rumors of corruption in the elections of 1912, he says that the victory of the party which commits irregularity is in fact a defeat, because it does not win the victory under natural conditions. The aim of the general elections is the emergence of the national will. This can only be in a complete liberty and freedom. He even said that the dissolution of the Ottoman parliament was a violation of national sovereignty (Sakal, 1999: 201). It is possible to see Ağaoğlu's respect for the national sovereignty and national will, and therefore his democratic and liberal attitude in other similar incidents. He opposed Hüseyin Cahit Bey, who wanted to ban minority groups from speaking in the parliament, and said that the law of minorities should not be violated (Sakal, 1999: 209). Because according to him:

It should be basically accepted that all the country's children that are not the same in terms of rights and level, are interested in the destiny of the country, may participate in all kinds of affairs and reach any rank and position and the only measure is comprised of the skills and abilities to be presented. For us the cornerstone of democracy is this principle. (Ağaoğlu, 1942: 44).

Another important point that he mentioned here is that individuals have to take authority and responsibility to the extent of their ability.

Ağaoğlu, who had never changed his tendency towards democracy, continued to defend the necessary elements for the settlement of democracy in Ankara. Ağaoğlu, who thought that no other power than the national will should emerge, was always in favor of protecting the rights of the elected people. When a law on municipalities was discussed on March 29, 1930, there was an argument like that when the thought the mayor could be dismissed from the

office for any criminal offense, and the mayor should either appeal to the governor or the minister of the interior to demand justice. Ağaoğlu saw this comments as incorrect and objected it (TBMMZ, d.III, C.17, pp. 99-101). According to him, elected municipal councillors should bring the case to court if they consider their mayor as criminal. Here, either the mayor is proven guilty of the offense and punished or he is absolved. The governor, who is an appointed person or a minister having a political character should not be involved. If the governor, not the court, reinstates the mayor, the elected municipal councillors will be subject to the will of an appointed person (TBMMZ, d.III, C.17, pp. 103-109). With a similar attitude, he also opposed the arbitrariness of lifting legislative immunities in the TGNA and said the parliament should not replace itself with the court (Sakal, 1999: 205-207). Because such decisions are meant to be the slaughter of national interest and therefore democracy.

According to Ağaoğlu, the person who has reached consciousness of rights and duties is the cornerstone of democracy. But this is not enough. There are other elements necessary for a full and complete democracy to be settled. Among these elements, freedom of thought and press is the first one. He has expressed his thought at every opportunity and has charged without thinking an attack against this freedom. For example, in a speech at the TGNA, he emphasized the importance of that everything should have a critic, there should be people who can separate good and evil from each other and express them when necessary (TGNA Minutes Journal [TBMMZ], d.I, C.22, p.601.). Another event that allows us to see the value that he gave to freedom of thought and press is that when he was the Director of Press, despite the Minister of Interior, he opposed the prohibition of some newspapers, criticized it hard and put some newspapers back into publication (TBMMZ, d.I, C.23, pp. 63-66). Because the presence of criticizing institutions is essential for democracy. If there are no such institutions, there will be no enough control, and certain characteristics such as arbitrariness, lawlessness and irresponsibility will be seen in managers, managers will not work, and oppress people. *“If the rulers of the government do not know that they are eyes around that look, see, and criticize and reprimand when necessary, they will unwittingly increase their desire to oppress and finally turn to the path of bullying.”* (Ağaoğlu, 1930: 35). But Ağaoğlu is opposed to unmeasured and immoral criticism. According to him, such criticisms also by covering the truth can make the right unjust and vice versa. For this reason

freedom of criticism should be used properly and not abused (Ağaoğlu, 1930: 28). In addition to the freedom of thought and press, Ağaoğlu considered that to inform the public about the laws enacted, decisions taken, and performed practices is necessary for democracy. He opposed clandestine deals, and after being expelled from Ankara, he criticized the restrictions put by the relevant authorities on the press and wanted the press to be free in his journal *Akın* which he published in Istanbul (Ağaoğlu, 1933, 26 July).

One of the criticizing institutions is undoubtedly the opposition. Ağaoğlu defended the rights of the minorities in the Ottoman parliament, saw one party government as anti-democratic and played an active role in the establishment of FRP. Ağaoğlu, in 1926, presented a report describing the problems of the one party government to Gazi and Prime Minister (Ağaoğlu, 2011: 148). After the FRP was closed, he did not return to the PRP, saying that democracy cannot be mentioned in a one party administration. For this reason, we know that he defended the concept of independent deputy. He thought that independent deputies could act freely against the party leaders (Sakal, 1999: 207). Right to elect and be elected is another issue Ağaoğlu has emphasized in the context of democracy. According to Ağaoğlu, being a member of a party and only going to the polls and vote does not mean holding an election (TBMMZ, d.III, C.12, pp. 56-66). Therefore, intellectuals and Turkish press are needed to work very well and educate the society (Sakal, 1999: 207).

He also made various comments on the right to elect and be elected given to Turkish woman. He regarded the women's participation in elections that consists half of the society as a necessity of democracy. But he has some concerns in this regard. Turkish women could not appreciate these rights and could waste this opportunity given to them because contrary to the European woman they earned these rights without giving any struggle, they were granted by Atatürk (Ağaoğlu, 6 December 1934: 9). Another element he sees necessary for the establishment of a full and complete democracy is organizational and associational activities. If there are no organizations that prepare individuals against political, social and economic events, establishing political parties has no meaning for democracy. Without such formations, even if people are included in a party, they are like an unconscious herd. They were left to the mercy of the leaders and his cadres who ruled the parties. As it is easy to

crush and intimidate herds in these societies, it is also easy to change into despotism. Aĝaoĝlu in his liberal and democratic utopia, titled *Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde* which is an allegorical work, listed the main laws that the people of the free land should obey. At the tenth law he emphasized the importance of solidarity by saying “Solidarity is a duty. Those who do not perform this duty will lose the title of country citizenship.” (Aĝaoĝlu, 1930: 8). In the explanation of this article; he told the difference between the people of despotism-led countries and the people of free countries.

Among the members of the Free Land solidarity is the principle. Look at the places that are not free; the individuals and families live separately there and there is little interest and relation between them. Anyway, the fist over their heads will not let them to approach each other, to unite. Here the principle is separation, egoism. In the free land it is unity [...]. It is a principle here for everyone to be concerned with everyone, to participate in each other's fate. Here citizenship is a network in which the people entering are like rings adjacent to each other (Aĝaoĝlu, 1930: 29-30).

According to Aĝaoĝlu, The Land of the Free People is the place where it has full and complete democracy. Laws of The Land of the Free People such as “To defend a right is a duty, and those who do not perform this duty will be expelled from the country immediately”, “Solidarity is a duty. Those who do not perform this duty will lose the title of country citizenship”, “Every citizen is obliged to inspect the country's officials” (Aĝaoĝlu, 1930:8) contain elements like the individual who has achieved consciousness of rights and duties, inspection, criticism and solidarity which Aĝaoĝlu regards as necessary for the democracy to take place. Apart from all these political and cultural elements, the freedom of enterprise of an individual plays an important role in the emergence and settlement of democracy. “*The first condition for the development and forward moving of communities and states' is the opportunity of movement and development for the individuals who are the dynamic force.*” (Aĝaoĝlu, 1933: 35). If individuals who are free in the economic field and enter the competition freely as much as they are in political, social, cultural and religious fields, they will acquire new abilities and help the society with their wealth and also have the possibility to use them for spreading their opinions which they defended. Hence, individuals become pioneers and leaders in the way of human clusters in the form of herds becoming nation, through freedom of enterprise (TBMMZ, d.II, C.8, p. 662). He has already dealt with democracy as the absolute condition of nationalism. In addition, he had an

understanding that nationalism and individual freedom should always be together and necessary for each other. Democracy was the regime of developed individuals and their communities comprised of them. Democratic societies at the same time were Western nation states that also acknowledged and protected national interests and values, and allowed the individuals the right of free-thinking, right of free-acting and the freedom of free enterprise.

To summarize so far, Ahmet Ağaoğlu is an intellectual who internalized democracy. Since the Ottoman period, he had defended democracy and democratic values with an understanding way far beyond his time. Democracy is the regime of societies that are comprised of free-thinking, free-feeling and free-moving individuals, who are also aware of their rights and freedoms. According to him, the full and complete existence and settlement of democracy requires elements such as freedom of thought and press, opposition, national will, right to elect and be elected, informing the public and freedom of press, civil society in which the people can organize, and freedom of enterprise. Ağaoğlu says that the Turkish Revolution was made against the individual oppressing nature of the East that does not allow freedom of thought and freedom of act. “*The Turkish Revolution was made to be a remedy for the pathetic situation of the East. Its last wish is to save the individuals from any domination, not to enslave to any power.*” (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 29). According to him, the basic foundations of the new Turkish state are based on free casting of votes by the individuals through elections. Individuals elect member of parliaments, member of parliaments elect the President of the Republic, President of the Republic elects the Prime Minister, Prime Minister elects the Ministers and they all control each other continuously. Besides, the new Republic is a state of law and the Constitution provided some rights for Turkish citizens. (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 29). But we cannot say that the new Turkish state fully met these expectations of Ağaoğlu. The Kemalist order did not bring the freedom he was expecting. Even, on the contrary to this expectation, groups like Kadroist’s that did not give any value to individual and defended the excessive statism, and people like Recep Peker⁶⁹ whose thoughts could almost be regarded as fascism came to the forefront in Ankara. PRP’s first program, which was prepared with the contributions of Ağaoğlu and written initially within

⁶⁹ For more information Recep Peker, see: Nilgün Nurhan Kara, *Türk Siyasi Hayatında Recep Peker* (Unpublished PhD thesis, Dokuz Eylül Üniv., Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılâp Tarihi Ens., Türkiye, 1999)

the framework of liberalism, was gradually changed and started to become statist or even a fascist one. Aĝaoĝlu, not compromising his stance, became the defender of democracy and freedoms in the face of all this. He opposed to every subject he believed that harm democracy in both the PRP and the FRP period, he also has struggled with Kadroist's "*Our starting point is to give an individual "work and duty" in the world, not to give "freedom" that separates him or her from the society.*" understanding (Aydemir, 1932: 87, Aĝaoĝlu: 1933: 21). According to him, freedom does not separate the individual from the nation, but establishes an unbreakable and untieable mechanism of solidarity between the individual and the society which consists of all of the individuals. Aĝaoĝlu regards the right of citizenship as, "*[...] the acknowledgement of the right and authority of all the revolutionary Turks to concern with the revolution equally, therefore, to think and speak about the revolutionary Turkey's fate*" (Aĝaoĝlu, 1933: 73). However, the Kadroist's claim is that "*they are trying to monopolize the revolution by accepting it and by taking the attitude that supposedly only they are representing the will and interest of the revolution, they will impose their will "unavoidably" on everyone*" (Aĝaoĝlu, 1933: 73).

Ŗevket Sreyya and Kadro movement have developed a negative attitude towards freedom. According to Sreyya, liberty leads to anarchy. Freedom must be sacrificed to protect the revolution. But, according to Aĝaoĝlu, this view is an idea that all the oppressors and tyrants in history defended. Freedom in reality does not lead to anarchy, but order and regulation. On the pretext of avoiding anarchy, oppression denies liberty and constantly provides the ground, opportunity and possibility for anarchy. However, societies who are accustomed to managing themselves will never allow anarchy (Aĝaoĝlu, 1933: 87). Aĝaoĝlu, always advocating parliamentarianism and individual liberty in the political area, criticized authoritarian and totalitarian ideologies such as fascism, communism and Hitlerism which were rising against democracy in the 1930s. He has stated that people who are prone to personal government against the parliamentary system may appear in times of depression and that they should not be believed and parliamentarianism should always be advocated (Aĝaoĝlu, Akın, 19 July 1933). In addition he rejected the principle of statism, one of the Kemalist principles, and argued that the Republic could only develop in a democratic environment.

4.1.6. Society

Ağaoğlu's view of the concept of society is based on the individual within a liberal framework. Ağaoğlu's views on this issue have brought differentiation not only with the Kadroist's that has totally opposite ideas, but also with the prominent members of his own community. Ağaoğlu clearly expressed his views on this issue in his works, *Devlet ve Fert* and *Üç Medeniyet*. Ağaoğlu defines society as “[...], a conscious class with a common ideal and with shared feelings and thoughts” (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 75). This consciousness can only be achieved through the development of the individual and the expansion of his freedoms. According to him, as the individual develops and the works diversify with the increase of freedom of thought and freedom of act, the bonds that connect the individuals with other individuals increase. Thus, social solidarity and unity are ensured (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 24). As it can be understood from this views that, Ağaoğlu also evaluates the concept of society within the framework of individual, freedoms, rights and duties, division of labor and democracy concepts and maintains his liberal attitude also on this issue. According to him, if states and societies have individuals who have possibility of development and free movement, they can be develop and progress (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 35).

There have also been frequent discussions about the concept of society between Ağaoğlu and the Kadroist's. Kadroist's, who argue that it is enough to give work and duties, rather than giving any freedoms to an individual in the society which separates individual from the society, believed that the freedoms separates the individual from the nation (Aydemir, 1932: 87). However, according to Ağaoğlu, “*Freedom does not separate the individual from the nation; but establishes an unbreakable and untieable network of solidarity between the individual and the society which consists of all of the individuals*” (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 22). This solidarity network is based on the division of labor in developed societies. In these societies, individuals find areas where they can use their abilities through freedoms. These abilities increasingly develop and finally reach the level of specialization. As a result of specialization, individuals complement each other. This brings the rise of society. As society rises and the division of labor and specialization increases due to freedoms, the roots of

social ties will grow deeper and in every direction. Such that, ultimately individuals will be connected to each other with vital interests (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 23-24).

Ağaoğlu thinks differently not only with the Kadroist's but also with his other friends like Ziya Gökalp in his views on the society. He criticized the socialist understanding of “there is no individual but society, there is no right but duty” (Filizok 2005: 268) which Gökalp said. According to him, this view is same as “[...]” *There is no one but the sultan, there is no right but pleasure*” principle - *it should now be ended. Thinking a society without an individual is to think of a person without hands, feet, head and trunk.*” (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 68). “In reality in living and developing communities, boosting and driving factors of the development is the individual (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 33). According to Ağaoğlu, societies are stagnant in terms of their qualities and the dynamic one is the individual. But the individual gets the opportunity of free thinking, free feeling and free acting from the society he lived in. As we do not have a conscious class having a common feeling and thought, common ideals we cannot talk about a healthy society in our country. The elements that make up the social life are either absent or missing in our country. One of these elements is family. *“The family is the first essential bridge between individual and society, nature and humanity, material life and spiritual life. Along with being the first and most continuous cell of social life, it is the most sincere, most sacred center of the individual life.”* (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 69). But our family structure is an obstacle which prevents the individual to realize himself or herself and emerge. We will not repeat in this part the views of Ağaoğlu on the family which he described as the first social cell between the individual and the society, and why the structure of our family lacks in emerging the individual and the society, as we have examined in detail in the family part of our thesis.

Another element that plays an important role in the development of social life is the form that our religious life took. Our perception of religion and the way it is lived is not appropriate for the social life to take place (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 75- 77). Ağaoğlu's views on this subject will not be repeated here as we have examined them in detail in the Religion and Secularism part of our thesis.

According to him, apart from family and religion institutions, philosophy and literature are the other factors that influence the strengthening of social life. “One of them with the idea that it created, the other one with the flow of feelings combine individuals” (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 77). These two bring about consciousness and togetherness of hearts among the individuals, and by generating common beliefs and excitements, even cause widespread social movements. In fact, according to him, the French Revolution is just the product of these two elements coming together. When we read the history of the Revolution, we see that all of the heroes of the Revolution were inspired by Voltaire, Diderot, Montesquieu, and especially Rousseau. Philosophical theories of Kant’s, Schelling’s and Hegel have created Germany, Tolstoy’s Russia, Karl Marx’s Bolshevism. In other words, in contemporary societies, intellectual movements have a profound effect on the social life. However, in our country these kinds of movements never draw necessary interest and seriousness. The main reason for this is the fact that institutions such as academia and universities do not exist or never existed in our country. This has prevented the development of science and therefore prevented the emergence of intellectual solidarity and collective excitement that were generated by ideas and philosophical movements. According to Ağaoğlu, the situation of literature, which has a unifying role in the fulfillment of social life, is gloomy in our country. According to him, literature is not only about poets and writers reflecting their own souls, feelings and thoughts in their works. It also reflects the spirit of age and society. So literature means life. Literature not only reflects the spirit of time and space, it also plays a role in the development of society by contributing to the spreading and development of new ideas, feelings and perspectives. With this point of view, Ağaoğlu brings the educational role of literature to the forefront. Our ancient literature, however, was society oriented, it not possible to find anything about life in it. Eulogy, ode and satires do not have the capacity to do that. Novel, story, tragedy, theater, comedy, etc. in which the life is the subject are all strange to us. Therefore, it is difficult to talk about society in our country as a result of the fact that some of these elements which enable the birth and development of social life are either missing or few and incomplete. We have people who come together without thinking and by chance (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 77-84).

Ağaoğlu tells us that there is a creative power in the individual that he sees as a dynamic force in the development of societies and states. He exemplified his view through Mustafa Kemal Pasha. “*When Mustafa Kemal was emerging, there was a movement of liberation in the Turkish circle, but it was Mustafa Kemal who gave the direction and nature that we know about this movement.*” (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 35). Ağaoğlu believed that the Turkish Revolution and the Republic would save us from the individual oppressing nature of the East, and would elevate us to the level of contemporary civilizations (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 29). But in the 1930s it was seen that this did not happen as he expected. In fact, Atatürk has taken the liberal-democratic Western model as an example since it was founded. But during the One Party period, we see that actual practices did not fit into this model for various reasons. Especially the political views of İsmet İnönü and Recep Peker are completely opposite to liberalism. After the FRP incident, instead of ideologues such as Ağaoğlu who based entirely on the individual in his understanding of the state and society, Ankara has taken the ideologues who advocated solid statism like Kadroist’s and who saw free individual as harmful to the state and society as reference. We see Ağaoğlu as an opponent identity struggled with this situation. Much of his writings in the *Akın* journal were the products of this struggle. This subject has been examined in detail in the *Akın* part of our thesis.

4.1.7. Religion and Secularism

Ahmet Ağaoğlu's view of both Islamic thought and religion in general like all of his other thoughts has been on different lines in different periods of his life. In order to be able to see these differences, firstly his childhood, that is to say, the period when Persian-Shi'a effect was clearly felt should be looked into. It is then necessary to focus on his life in France where he spent his youth and completed his high education. Here, Ağaoğlu, due to the influence of the environment he contacted, brought Shiism to the forefront because of his Iranian identity. In addition, he met people like Ernest Renan, also one of the representatives of liberal-nationalism, modernist Islamist Cemaladdin Afghani and positivist Young Turk Ahmet Rıza here. These names influenced his view on religion, perception of religion. In addition to this, different geographies that Ağaoğlu lived in and the various problems he encountered in these geographies caused his religious ideas to change. In this part, Ağaoğlu's views on religion,

perception of religion, views on Islam, emphasis on secularism will be evaluated with taking all these factors into account.

Ağaoğlu was in favor of Shiism in his childhood and educational life in France, because of the influence of the circles he met, especially Renan. On his return to the Caucasus, both the situation of the Caucasus at that time - the emergence of nationalist movements - and the influence of Afghani, he changed his attitude and defended the unity of Muslims and Turks. He will now make an effort to think above the sects and to reform the parts of Islam which he thinks as backward. But this situation is not yet the end of the changes in Ağaoğlu's understanding of religion. When he escaped from the Caucasus to the capital of the Ottoman Empire, where the caliphate and the sultanate reigns, he was the defender of the policies of Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism. Ağaoğlu, who was involved in the establishment of the Republic and the construction of the new Turkey upon the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, has also renewed his views on Islam and religion. Ağaoğlu became an inspector of education in the Ottoman period through Young Turks and the Unionists whom he knew like Ahmet Rıza. Then he was appointed to the Suleymaniye Library as a Director. In addition, he taught Russian language and Turkish-Mongolian history in Darülfünun. In a short period of time he started working as a writer and an editor in newspapers and magazines like *Sırat-ı Müstakim*, *Sebilül'r-Reşad*, *Le Joune Turc*, *Tercüman-ı Hakikat* and *Türk Yurdu*. He was appointed as a member of General Assembly (Meclis-i Umumi) of the Union and Progress party in 1912 and then entered the parliament representing Karahisar. When we follow both the writings in newspapers and magazines and the ideas he presented at the Ottoman parliament, we see that Ağaoğlu's tendency towards Turkism and Islamism was intense in this period. Nationalism is at the basis of the conflict between Turkism and Islamism. Islamists think that national sentiments are a big obstacle to become a community (ummah). In fact, according to him, the world of Islam is only an abstraction. In reality there are many different Muslim peoples. The only way to strengthen the Islamic world is to correct the situation of the Muslims politically, socially and economically. In short, the power of the Islamic world is as much as the power of the nations that make up this world. So if a person works hard for the nation, it also means that he works hard for the religion at the same time. Nationalism therefore is not an obstacle to the development of Islam, but it contributes to its

development. In fact, the essential elements of nationalism are common language, religion, worship, history, homeland and common ideals. In other words, religion is one of the main factors that form the essence of nationalism. For many years, the Turks, who have been the protectors of Islam; have created an unbreakable bond between their nation and their religion Islam. In fact, there is not an area in the life of the Turks that Islam has not penetrated. Aġaoġlu opposes Islamists who see nationalism as an enemy as well as the nationalists who deny religion:

Those who are partisans of nationalism have almost always been partisans of religion. Those of our partisans of nationalism who are against religion have not studied and examined what nationalism is at length and in depth; they have been deceived in their own feelings, in their way of thinking. He who repudiates the religion of a nation, which is its fundamental spirit and life, cannot be a partisan of that nation. Such people can be free thinkers, cosmopolitan, progress-loving, freedom-loving and even patriotic, but they cannot be partisans of nationalism [...] it is not possible while repudiating a nation's religion to be a partisan of that nation. (Aġayef, 1328-1912/13: 297; Shissler, 2002: 171)

The conclusion we can draw from here is the greatness of the importance Aġaoġlu gives to religion. For Aġaoġlu, religion is a fundamental and undeniable part of identity. According to him:

Religion is one of the most important principles of nationality. The reasons for this are very simple and clear. For tying people to one another, especially in the days of nomadism, religion is one of the greatest and most effective factors; and indeed after language it is a unique factor. All of the people living in the world and having reached the height of advancement with respect to nationality today, were formed first of all on religion, on the unity of religion. Religion always plays the role of leaven in the formation of nationalities and nationalisms; indeed religion has a great and primary effect even on the establishment of the national language, the national customs and convictions, the national mode of thought and way of life. (Aġayef, 1328-1912/13, 293-294, Shissler, 2002: 174-175).

Aġaoġlu finds out a duality between revelation and religion, and confines religion into the historical space as we have seen in Renan and Ahmet Rıza. According to him, power and progress can only be achieved in a national and liberal society. Religion can only play an important role in this progress as a historical phenomenon. A number of changes have been observed in the religious views of Aġaoġlu in the Republican period. In this period he defended liberal views on religion and secularism in particular. Aġaoġlu, who praised the

sects by saying “Long live the caliphate of Islam” in the Ottoman period, mentioned the value of educational, instructive and most importantly unifying aspects these institution (Ağaoğlu, 1915, 14 February). His view will change during the Republican period and will criticize traditional religious education and clergy severely. However, he has mentioned during the Ottoman period that the involvement of the clergy in politics and the fact that Sheikhulislam’s office was a state institution connected to the state would have harmful consequences. He is against the fact that the clergy should be a civil servant. A person who takes orders from the government and politicians cannot serve the religion. Even if he serves, then he would have put the religion at the disposal of politics (Sakal, 1999: 176). When politics and religion are together, abuse occurs. In order to get rid of this abuse in the Republic of Turkey and to separate religion and politics from each other, the first move was the abolishment of the caliphate⁷⁰. When the issue of the abolishment of the caliphate came to the parliament there was a debate among the first and the second groups⁷¹. Ağaoğlu was one of those who played a role in this debate, in which the ones who were in favor of and the ones who disagree with the abolishment of the caliphate confronted. Ağaoğlu wrote seven articles in a booklet prepared by the Directorate of Press and Intelligence and explaining that the abolishment of the caliphate is a very auspicious job. In these writings, he said that Islam has left the administration of state and world to those who know them, and

⁷⁰ For more information, see: Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, *Nutuk (Vol: I- II)* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 8th Edition, 1981), Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London, Oxford University Press, 1961), Herbert W Duda, *XIX. Yüzyılın Sonu ile XX. Yüzyılın Başında Türkiye’de Hilafet’ten Cumhuriyet’e Geçiş* (Trans. Abdurrahman Güzel, Ankara: Türk Kültürü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1989). A. Afet İnan, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti ve Türk Devrimi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1998),

⁷¹ “The Turkish Grand National Assembly, which was established during the Turkish National Struggle on 23rd April 1920, consists of parliamentarians who rely on the main objective of the salvation of motherland and independence of the nation and who actually had very different views and opinions. Especially following the victory of the Turkish National Struggle, these divergences became more apparent and discussions about views gradually increased on almost every subject. This condition decelerated the Council works and started to disable Mustafa Kemal Pasa to achieve his goals in almost every area. Thus, Mustafa Kemal Pasa established the Anatolian and Rumelian Law Group of Defence, which is also called the I. Group, on the 10th of May, 1921 in order to make more rapid decisions and bring Turkey to the ideal point as soon as possible during a period, when making and applying rapid decisions had vital importance in the phases of independence and establishment. On the other hand those who were in the opponent came together under the leadership of the representative of Erzurum, Hüseyin Avni Bey. This formation was called II. Group.” (Bolat and Dermiraslan, 2013:30). For more information, see: Ahmet Demirel, *Birinci Meclis’te Muhalefet: İkinci Grup* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994), *Ali Şükrü Bey’in Tan gazetesi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996), *Birinci Meclis’te Mustafa Kemal’in Muhalifleri* (İstanbul: Ufuk, 2013), Mete Tunçay, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nde Tek Parti Yönetiminin Kurulması 1923–1931* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2015).

the ruler should be elected in line with the shura and the ijma al-umma. He said that, despite the religious leadership of prophet Muhammed who said “You know worldly affairs better than me”, he delegated worldly affairs to those who knew them and he entered various polemics about this subject. As we have mentioned before, Aḡaoḡlu's devotion to Islam is not like a believer (Sakal, 1999: 169-170). He does not accept classical religious beliefs. According to him, religion is one of the elements that cause people to become nation. Religion is important because of this feature (S. Aḡaoḡlu, 1940: 30).

Aḡaoḡlu, who thinks that Islam is libertarian and progressive in essence and argues that Islam is not responsible for the backwardness of Muslims today, on the contrary Muslims are responsible for the regression of Islam. Because, according to him, there is a constant and mutual interaction between religions and those who adopt that religion. Religions influence and influenced by conditions and development possibilities. They either progress or recess. Besides, this interaction is the basis of the birth of sects and cults in religion. Hence, if religions have an influence on people, then people also have an influence on religion (Aḡaoḡlu, 1959: 22-23). This situation is expressed in the work called *İslamlıkta Kadın* as:

[...] Islam today lives its own Middle Ages. The imperfections in Islam today are no different from the imperfections attributed to Christianity in Europe in the Middle Ages: How Christians at that time did not know their own religion; most of the Muslims do not know their religion now. Thus, to what extent Christianity is responsible for the flaws and misdemeanours of the Catholics in the Middle Ages, Islam today is responsible to that extent for the flaws and misdemeanors of Muslims. The causes of these imperfections should not be searched in religions, but in some rules that are directly the enemy of religion (Aḡaoḡlu, 1959: 24).

Aḡaoḡlu, who says that the Middle Eastern tribes, especially Iran, are the basis of the principles mentioned here, thinks that the Islamic essence is deteriorated due to their effects. The reason of this deterioration of essence was to “accept religion not as an order of conscience but a whole of principles that dominate all the material and spiritual parts of our lives.” (Aḡaoḡlu, 2013: 29). According to Aḡaoḡlu, religion followed us from the cradle to the grave and wanted to control all our material life besides our spiritual needs. In fact, “*Today's contemporary societies have passed this phase of understanding of religion four centuries ago. At that time they were the same. Religion also meddled in everything,*

regulated everything in them.” (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 29). According to him, classes that represent religion always and everywhere have crossed the boundary of spiritual domination and have laid their hand on the material area of life and have tried to regulate the material area. This situation is very clear in Christianity. The phrase “Hors de l'Eglise point de salut” (no salvation for anyone but the Church) is important as it shows the extent of the intervention in Christian communities. The excommunication authority in the hands of the Pope not only made ordinary people tremble, but also the Kings. This situation lasted until the political and social developments that led to the duty and division of labor law. Objections have started to rise against the Catholic Church's interference in every business. Against the tyranny and domination of the church, the individuals slowly raised their voices. Against the tyranny and domination of the church, individuals slowly raised their voices. The first voice raisers were oppressed and tortured, and some were executed. But history is not stopping, it is always walking. Luther⁷² and Calvin⁷³ rebelled and started to criticize the ignorance, hypocrisy, abuses and immorality of the official religion representatives with reference to the Bible. Luther translated the Bible from Latin which the people had not understood before, to German in a way that everyone could clearly understand. People no longer needed deceptive interpretations of priests, and everyone could learn divine responsibilities on their own. This movement spread quickly, being a model for France, Switzerland and other countries in a short time. The Catholic Church could not be expected to be an onlooker to this situation. Rome struggled to destroy such movements with all its might. But it was a futile effort. Neither the inquisition nor auto-da-fe⁷⁴ nor the excommunication could suppress these

⁷² For more information on Martin Luther, see: Martin Luther, *Selected Political Writings* (Ed. J. M. Porter, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), William Stang, *The Life of Martin Luther* (New York: Pustet & Co. N.B. 1883), Erik H. Erikson, *Young Man Luther: A Study in Psychoanalysis and History* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1958), John Dillenberger, *Martin Luther: Selections from his Writings* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961), Timothy Lull, *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989). William Stang, *The Life of Martin Luther* (New York: Pustet & Co. N.B. 1883).

⁷³ For more information on John Calvin, see: John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Ed. J. T. McNeill, trans. F. L. Battles, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), Paul Helm, *John Calvin's Ideas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), Kilian McDonnell, *John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), Alister E. McGrath, *A Life of John Calvin* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), Wilhelm Niesel, *The Theology of Calvin, Grand Rapids* (Michigan: Baker Book House, 1980), Paul Helm, *Calvin and Calvinists* (Bodmin, Cornwall: MPG Books, 1998).

⁷⁴ “An auto-da-fé or auto-de-fé was the ritual of public penance of condemned heretics and apostates that took place when the Spanish Inquisition, Portuguese Inquisition or the Mexican Inquisition had decided their punishment, followed by the execution by the civil authorities of the sentences imposed.” (“Auto-da-fé”, 2016).

movements against the Church. Aĝaoĝlu does not intend to praise the Protestantism who is fighting against the Catholic Church in giving these examples. He says that as soon as it became an independent sect, they showed a tendency for domination, rape and aggression like Catholics did (Aĝaoĝlu, 2013: 31-34). Here, the main subject he wants to underline is the struggle between clericalism and liberalism.

Here is the most important of the fighting ideas in Europe since two hundred years! The struggle between the “clericalism” mentality, which is supposed to manage and organize the material and spiritual life of the societies, and the secular mentality, which wants to be totally free and dominant in the ideological and material areas. Since the beginning of the 18th century, European societies which were divided into two by these two movements, two mindsets, have continued to struggle under the name of “liberalism” and “clericalism.” (Aĝaoĝlu, 2013: 34).

He is in favor of liberalism and secularism in this struggle. According to him, this struggle covers all of life. Politics, literature, philosophy, industry and economy are different areas of this struggle. Contemporary societies have successfully come through this struggle with the division of labor and duty rule. Therefore, concepts that best summarize the situation of contemporary societies are free ideas and free movement. There was a balance between Muslims and other societies that has not separated religion and world affairs. But “freedom and liberty, rule of experience and intellect on one side, stagnation and adherence to the past on the other side. Certainly one of them will walk and move forward, the other will at least stop.” (Aĝaoĝlu, 2013: 36). Emphasizing the necessity of separation of religion and state since the Ottoman Empire, Aĝaoĝlu was also against the domination of religion in the field of law and education. According to him, in these areas, whenever it was desirable, religion was used as an excuse and all kinds of novelty were opposed and the social developments that should be realized were prevented in the name of religion.

By giving religious form not only to the rules but also to the habits, thought and movement efforts of the individuals and the material and spiritual development of societies are being stopped. Those who consider themselves as representatives of religion assume all kinds of authority in every matter belonging to science, politics, economics, finance, education and teaching, and they stick their noses into everything. By titillating the masses that are ignorant and unaware of their religion and their world equally, they regard it as a task for them to struggle against every change, every kind of novelty that time and space require. (Aĝaoĝlu, 2013: 37)

Ağaoğlu believes that religion is necessary for the nation and human life. But it is difficult to say that he cares about concepts like the afterlife, heaven and hell. For him, religion is an instrument that can be used to become a nation. Therefore, he has been particularly interested in the educational aspect of religion. According to him, our religious officials have not used this aspect of religion adequately, has not contributed enough to the nation. The mosques are empty other than the hours of worship. Religious officials are wasting their time outside prayer hours. However, in Europe and Beyoğlu, Christian religious officials are not witnessed wasting their time. These clericals are constantly together with the people and the congregation. They take care of the needy, they try to find a remedy for the sufferers (Sakal, 1999: 171-172). Ağaoğlu often talks about the negativity of traditional religious education. For him, it is important to teach young people the good principles of Islam, the provisions for raising well-behaving, hardworking and virtuous people. However, the traditional religious education in our country is filled with details which crush the children's minds:

Please check the books of the religious orders taught in our schools. Religious lessons are the dry and lifeless details that crush the soul and mind of our children. Eight, nine-year-old children are strangled under the words of obligations (fardh), duty (vacib), halal and prohibited (haraam). In childhood we do not tell him: "Islam demands you to be a good man, and you have to have some attributes for it." We frighten and destroy the hearts of eight- to nine-year-olds with details of ablution, types of ablution of the whole body and cleansing. For that reason, even when the child finishes his school, he is getting out without understanding the real attributes of Islam. (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 52).

Emphasizing the importance of translation of the Qur'an to Turkish, Ağaoğlu not satisfied with it, wanted the sermons and prayers to be in Turkish. In fact, he severely criticized an incident in which an imam in Istanbul being suspended and subjected to an inquiry for reading the verses in Turkish and pray with them (Sakal, 1999:179-180). In brief, for Ağaoğlu, religion is the whole of the principles that regulate the relationship between God and man. According to him, only matters related to worship and beliefs constitute the subject of religion. If religion is involved in anything other than these areas, which are the main subject, they only entered the religion and out of necessity. Because, the foundation of Islam is beliefs and worship. These are unchangeable principles. The parts belonging to world affairs are second degree and they entered Islam coincidentally. He is totally free in world

affairs, even though he is dependent on religion in beliefs and worship. The material life should be organized as the individual wants, taking into account the interests of the nation. He has an understanding that looks at the religion from an historical perspective; religion is useful for society and necessary for people (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 40-42). Samet Ağaoğlu expresses this situation as follows:

My father would think of religion as one of the agents which kneaded people as a nation. He did not want the people to be deprived of this feeling. I do not think that he reached the idea of Allah with classical religious thoughts. During the days before his death, he accepted death as an incident related to fate apart from religion (S. Ağaoğlu, 1940: 30)

According to Sakal, Ağaoğlu is a deist⁷⁵ in his last twenty years, which corresponds to the period of reforms in Turkey. Although this view is partly acceptable, it is disputable. What is undisputable is that Ağaoğlu is a person who does not attribute a divine meaning to the provisions of Islam, who regards it very important as a social cement and thinks it as a device that contributes to social development by its nature (similar to Ahmet Rıza). Religion could perform an important duty in the building of a nation state. But this should be with a secular understanding, religion should not go out of the area of faith and worship between God and man.

4.1.8. Woman

One of the reflections of Ağaoğlu's liberal attitude also emerges in the attitudes he has taken on the subject of women. The topics we will discuss in this section will be presented both by using his book *İslamlıkta Kadın* and the writings he penned during French years, Ottoman and Republican periods.

Ağaoğlu who published his book titled *İslamlıkta Kadın* in Russian, in 1901, dealt with the issue of women in the Islamic world. In addition, *İslamlıkta Kadın*, is an important book

⁷⁵ *Deism* is “the name of the philosophical school which accepts God's existence and him being the first cause of the world but doubts the prophecy or denies it, within the framework of a reason-based and natural understanding of religion.” (Erdem, 1994:110). According to deists, God created the universe, began to function, but is no longer actively involved in it. For more information on deism, see: Robert Corfe, *Deism and Social Ethics: the Role of Religion in the Third Millennium* (New York: Arena Books, 2007), Jack Fruchtman, *Thomas Paine: Apostle of Freedom* (New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, 1994), S.G. Hefelbower, *Deism Historically Defined* (The American Journal of Theology, 1920).

because Aġaoġlu as an intellectual, told us about his tendencies for various subjects through women. The elements that prevent the emergence of the free individual have been criticized through the theme of women in this book. According to Shissler, in this work and in his writings on the issue of women in the years of France three important intellectual stances stand out:

1. The choice of a national identity;
2. The adoption of a fundamentally liberal attitude toward individuals and social development;
3. A positive attitude towards Islam justified by a particular kind of historical treatment. (He uses this treatment on other subjects too, at times, but he uses it very consistently when discussing Islam.) (Shissler, 2002:137).

Aġaoġlu, in the introduction part of *İslamlıkta Kadın*, argues against the widespread acceptance in the West that Islamic religion and its rules are responsible for the bad situation of the Muslim women in Asia.

It is wrong to blame only the influence of Islam for the present condition of Muslims, their incapability, their spiritual poverty, their social disorganization. By thinking like this, we would be neglecting the human being, a vital factor in life, and we would be giving him a totally passive role. However, religion, which has an abstract meaning, is not powerful itself and cannot create life. Finally, there is a vibrant and mutual interaction activity constantly, albeit not clearly felt, between the religions and the people who embrace it (Aġaoġlu, 1959: 22)

According to Aġaoġlu, in the course of this mutual interaction, dark religious traditions from the Middle Ages, bigotry influenced religion negatively. This is not only true for Islam, but for Christianity and other religions as well. *“Religions, which emerge in the form of a great force and prompted people to the extent that people have reflected their material and spiritual needs at first, begin to be influenced by the new conditions of life, adapt new conditions over time.”* (Aġaoġlu, 1959: 23). In other words, religions adapt to the conditions of development. According to these conditions, they either deteriorate or improve. The emergence of various sects and cults within a religion cannot be explained in any other way. For example, when we compare initial Christianity with the Christianity of the Middle Ages and present day Christianity, we see the breakup of a religion which has defined basic principles. The same is true for Islam (Aġaoġlu, 1959:

23). Aġaoġlu in the first part of his book mentioned about the woman's pre-Islamic situation both in Arabs and in Iran. According to him, the attitude of Islam towards the woman cannot be determined without examining the pre-Islamic life conditions of the Arabs and the condition of woman not only among Arabs but also among surrounding nations (Aġaoġlu, 1959: 24). In this part, Aġaoġlu examined whether Islam affects women's development or decline by looking at the pre-Islamic situation of woman in Arab and Iranian society. "Before Muhammad, the situation of the woman in Arabia and the countries surrounding Arabia was terrible." (Aġaoġlu, 1959: 25). "He argues that in Iran women could be bought and sold; were subjected to what amounted, by Islamic standards, to incestuous relationships; led strictly segregated lives; and so on." (Shissler, 2002:137). Woman, who almost was a slave in Iran, was deprived of all rights in the Arab world.

Among the Arabs the situation was just as bad, if not worse: girl children were considered bad luck and exposed at birth; daughters could be sold or bartered by their fathers; women had no property rights or rights of inheritance either from male relatives or husbands; marriage was not binding, so women could be cast off at any moment; and polygamy was widespread and completely unchecked. (Shissler, 2002: 137).

Aġaoġlu, after making these comments, devoted the second part of the book to the subject of *Women According to the Sources of Islam*. In this part he explains the position and rights of the woman according to the Qur'an, and the rights given by the Prophet to woman and his practices (Aġaoġlu, 1959: 32).

[...] European writers accusing the Qur'an and Muhammad of being hostile to half of mankind, that is, being hostile to women, are unfair. These writers are also unfair, when they blame Muslims for the imperfections and deficiencies of their religion. Because, on the contrary, these imperfections and deficiencies have emerged and continue to exist in spite of Islam and at the expense of Islam. (Aġaoġlu, 1959: 33).

According to Aġaoġlu, when we look at the Islamic sources, the Qur'an and Muhammad, the rights given to women in real Islam are very broad and liberal. If the conditions of the period are taken into consideration, the Prophet's treatment towards women is very well. It is a revolution for the Arabs of that period that the Qur'an imposes responsibilities that equate women with men. The Qur'an also prohibits the abandonment of girls, gives the right of administering, selling, inheriting property and contracting to women. Muhammad has

always tried to improve the situation of the women around him (Ağaoğlu, 1959: 28-35). Ağaoğlu commented on many issues by showing evidence from the Qur'an and the Prophet's life and practices. All of this is a step on his way to the main goal. He wants to discuss the historical changes and developments of women in the Islamic world for centuries. In the third and final part, which is titled *The Development of Women in Islam and the Present Situation of Women*, he gives many examples on issues such as respect for women in the old and glorious days, the height of the position of the women in society and supervision of women's rights in the Islamic world. Ağaoğlu who attributed the deterioration of Islam, especially the decline in the rights of Muslim women to the Turks and the Mongols during his years in France, has changed his view in this section and both absolved and praised the Turks. The new culprit is Iran and some Middle Eastern tribes. Even, in Azerbaijan, fatwas were given that the wedding of Ağaoğlu is null and void and he can be killed because he held the ahunds responsible for the woman's pathetic situation (Sakal, 1999: 138). In the last part, we see that he mentioned another important issue. This is the issue of woman and the reform of alphabet. According to him, the salvation of Muslims depends on the solution of these two issues.

The salvation of Muslims, their material, spiritual, and even political development, depends only on the solution of two issues: the issue of women and the reform of the alphabet. Present-day Muslim woman can only fulfill her social duties in a beneficial manner provided that she is a free and conscious mother and a wife. [...]. As the difficulty of the alphabet severely hinders the learning of how to read and write, it blocks the ways to the enlightenment of the minds and hearts of the Muslims. The woman and the alphabet ... Here are the two archenemies of the Muslim world, which slowly drags it to death [...] (Ağaoğlu, 1959: 52-53).

It can be understood from here that for Ağaoğlu, the issue of women and education in general and woman-specific, are the keys to the salvation of Muslims. This view immediately brings to mind Gaspıralı and Cedidism movement. At the base of the movement of Cedidism led by İsmail Bey Gaspıralı was also the reform of religious education and worship and the opening of Usûl-i Cedid schools and the delivery of modern education to Muslims and Turks. Cedidist's especially paid attention to girls' education. We also know that Ağaoğlu is one of the important representatives of the Cedidism movement in the Caucasus. Therefore, while expressing these views, we can say that he was influenced by the Cedidist's, especially

Gaspıralı, who affected all Turkestan. Aġaoġlu's views were not solely theoretical. For example, when he was in Azerbaijan, he was the first one who opened a Girls High School which gived education in Turkish and Russian (Gülseven, 1989: 99-116, Sakal, 1999: 141). We also see that his family life reflected these views. The first woman lawyer in Turkey was his eldest daughter Süreyya Aġaoġlu. His little daughter Tezer Taşkıran has authored valuable works about women and children⁷⁶ (Sakal, 1999: 141).

Aġaoġlu, both in the Ottoman years, as well as during the Republican period, defended in his writings and lectures that women should be educated like men. He also wanted the women to have the right to elect and be elected, and to take part in civil services without facing discrimination. It is known that especially in the period of 1925-26, at the lectures he gave at Ankara Law School he focused on the issue of women. Women's education is very important for him because women are both the half of a society and the main teacher of the future generations and the basic element to raise children. The women who constitute half of the population, who set up the home and who are the main element that teaches the mother tongue to the children remain uneducated. Women's lack of education is disaster for the society (Sakal, 1999: 136). Aġaoġlu admired the well-educated women who take part in the social life in Europe. German women who worked in universities and while their men were on the front worked as workers, technicians and engineers in factories, engaged in science in universities, and produced technologies in World War I have impressed him (Aġaoġlu, *Türk Yurdu*, 1331 [1915]: 104-105).

After the Turkish woman was given the right to elect and be elected, he wrote various articles in the newspapers and said that our women would become member of parliaments and governors. But he had some concerns about this issue. Turkish women could not appreciate these rights because contrary to the European woman they earned these rights without giving any struggle, they were granted by Atatürk. If Turkish women did not realize this favor of

⁷⁶ Some examples, see: Tezer Taşkıran, *Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında Türk Kadın Hakları* (Ankara: Başbakanlık Kültür Müsteşarlığı Yayınları, 1973), *Türk Ahlakının İlkeleri* (İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1943), *Dede Korkut Masalları* (Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1945).

Atatürk and spent their time and energy to dress up and to have fun, they would have missed the opportunity given to them (Ağaoğlu, 1934, 6 December).

In conclusion, while Ağaoğlu is discussing women's current situation and the position that they should be in his books and writings, the concepts he uses are rights, justice, individual and individualization which are also the basis of liberalism. He deals with the issue of women in the context of both natural rights and civil rights. He emphasizes the liberation in the areas of property, marital status and organization. The removal of the obstacles in front of being an individual and becoming free is on the basis of what he said about woman, alphabet and education.

4.1.9. Family

In this part, Ağaoğlu's views on the family will be presented with the help of his book *Üç Medeniyet* in particular, in which he claimed that Western civilization has an unquestionable victory against all other civilizations, his book *İslamlikta Kadın* and other writings in various newspapers and magazines. The purposes of removing the obstacles in front of being an individual and liberation of the individual, like his thoughts on the woman issue, is on the basis of his thoughts on the concept of the family. But there is a detail that needs to be expressed here. Although Ağaoğlu has many liberal attitudes towards the establishment of the family and the position of the woman in the family, he has advocated the development of a Turkish family ideal which will be developed by Turkish intellectuals themselves and hundred percent compatible with the conditions of Turkish society (Ağaoğlu, 1935, 26 February). According to Ağaoğlu, there were two important factors that influenced the emergence of a family. First one was innate and natural influences, and the second one was social and spiritual influences. A perfect family could only emerge when these two elements are together and compatible. According to him:

The family is the first essential bridge between individual and society, nature and humanity, material life and spiritual life. Along with being the first and most continuous cell of social life, it is also the most sincere, most sacred center of the individual life. Even though it is the clearest example of animal tendency, it is the highest meeting place of human and spiritual attributes (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 69).

As it is understood from here, Aġaoġlu gives high importance to the family institution especially in terms of the roles it plays in the context of the relationship between individuals and society. For this reason, family should be protected, should be kept away from the dirty behavior, tradition and tendencies that have come from all along. But a family with a weak foundation cannot be protected. According to him, the reason for the families with weak foundation is our marriage procedures. “*In our country, the men’s and women’s approaching each other for marriage does not depend on mutual charm, but some other conditions then their wishes and choices. Even, before marriage no true love can ever be said.*” (Aġaoġlu, 2013: 71). In fact, spouses knowing each other and loving each other in every way should be the first condition of marriage. True love is born only after spouses meet each other for a long time and a harmony ensues between their souls and their hearts. It is not enough for marriages to see a woman several times in any place and to have a purely physiological interest in her. Even if this interest is mutual, it is far from love. Because, apart from physiological attraction for a healthy family, feelings, moral and social affinities are also necessary. Aġaoġlu expresses that polygamy⁷⁷ in Islamic societies is one of the factors that ruins our family institution. According to him, the couplings including polygamy cannot be called as a family. There are no spiritual bonds in such couplings. In his work *İslamlıkta Kadın*, he emphasized on polygamy. According to him, before Muhammad was a prophet, there was a common and unrestricted tradition of polygamy in Arabia and the neighboring countries of Arabia. This tradition, which settled in the East for centuries, could not be demolished by Islam at once. It was important for Islam to at least limit these societies with an endless polygamy culture. Islam, which limited wives with four, links this to very difficult conditions to fulfill. The most important of these conditions is that husband must be fair and equitable with the wives. “But if you fear that you will not be just, then marry only one (woman)” (Qur’an Meaning, 2001: Nisa 3; Aġaoġlu, 1959: 32). Aġaoġlu, while criticizing the family institution in our country, by referring to the multi-woman harem life of some sultans and some family atrocities that they have shown, says that sound family structure

⁷⁷ Polygamy is defined as a marriage in which an individual has more than one mate simultaneously that can either be male or female.

that could not be established is at the foundation of these incidents that must be greeted with astonishment (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 71-72).

According to him, there is inequality in the foundation of our family institution. This inequality is against the woman. In our families, all the rights have been assigned to men when all the duties have been assigned to women. A man can break his marriage agreement, use the whole of the law in favor of him and assign all the duties to woman (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 73). With all these negative effects, woman has been pushed out of life in Islamic societies, has gone away from science and knowledge, has been regarded as a sexual commodity, and has lived as lazy and unthinking beings in the harem. In the West, however, this is exactly the opposite.

[...] In the nations which are living as a state by maintaining national unity and are strong enough to protect and defend everyone's life, property, honor and rights equally by establishing a central government, we see the exact opposite of the situation above. Here, the families established by husband and wife and children constitute an independent cell by becoming a full personality. The woman has high value. Here the woman, like a man, is defended and protected by the government. The durability and soundness of such communities is entirely up to the durability and soundness of the family. (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 70-71).

If the woman and family issue is solved, which he regards as one of the reasons for the collapse of the Islamic world, Islam will rise again and Muslims will have better conditions. Ağaoğlu said that young people who have the capacity to do this can only grow up in healthy families (Sakal, 1999: 137). However, this is unlikely, because in our family structure there are many obstacles in the way of the emergence of free individuals to change this situation. The family is a social phenomenon. It is therefore inevitable that the establishment of the family is related to the society that it is established. In Europe, “[...] *the strongest meetings among the individuals, the most solid institutions, are determined completely freely, with consent and willingness, on equal rights and duties.*” (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 73). Here, the elements that regulate the relations between individuals are liberty, equality, having the same rights and the freedom of agreement. Marriages are strong as they are realized within these rules of the social order. On the other hand the foundation of our family is inequality. This situation has negative effects on the foundation of living in harmony which is also the order of religion (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 73). “*The Turkish family, which is the foundation of the Turkish*

society, should be saved from this situation and it should be established on the principle of equality of husband and wife, as required by the Turkish social structure.” (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 74).

Ağaoğlu after criticizing the issues such as not being able to establish the family correctly and firmly and impossibility of the emergence of free individuals from the family in the Islamic societies in general and especially in the Ottoman Empire due to the various reasons mentioned above, thinks that the women and family issues are disappeared in the new Turkey with the Turkish revolution. The right to elect and be elected given to the Turkish woman, the improvement and liberation in the areas of property, marital status and organization and the establishment of the Turkish society on equal rights and duties meant the treatment of old diseases of women and family. But this time another situation emerged which worried Ağaoğlu. “According to him, while the negativities of lemma oppression, male bully, harem life etc. were being condemned, European negativities have begun to be felt in our society.” (Sakal, 1999: 139). The effects of excessive westernization or European negativities⁷⁸ on the community life, the education given in the foreign schools and especially the damages of the nannies (Mürebbiye)⁷⁹, called the governess, on family and community life were discussed by Ağaoğlu (Sakal, 1999: 139). “*Poor children are left to the hands of foreign nannies. So-called mother, she only sees them in the morning when they are returning from the ball to home [...]*” (Ağaoğlu, 1934, 8 December). He criticized women's fondness for ornaments and squandering, and told that gambling ruins family and family life with poker and bridge games (Ağaoğlu, 1933, 25 June). He opposes the degeneration of the family, which he sees as a center of decency, morality and ethics, with extreme westernization (Ağaoğlu, 1933, 10 August).

⁷⁸ For more information, see: Şerif Mardin, *Tanzimattan Sonra Aşırı Batılılaşma, Türk Modernleşmesi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991).

⁷⁹ *Mürebbiye* is a live-in woman who is privately assigned to care taking and education of a child or children of the house, and working on a salary. In the Tanzimat era, where the desire for Westernization became evident in the Ottoman Empire, these women were generally of French origin. In this period, the Ottoman families which were leaving their children to the hands of French nannies were criticized, in particular, through literature. An examples on adverse effects of mürebbiye, see: Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar, *Mürebbiye* (İstanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2014).

As it can be easily understood from this point, Ađaođlu has not shown much of his explicit negative attitude towards Western civilization and the values of this civilization on the family affairs. Though he has many liberal attitudes on the family and the position of the woman in the family, he said that the husband's permission should be taken in many matters and the Turkish family cannot be established with the laws imported from Europe. According to him, not the legal norms which are ready to use but a family ideal which will be developed by the Turkish intellectuals and is suitable for the conditions of Turkish society is necessary (Ađaođlu, 1935, 26 February). But this should be inspired by Europe and Islam. The family should be protected, gambling and drinking should not be allowed in the family, woman should not engage in ornaments, ball and similar ugly affairs (Sakal, 1999:143).

4.2. A Liberal Opponent Journal: *Akın*

In an environment where the one party administration was strengthened by FRP's self-closure, Ađaođlu published the journal *Akın*, which emerged with its oppositional and liberal discourse. He politically, economically and socially criticized the one party government in this journal. But in the authoritarian and statist climate of the 1930s, this journal, openly advocating liberal thought, was not long-lived. *Akın*, which its first issue was published on May 29, 1933, had a total of 119 issues and ended its publication on September 24, 1933. *Akın* having the sub-title "Daily-Political-Social-Independent Turkish Newspaper" was published in Istanbul (Uyar, 2013: 224). Ađaođlu defines *Akın* as "republican, populist, secular and reformist" (Ađaođlu, 1933, 29 May). In a period when the oppositional press was silenced as a result of the Press Law enacted in 1931, Ađaođlu informed the public about corruption, profiteering, monopolies, defects of the current economic system and the arbitrary practices of the one party administration and made various criticisms from a liberal point of view. In *Akın* he advocated parliamentary democracy and criticized authoritarian and totalitarian ideologies such as fascism, communism and Hitlerism which were rising in that period. In addition he rejected the principle of statism, one of the Kemalist principles, and argued that the Republic could only develop in a democratic environment. Ađaođlu's liberal views reached the summit during the period that *Akın* was being published. *Akın* which was published by Ađaođlu, a talented journalist and a polemic master, engaged in a

polemic with many people, newspapers and organizations in a short period of time. It had a hard debate with the leading media organizations of the time, such as *Cumhuriyet* newspaper of Yunus Nadi and the *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* newspaper which is also the official newspaper of the government. Even occasionally, it engaged in a polemic with readers (Açık Görüşler: Tanin Başka, 1933).

Unlike his contemporaries, *Akın* emphasized the importance of distance in relation to power and expressed that this provides “freedom of thought, freedom of writing” and said that other newspapers wanting to “[...] earn simple, hide mistakes, applaud everything and spend their days”, is mockery (Ağaoğlu, 1933, 3 August). In this context, Ağaoğlu wrote a harsh criticism against the newspaper in the last issue of his journal:

There is a daily newspaper in Ankara. Its name is Hakimiyet-i Milliye. This newspaper is the property of the government. It takes its food directly or indirectly from the donation of the government. Its duty is to defend the policies adopted by the ruling statesman [...] It chooses its own words, is a parrot in ideas [...] (Açık Görüşler: Hâkimiyeti Milliye, 1933, 24 September)

Ağaoğlu has dealt with various events, agendas and problems in the country through the *Akın* journal. He informed the public about the negativities such as corruption, profiteering, monopoly, criticized the current economic system's defects and the practices of one party administration. One of these criticisms is about sugar profiteering. In his writing titled *Şeker İhtikârını Kim Yapıyor?* (*Who is Doing the Sugar Profiteering?*), he stated that at a time when economic depression and monetary tightening are taking place the people do not have the power to tolerate the profiteering in sugar prices. As a result of his calculations he said that sugar should be maximum 43 cents with the customs and monopoly taxes added on top of the cost of it, but it is sold for 60-64 *kuruş* in Istanbul. Ağaoğlu questioned who is pocketing this difference, and defended that the municipality should stop this profiteering and protect the public (A., 1933, 13 July). Another profiteering case which was published on the journal was about Bomonti Beer Factory. This factory has established a trust⁸⁰ by joining with other beer factories and taking influential people among them as shareholders. Barley, which is the raw material of beer, is 17 *kuruş* on the market, while beer is sold for

⁸⁰ In an economy, the merger among entities/corporations to dominate the market by limiting or abolishing free trade.

35 kuruş. However, according to the findings of Aġaoġlu, brewing companies give very little tax to the state and the price of beer does not decrease even though barley prices fall in the country. According to Aġaoġlu, the profit of the Trust is at least three times the cost. Ahmet Aġaoġlu has criticized against the state monopolies; also he has not been pleased with the fact that a few greedy people have obtained a de facto monopoly and opposed this situation. According to him, Bomonti's monopoly should vanish; monopoly should not be in the hands of private persons (Hükümetten İcraat Bekleniyor, 1933, 31 July). An important criticism in the journal is related to the workers' rights. In the writing, the current problems of coal workers are mentioned, and the Minister of Economy Celal Bayar was asked to solve these problems immediately.

[...] When we talk about the rights of coal worker, we are not talking on behalf of a class or caste. We are not bearing wrath against the capital while complaining about the fateless death of a worker. We owe foreign aid a debt of gratitude which appreciates our feelings, respects humanity, and recognizes our dignity. We accept it as friend and venerable. (İktisat Vekili Celal Beyefendiye, 1933, 24 September)

As it can be understood from this point that Aġaoġlu does not have any negative attitude towards capital like a liberal thinker should be. He does not even want to be understood like this. His objection is that companies that earn millions in coal mines do not consider workers' health. In this writing, he questioned why the government did not control the companies that did not take measures to protect workers' health. He asked why the government officers shut their eyes to this. He wanted whether there is an interest here or not to be investigated. He wanted from the Minister of Economy Celal Bey that these issues to be studied in depth. According to him, the government should protect the life of the Turkish workers in the coal mines against “ungrateful companies.” (Uyar, 2013:227-228).

One of the issues that take place in various numbers of *Akın* is related to industry and agriculture. In his writings such as *Ziraat mi Sanayi mi? (Agriculture or Industry)*, *Ziraatimiz (Our Agriculture)* and *Fazla Ucuzluk Ekincilerimizi Eziyor. Fazla Ucuzluk İyi Bir Alamet Midir? (Over-cheapness Oppresses Our Croppers. Is Over-cheapness a good sign?)* he is assessing the current state of the country's economy. According to Aġaoġlu, it is not possible for Turkey to develop only by preferring industry or agriculture. According to him, it is a wrong attitude to prefer one of these two sides to the other. The right thing is that they

develop together (Akin, 1933, 3 June). Aġaoġlu, however, expresses that Turkey is an agricultural country. According to him, the burden of the state, government, civil servants, trade and industry is on the Turkish farmer. The industrial sector, trade capacity and mining of the Republic are insufficient. The peasant is unaware of modern agriculture. Most of them do not know what a cooperative is and how to use machinery in agriculture. In addition to this, the prices of agricultural products are decreasing day by day. Under these circumstances, it is imperative that the government should protect and strengthen the peasant (Aġaoġlu, 1933, 20 June). The method of protecting peasant is through the reduction of taxes on him, the creation of cheaper and easier loan facilities to him, and the facilitation of access of his products to abroad and to areas with a dense population (A., 1933, 12 June)

In another writing in *Akin*, Aġaoġlu points out that it is wrong for the world to look for administrations such as communism, fascism, Hitlerism or individual governments, that is, dictatorships to be able to get out of the great depression and that it is meaningless and wrong to blame parliamentarism for the depression. According to him, it is almost madness that an arbitrary administration is preferred to a parliamentary will (Aġaoġlu, 1933, 19 July).

Following the closure of the FRP, the absence of opposition even a controlled one, especially in the period when decisions such as the silencing of the entire opposition press were taken with the Press Law enacted in 1931, Aġaoġlu for sure enlightened the public through *Akin* journal. Even though for a short period of time, Aġaoġlu has been able to criticize the municipalities, corruption, monopolies, current economic system, and various practices of the one party administration in his writings in *Akin*. It is easy to see how brave the *Akin* journal's publishing policy when the conditions of the period are taken into consideration. Here, Aġaoġlu criticized authoritarian and totalitarian ideologies by advocating parliamentary democracy. He also rejected statism. Aġaoġlu stood behind the values he believed, even if he was isolated after the closing of FRP. Unlike him, many members of FRP have returned to PRP. *Akin* which was published in the Early Republican Period, took its place on the stage of history as a liberal newspaper.

4.3. Liberal Dilemmas of Ahmet Ağaoğlu

Ahmet Ağaoğlu, who spent his life in Azerbaijan, Russia, France and eventually in Turkey, is a name that falters between Kemalism and liberalism in the Early Republican era, when he appeared as a liberal intellectual. In fact, there are two main reasons, one emerging from the other, for his liberal contradictions, his sway between Kemalism and liberalism. First one is the contradictions stemming from the articulation of liberalism and nationalism, ideologies which are very difficult to articulate, in other words arising from nationalist liberalism. The second one stemming from the first one is the contradictions arising from the Kemalist power-intellectual relationship. In this part we will first examine Ağaoğlu in the framework of liberal nationalism. In this context, we will present the main features of this kind of nationalism and its reflections on Ağaoğlu with its contradictory aspects of classical liberal theories and values. After this, we will examine the contradictions of Ağaoğlu in relation to the state as a journalist, a politician and an intellectual in the Early Republican Period.

The historical roots of liberal nationalism are based on American and French revolutions. Historically, political reasons have played a role in the emergence of nationalist views, the development of the character of nationalism and the shaping of its goals. Indeed, the emergence of nationalism in Europe has followed a course parallel to the historical development of liberal discourse and the implementation of liberal practices. This situation has caused the liberal values and the nationalistic goals to interfere with each other and even intertwine. For example, liberal nationalism attaches great importance to popular sovereignty. The reason for this is the autocratic and oppressive structure of the multinational empires that the nationalists were struggling with in the nineteenth century Europe. The main theme of this kind of nationalism is self-determination. This nationalism, which emerged in response to foreign sovereignty or colonial rule, was in search for national liberation and self-determination through concepts such as freedom, justice and democracy. This kind of nationalism has been expressed as liberal nationalism, since it is also including liberal values. Self-determination is the focal point of liberal nationalism, which means that a nation has the right to self-determination, self-governance, and the government being both

constitutional and representative. In addition to this he advocated that, this kind of nationalism will provide national self-determination, the emergence of different nations and their self-governance and a peaceful and stable international order. Mankind can be divided into nations, but these nations should be interconnected by mutual understanding and cooperation, rather than being isolated from and excluding each other.

Within liberal nationalism, the independent individual, progressive and enlightened mind, national feelings and natural reflexes are integrated. Liberal nationalism, which advocates that the government should be both constitutional and representative, is at the same time a republican. It constantly emphasizes that the republic will develop with citizen-individual and the importance of citizenship. In this context, liberal nationalist understanding gives importance to the democratic and collective participation of the people against the forms of administration such as monarchy and aristocracy. This tradition therefore supports individual freedom and democratic governance (Erdoğan: 1999: 93-95). Political thinkers such as John Stuart Mill, Ernest Renan and Giuseppe Mazzini are at the root of the liberal nationalist tradition that brings together liberalism, rationalism, enlightenment and republicanism.

The liberal nationalism, which we have briefly mentioned of its historical background, tries to reconcile liberal and nationalist theories, which are regarded as opposing and incompatible ideologies within the context of political theory (Tamir, 1993; Miller, 1997, 2000; MacCormick, 1999). In liberal nationalism theory, culture is considered to be an important element of individual identities, and it is thought that democracy can only take place within national boundaries (Karabulut, 2014: 873). There is a serious tension between the understanding of community which is shaped by liberalism around values such as individual freedom, equality and pluralism, and the understanding of community which is described as exclusionary and closed by nationalism, whether it is ethnic or cultural (McCarthy, 1999: 175). Liberal nationalist theory does not consider the tension of classical liberalism with nationalism as a necessity, arguing that liberal principles have historically taken place in the nation-state model. According to liberal nationalism, national and cultural identities do not harm liberal values such as individual autonomy, equality and freedom but complement them (Tamir, 1999:6). Classical liberalism gives tremendous superiority to individual liberty and

human rights over collective entities such as the state, nation, and people. From this point of view, all humanity has equal moral values irrespective of race, beliefs, social origins and nationalities. Therefore liberalism is universal. Contrary to this view, there is no universality in liberal nationalist theory. According to this theory, liberal principles historically have become valid in the nation-state model. In liberal societies there is a close connection between political legitimacy and the concept of nation. Liberals are therefore mistaken that only respecting human rights and treating equally against all of their citizens is enough for the legitimacy of a state (Karabulut, 2014: 876-877). Liberal nationalists emphasize the importance of national culture and identity in terms of both the modern individual and democracy. In their view, national identities have played an important role in the social integration of citizens since the beginning of the modern era. For liberal nationalists, the concept of “nation” has been defined by a reference to common culture, history and language rather than common lineage and ethnicity. Liberal nationalist theory criticizes classical liberalism because it overlooks the role that culture plays in the lives of individuals as it regards individuals as abstract and uncommitted beings (Karabulut, 2014: 877). Nationalistic liberalism re-arranges classical liberalism's individualism, which emphasizes individual freedoms and rights, along with the nationality principle. In this arrangement, within the context of democratic citizenship, citizen's communities united by national identity and culture which have a strong solidarity among them are needed for the creation of values such as public participation and common goals determination. Nationalist liberalism in this respect claims that the atomistic individual pursuing his own interest and benefit of liberalism will not be the subject of the bonds of social solidarity and belonging required by democratic politics. By the expression of Miller *“Liberal nationalists claim that not only national self-determination can be pursued consistently with liberal principles, but also that liberal values themselves can only be realized in a political community whose members share a common national identity.”* (Miller, 2006: 535). Nationalist liberalism regards the concept of nation as an integral part of the democratic system. Therefore, nations appear as the main areas in which international democratic institutions can operate (Miller, 2006: 532).

In summary, the central point of liberal nationalism is the acceptance of *demos*, the subject of democracy, is synonymous with the nation and the thought that the condition of democratic citizenship is to be a member of a nation. In other words, liberal nationalism sees the nation as the unchanging political unit of democracy and says that effective citizenship can only be realized in communities with a common national identity. Here, according to classical liberal theory, the basic problem of liberal nationalism within the context of the individual-society relation is that, it put the individual forward as a constituent of society or nation, rather than being a single and unique subject. From an individual point of view, all humanity irrespective of their races, beliefs, social origins and nationalities has equal moral values and therefore liberalism is universal. Nationalism, on the other hand, put keeping a nation together and the elements that provide it at its center. Therefore, the establishment of national sovereignty in nationalism can exert pressure on the elements which it thought to obstruct its realization as the nation's self-determination right is not a first degree priority, and it acknowledges that this oppression is legitimate. However, in liberalism, neither national sovereignty nor self-determination can get ahead of the individual, cannot deprive the individual from its self-determination right, even these values can only be meaningful if they serve the individual (Erdoğan: 1999: 93-95).

Ahmet Ağaoğlu met with liberal nationalism, which we have summarized its emergence historically and its place in modern political theory above, in Paris, he went hundred years after the French Revolution. Darmesteter, Renan and Madame Adam, whom he had contacted in France and the intellectual circles he had entered through them, sometimes temporarily and sometimes permanently affected Ağaoğlu. Darmesteter, his university teacher, was a non-dogmatic, pious middle-class liberal and advocated liberal values, loyalties in professions, and equal rights to citizens. However, his liberalism was not universal but nationalistic. Darmesteter had the thought that historically and culturally every nation had its own mind-set. Within this context, he never had the race-centered view of nation; he put culture and mentality at the base of his thoughts. Although there are some tides in Renan's thought life, liberal attitude on issues such as separation of religion and state affairs, freedom of conscience stands out instantly. In *What is a Nation?*, he claims that instead of racist, language and religion-based, land-based nation definitions, people living

in a place with their free will can provide national ties. In addition, he also said that the most distinguished feature of human mind is its critical characteristic. Madame Adam is a strict republican. Adam, who is attached to the principles of the French revolution, believed in the liberal republic and rule of law. She advocated civil and political rights, progress and bourgeoisie. Renan's, Adam's, and Darmesteter's thinking that religion should be separate from state affairs, emphasizing on freedom of conscience and caring about religion only because of its unifying role in the social sense, also form the basis of Aĝaoĝlu's ideas of modernization and progress. As we discussed in detail in the Religion part, Aĝaoĝlu considered religion necessary for society as an educational and unifying element. He had a thought that brings the elements such as religion, language and thought rather than the racist point of view to the forefront in the formation of the national identity. In addition to these effects, Aĝaoĝlu was influenced by the free market advocating type of liberal republicanism that emerged after the Boulanger⁸¹ incident and always opposed the statist economy. These three names, which we briefly give their basic opinions here, and the intellectual circles that Aĝaoĝlu met deeply affected his liberal stance (Shissler, 2002 80-81).

[...]the three eminent French figures who befriended him showed him a non-radical liberalism that was national and not cosmopolitan in nature; that put great stock in religion, religious feeling and tradition; and that rejected the older Voltairian vision as cold, lacking in heat and humanity and overly sceptical, materialistic and individualistic. In addition to the values of merit, rationality and progress, one must have ideals and faith and keep a covenant with the past that is based on conserving a 'mentalité', which, however, must not intrude in such a way as to prevent freedom of thought. (Shissler, 2002: 81)

The emergence of liberal thought in Turkey followed a parallel path with the application of Turkish modernization. This situation has led to a relationship between modernization and liberalism that cannot be defined by clear lines, and even liberalism and liberal values have long been regarded as an extension of modernization and Westernization in the literature

⁸¹ Georges Ernest Boulanger (1837–1891), nicknamed Général Revanche, was a French general and politician. He was leader of Boulangisme which was against the bourgeois class, the parliamentary regime. The Boulangisme is inspired by a monarchical rationale and, threatened Third Republic. For more information Boulanger and Boulangisme, see: Frederic Seager, *The Boulanger Affair, Political Crossroads of France, 1886–1889* (N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1969), William D. Irvine, *The Boulanger Affair Reconsidered, Royalism, Boulangism, and the Origins of the Radical Right in France* (Oxford University Press, 1989), Michael Burns, *Rural Society and French Politics, Boulangism and the Dreyfus Affair, 1886–1900* (Princeton University Press, 1984).

(Coşar, 1997:155-156). This is because state was at the helm of the modernization process of Turkey, both in the last period of the Ottoman Empire and in the Republican period. Liberal intellectuals have tried to overcome these deficiencies with reference to the government because they could not have found a reference in the society during the modernization process. This has led to the already existing tension in the intellectual-power relationship, to transform into the tension of intellectuals own existence. To put it more precisely, liberal intellectuals of Turkey are trapped between the Western values, which they took as a model, especially the institutions of Western democracy and the principles and reforms of the Republic (Coşar, 1997:155-156).

The establishment of the new Turkish state led to the acceleration of the modernization process, which has been carried out decisively since the last periods of the Ottoman Empire. Efforts to form a nation-state constitute an important pillar of this modernization process. There has been an unprecedented turn in Turkish political life, and this process has primarily affected the intellectuals. Turkish intellectuals seeking solutions to the collapse of the Ottomans had to leave the ideologies such as Ottomanism, Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism which they were advocating before and had to take part in the establishment of New Turkey and the building of the Kemalist nation state.

In this process, the Turkish intellectual seems to have performed two important duties. The first duty is to create the ideology of the Turkish revolution, that is, to establish the intellectual basis of the new regime. The second duty which is born out of this duty is to teach and make the people accept the meaning and importance of the revolution and the mentality of the new regime. In other words, second duty is to make legitimizing propaganda of the Kemalist nation state. Ağaoğlu is one of our intellectuals who have internalized and best fulfilled these responsibilities -because of his liberal nationalism- that have been imposed on the Turkish intellectuals during the Early Republican Period. In fact, at the time when Ağaoğlu's liberal rhetoric has reached the highest level and when he engaged in hard polemics with the Kadroist's, "to create the ideology of the revolution" is at the basis of the debates (Ağaoğlu, 1930: 2). This is exactly the point where the liberal contradictions of Ağaoğlu emerged. The importance he gave to the nation, national sovereignty and Turkish

identity because of his liberal nationalism, brought along the dilemmas such as moderate statism within the framework of individual-society and individual-state and government support. We see that the first place where the liberal attitude emerged in the Early Republican Period in Turkey was the political arena. Founded on November 17, 1924, the PRP defended liberal values in political, economic and administrative terms and exhibited an independent opposition against Kemalist power. PRP has defended the views of liberalism, democracy, respect for religious freedoms, direct election, legal guarantee of judges, non-partisanship of the president and administrative decentralization. But the party did not able to resist the Kemalist power and had been short-lived. This situation is important in that it shows the power of the oppression of Kemalism over the opposition. At the same time, it has led to a situation in which liberalism was seen as an alternative to Kemalism in the Early Republican Period.

The second opposition test is the FRP, a controlled opposition, which is established by the Kemalist power by itself. As an opposition loyal to Kemalist power, the FRP, which is a test of democracy and multi-party life, is desired to be a liberal opposition to the Kemalist ruling within the limits allowed by the regime. Again, as in the PRP, liberalism is the opposition against Kemalism. But the FRP has been closed the moment it has crossed the boundaries Kemalism has set for it, posing a danger for the regime, that is, as soon as it has turned into a true opposition. The FRP experience has brought along the view that for Kemalist power - with the help of global conditions of the time- liberal values are dangerous. In fact, according to Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, "Thinking of liberalism is to deny the revolution." (Coşar: 1997:159). Therefore, liberalism is no longer just an opposition but at the same time an enemy of the regime. Ağaoğlu's FRP experience, which started with the wish of Atatürk, is a borderline in terms of his attitude towards the Kemalist regime. Ağaoğlu struggled to combine Kemalism with his liberal view before the FRP was closed and after the FRP was closed, he did not begin fighting directly with Kemalism but statism, one of Kemalist principles. Ağaoğlu has been actively served in important institutions within the state both before and after the declaration of the Republic. If we say it in his own words:

[...] [Is] a man who; managed the press of the revolution for years, headed the official organ of the revolution for years, wrote and defended the first charter of the

revolutionary party, participated in the organization of the constitution, carried the title of the member of parliament of the revolutionary party, was a member in the administrative committee of the revolutionary party group [...] (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 101-102).

In this respect, Ağaoğlu served as a social engineer in the formation of the Kemalist ideology, in the formation of the intellectual grounds of its principles and reforms, and in the transmission and acceptance of the intellectual grounds to the public until the closure of FRP. When the works and articles written by Ağaoğlu until the FRP was closed are examined, it is seen that he has focused on the mentality of Turkish revolution, Kemalist principles and the role that Turkish intellectual should play in the light of these mentality and principles. Ağaoğlu attaches great importance to the West, which he has referred to during the modernization process, the concepts of nation state and nationalism and the democracy, which he sees related to these. (Ağaoğlu, 1933:24). When describing the nation, he brings the basic elements such as literature and philosophy, which contribute to the formation of national consciousness to the forefront (Ağaoğlu, 2013: 79, Ağaoğlu, 1930: 69). He says that, these have a vital importance in the formation of the Turkish consciousness in society, and a class consists of intellectuals like him is needed for the emergence of such consciousness (Ağaoğlu, 1933:122). This point of view of Ağaoğlu is in common with the Kemalist regime until the 1930s, which was referring to the West and attempting to bring society within boundaries defined by it. He explained the role of the intellectual in this period as follows:

There are spiritual factors which invigorate European civilization and the institutions that civilization have, which are the conditions of civilization. These factors are: Loyalty, truthfulness, self-respect, helping the weak, fondness, interest and sacrifice for the citizen, respect for the truth, attachment to duty, in summary, a high level of moral and love and respect of science and wisdom. Since we have made a giant leap in our last revolution, Europeanized all our institutions and lifestyle, to revive these institutions, to make them productive, we should take their souls and fill their inner parts [...] The duty to perform this second operation falls on intellectuals like us. (Ağaoğlu, 1933:122)

In his liberal and democratic utopia *Serbest İnsalar Ülkesinde* he emphasized the importance of intellectuals in the building of the nation by stating “[...] when nation is said, not all the individuals within a mass, but a conscious, enlightened

class which represents that mass with spiritual characteristics [comes to mind]. This class is the guide of the nation that acts as a translator of its purposes and wishes.” (Ağaoğlu, 1930: 68). This class will convey the consciousness of Turkishness to the society. According to him, there was a significant influence of movement of ideas and literature on the building of the nations.

English, German, French, Italian, Russian nations without the litterateurs like Shakespeare and Milton, Locke and Spencer, Goethe, Schiller, Kant, Hegel, Moliere, Voltaire, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Victor Hugo, Dante, Machiavelli, Bruno, Pushkin, Lermontoff and so on would not come into existence. (Ağaoğlu, 1930: 69).

Turkish intellectual's finding ways like in the West to ensure the integration of the Turkish Revolution and the Republic with the public through intellectual as well as the literary movements is at the basis of Ağaoğlu's discourse. Turkish intellectuals should shape the society around the framework of the Turkish revolution and ultimately transform it into a nation. In other words, for Ağaoğlu the task of the Early Republican period intellectual was to educate the people in line with the principles of the regime. The establishment of the Turkish Language Institution (TDK) and the Turkish History Foundation (TTK) and the inclusion of language, history and geography lessons in universities were always the moves towards this aim. Ağaoğlu fulfilled this task both with the lessons he had given at the university and with his works at TTK. Ağaoğlu tried to establish connections between Turkish history and Roman, Etruscan history with works such as “*Outlines of Turkish History*” project. The aim here was to break the bonds of the new Turkey with the Ottoman history, to create a new identity and nation foreseen for the society by making contact with Western civilization (Özcan, 2010: 188-191). Similarly, he made connections between Hitites and Turks in *Turkish History Thesis* project (Erimtan, 2008). Ağaoğlu successfully fulfilled the duties assigned to the early Republican Period intellectuals both during the period of the PRP in which he was in power and during the period of the FRP in which he was in the opposition. Although his engagement in politics in FRP led to the confrontation with Kemalism, he continued to engage in politics because he was worried that the Turkish revolution which was originally carried out by the genius of Mustafa Kemal would fail due to some bad characteristics RPP acquired as being the only party.

He lists these characteristics as follows:

1. Inadequate self-denial
2. Inactivity of the party
3. Absence of mutual control (Ağaoğlu, 2011:142).

In other words, Ağaoğlu regarded the emergence of FRP as a remedy for the continuation of the Turkish revolution without slowing down and for the advancement of the Republic. According to him, the FRP will demonstrate a constructive opposition in the parliament, enliven the static political life, and ensure that the various disturbances that are the result of the one party administration are eliminated (Coşar, 1997:162). Therefore, Ağaoğlu was loyal to the principles of Kemalism, reformism and statism like all of the intellectuals of the period, his perception of these principles was different from other intellectuals (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 56-57). It is clear that Ağaoğlu's liberalism progressed on the course of liberal nationalism until the closing of the FRP, with attitudes such as the value given to the concept of nation, the efforts to create identity, emphasis on cultural elements, and the value it gives to elements that strengthen social ties such as literature and philosophy. In addition, the liberal nationalist attitude of Ağaoğlu is also seen on the value he gives to the notion of democracy and national will. In Ağaoğlu, self-determination and democratic republic have a very important place. We see that both in the PRP and FRP he defended his views such as the necessity of the national will, the superiority of the elected against the appointed, the value of the legislative immunities, the independence of the basic organs of the state, freedom of the press, right of criticism and freedom of opposition (Sakal, 1999: 205-207).

Ağaoğlu has put other new identities beside his liberal nationalism which tries to unite liberalism and nationalism, and he a bit exaggerated eclectic identity in this period. We can clearly see from the below statement the dilemmas that arise in the context of the power-intellectual relation which has caused a debate on Ağaoğlu's liberal identity:

I transferred to FRP as revolutionary, democrat, liberal, statist and Kemalist. Because since the first days of the Revolution, as a man who worked under the supervision of the revolutionary chairmen, managed the press of the revolution for years, headed the official organ of the revolution for years, wrote and defended the first charter of the revolutionary party, participated in the organization of the constitution, carried the title of the member of parliament of the revolutionary party,

was a member in the administrative committee of the revolutionary party group, I say that: I was in the opinion that the Republican People's Party was a liberal, democratic and statist as much as I was until the establishment of FRP (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 101-102)

Ağaoğlu was democratic and liberal by his own expression in the early Republican period but also Kemalist and statist. This weird identity articulation by nature is a reflection of the state-intellectual relationship we mentioned above. This is the result of undertaking the intellectual infrastructure and propaganda task in building the nation state, in other words, result of being the state's organic intellectual. Having a historical perspective has affected the emergence of liberal contradictions seen in Ağaoğlu during the Early Republican Period. According to him, history is a continuous search process in which each society tries to reach a consensus within its own contradictions. Every incident that has taken place in this process, with his words “formation”, makes specific contradictions of the societies more difficult and complicated. This situation, that is, the contradictions and conflicts that arise in society, provides the continuation of social evolution (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 40). Ağaoğlu puts the individual and the state at the center of these conflicts and contradictions arising from the specific structures of the societies. According to him, as a dynamic force, the individual is the main actor in the occurrence of collisions and contradictions, thus ensuring progress.

[...] individual increases the capital, establishes the technique and by making changes in the structure of the social life with this activity, causes new contradictions, new needs to arise and opens up new possibilities for the emergence of new social organisms and new state functions that will satisfy these needs and eliminate contradictions. (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 41).

The individual and the state are two principal elements that play a leading role in the development of humanity. While the individual is always advancing, the state expands its powers parallel to this expansion. More precisely, state, in which the individuals are the foundation, is the regulator of collisions and contradictions and the guarantee of harmony and order in society (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 41-42). Ağaoğlu filled the gap between state and individual with the notion of nation. The nation is a force emerged from mutual attraction among the people of the same race, speaking the same language and carrying the same culture, which cannot be prevented and will surely come together (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 92-95). Ağaoğlu, who had engaged in harsh polemics with Kadroist's on the concept of the

individual, the basic element of liberalism, criticized Kadroist's for the fact that they ignored the individual within a talismanic entity which has the power to do all the political, social and economic things, which they called as state (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 59). However, when we look at the views of Ağaoğlu, we see that the individual gains a value within the society and nation rather than “an absolute category” (Coşar, 1997:165) alone.

For him, the individual is the only value that enables the progress of societies and states. The progress of the republic can be developed through a modernized state structure, national sovereignty and citizen individual whose rights are protected by the constitution. In other words, in Ağaoğlu, individual is not a category separate from the society, independent of it (Ağaoğlu, 1930: 105). In *Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde* he expresses this situation as follows:

Look at the places that are not free; the individuals and families live separately there and there is little interest and relation between them [...] Here the principle is separation, egoism. Citizens are strangers to each other, everyone is indifferent to each other. In the free land it is unity. It is a principle here for everyone to be concerned with everyone, to participate in each other's fate. Here citizenship is a network in which the people entering are like rings adjacent to each other (Ağaoğlu, 1930: 29-30).

According to Ağaoğlu, the individual is composed of two different elements which are opposites. The first one is outer self and the second one is inner self. “One represents Egoism, the other represents Altruism.” (Ağaoğlu, 1939: 11). “*There is no doubt that for me a strong altruism carries love, and has the ability to make sacrifices for high purposes, but unfortunately my outer that stands up against it, is exactly the opposite*” (Ağaoğlu, 1939: 10-11). Ağaoğlu's “outer self” lives only for its interests, it thinks no one but itself, it is selfish. In this respect, it has some characteristics that contradict with the classical liberalism's concept of *laissez-faire*, *laissez-passer* and the natural order can be realized with individual interests (invisible hand⁸²) thought. On the contrary, “inner self” has many characteristics such as “humanity, right, sacrifice of goods and personality for homeland and

⁸² *Invisible hand* is a term used by Adam Smith to describe the unintended social benefits of individual actions. It is a metaphor for how, in a free market economy, self-interested individuals operate through a system of mutual interdependence to promote the general benefit of society at large. For more information on invisible hand, see: Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (Edwin Cannah (Ed.), London: Methuen & Co., 1904), W. Samuels, “The Invisible Hand” (In J. Young (Ed.), *Elgar Companion to Adam Smith*, Cheltenham: Elgar, 2009), M. Blaug, “Invisible Hand” (In S. Durlaf, L. Blume (Ed.), *New Palgrave dictionary of economics*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

citizens, [...] helping the oppressed, knocking down the persecutor [...]" (Ağaoğlu, 1939: 10). We have previously stated that Ağaoğlu regards the individual as a free-thinking, free-feeling and free-acting person who has attained the right and duty consciousness. The "inner self" mentioned here is the party with the right and duty consciousness. In other words "inner self" represents *civic virtue*⁸³. It is the underlying main factor of the individual's being a dynamic force (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 32-35). Therefore, Ağaoğlu's individualism is altruist and solidarity (Kadıoğlu, 1998: 58). According to him, the individual is an integral part of society and the nation. The individual does not constitute a category on its own, but represents a "citizen" who plays an important role in the development of the society and the state. This seems to be a contradiction in classical liberal sense of Ağaoğlu, but it is in fact the main argument of liberal nationalism. In this context, Ağaoğlu provided the emergence of an individual concept suitable for the Early Republican Period. But this concept is not formed with reference to the universal principles of classical liberalism but with reference to liberal nationalism taking in to account the political, social and economic circumstances of Ağaoğlu. Ağaoğlu has been "in search of a liberal identity for his own society" (Coşar, 1997: 169). Therefore, when we carefully examine the liberal attitude of Ağaoğlu in the Early Republican period, it seems that it has different qualities that classical liberalism should have. Ağaoğlu's liberalism should be addressed within the framework of a specific national tradition specialty (Vincent, 2010: 25) as it is in German, Italian, Spanish, French and British liberalism.

This attitude of Ağaoğlu continues on the issue of freedom. Freedom is necessary for the individual to reach the rights and duties consciousness (Bora, 2017:527). According to him freedom "[...] establishes an unbreakable and untieable network of solidarity between the members of the society which consists of all of the individuals." (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 22). In other words, as the individual develops and gains his or her freedom; order, harmony and unity take place in the society (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 24). The state should play a role in forming

⁸³ "Civic virtue can be formally defined as a disposition among citizens of participating in actions that support and sustain a fair political order. Virtue can be seen as going after the public good rather than the self-interest." (Köktaş, 2014:123). For more information on civic virtue, see: R. C. Sinopoli, *The Foundations of American Citizenship Liberalism, The Constitution and Civic Virtue* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

this unity, ensures “maintaining and strengthening the influences and the values in the eyes of the public.” (Ağaoğlu, 1930: 79). Therefore, freedoms which has emerged as a result of the fact that liberalism has considered the human personality as the most important value, gives place to “Freedom in the society” in Ağaoğlu (Coşar, 1997: 166). Ağaoğlu’s view of the freedom concept “[...] originates from a human-centered perspective (freedom as a right), from a social perspective (freedom as a duty) [...] freedom is determined by the principles of the state within the society, requires consent to these principles.” (Coşar, 1997: 166). This point of view is a reflection of liberal nationalism on Ağaoğlu and is similar to the German idea of freedom (Krieger, 1972: 367-368; Coşar, 1997: 167), which is formed on the basis of the idea that freedom can only be realized by the freedom of nation and state.

We have mentioned that having a historical perspective has also affected Ağaoğlu’s liberal contradictions during the Early Republican Period. The best example of this can be seen in his view of the economic attitude of the statism principle. In fact, Ağaoğlu by mentioning “State is even statist by its nature. Its main duty is to intervene in the social order to eliminate the contradictions that occurred and to provide harmony.” (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 98) asserts that statism is a unique feature of the state itself. According to him, “[...] everywhere and every time state intervention stemmed from the need to eliminate the contradictions arising from the developments that occurred in the national life.” (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 61). In Turkey, however, there is no reason that requires government intervention. “There is no class in Turkey, no class struggle, no big capital, no clash between the worker and the capitalist; that is, none of the contradictions that require the maximum intervention of the state in contemporary states exist in Turkey.” (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 62). Therefore, any intervention by the state in Turkey is not legitimate because of the absence of economic disputes that cause the social order to deteriorate. It is therefore very wrong and meaningless for the state to intervene in the economy. The role of the state is not to be an actor in the economic sense in Turkey in accordance with the conditions of the period. It should only assume the work of the individual that he or she is not capable of and provide the guarantee of economic freedoms (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 72). Ağaoğlu emphasized here that state’s intervention in the economic area is unnecessary due to the conditions rather than the classical liberal view. But there is another contradiction here. According to this logic of

Ağaoğlu, it should be quite usual for the state to intervene in the economy due to lack of capital during the Early Republican Period and to take part in economic life as an actor. Likewise, Ağaoğlu gives permission to the state to intervene in the works that the individual is not capable of.

One of his views that contradict with liberalism is his view of the concept of family. Although Ağaoğlu has held many liberal positions on the establishment of the family and the position of the woman in the family, he has advocated that the Turkish family should be developed by Turkish intellectuals themselves and in line with a family ideal which is hundred percent compatible with the conditions of Turkish society (Ağaoğlu, "Family Ideal", Cumhuriyet, 26 February 1935). But according to him "*while the negativities of ulema oppression, male bully, harem life etc. were being condemned, European negativities have begun to be felt in our society.*" (Sakal, 1999: 139). In fact, Ağaoğlu's idea of taking all the values of the West who views the concept of civilization as lifestyle left its place to conservatism⁸⁴. The effects of excessive westernization or European negativities on the community life, the education given in the foreign schools and especially the damages of the nannies, called the governess, on family and community life were discussed by Ağaoğlu (Sakal, 1999: 139). He opposes the degeneration of the family, which he sees as a center of decency, morality and ethics, with extreme westernization (Ağaoğlu, 1933, 10 August). In fact, his attitude can be correlated with the meaning liberal nationalism attributes to culture.

As can be seen, the contradictions both arising from his liberal nationalism and from the context of power-intellectual relationship with the influence of this eclectic ideology stands out in the liberal attitude of Ağaoğlu in the Early Republican Period. The individual who forms the basis of liberal thought is defined in Ağaoğlu as a value within the society and the nation, not as an element on its own, unlike classical liberalism. He regarded the nation state as the last point in the evolution of mankind in the historical process, so he undertook the social engineering of the Kemalist regime intentionally and willingly. Nevertheless the

⁸⁴ Conservatism can be dealt with both as an "occasional feature of all of the different political-ideological positions" and as an "independent political ideology" (Erdoğan, 2004:5). The conservative concept mentioned here should be regarded as "thought style" with reference to Mannheim (Mannheim, 1969: 74-78). In other words, used in the meaning of "attitude" or "mood" articulated to various doctrine or ideology (Çiğdem, 1997: 32)

meaning and duty he attributes to the state does not match the classical liberal values. According to him, state in which the individuals are the foundation, is the regulator of collisions and contradictions and the guarantee of harmony and order in society (Ağaoğlu, 1933: 41-42). This view, formed with a historical point of view, has led to the idea that in the current conditions of Turkey, the state does not have to be statist. In the first years of the foundation of the Republic, Ağaoğlu who pondered on the westernization, Pan-Turkism and the construction of the Kemalist nation-state, although he faced Kemalist power after the closure of the FRP which he had entered for the progress of the Turkish revolution and focused more on the concept of the individual, his views remained unchanged and continued to consider the individual within the society and have a moderate understanding of statism. In short, the contradictions we can consider within the context of nationalist liberalism and his role in the Kemalist nation-state construction are the result of his pursuit of liberalism which suits his society, not the principles of classical liberalism during the Early Republican Period.

5. CONCLUSION

Ahmet Ağaoğlu has involved in the great changes and transformations that took place during the unusual turbulent periods in the Caucasus under the Russian domination as well as in the Ottoman period and in the Republican period of Turkey at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century. He directly or indirectly witnessed the 1905 Russian Revolution, the 1908 Young Turk Revolution, the October 1917 Revolution, World War I and the Turkish National Struggle. Following the National Struggle, he undertook various roles as an organic intellectual of the state in the establishment of the Republic.

Ağaoğlu seems to have different identities and tendencies such as Iranian, Russian Muslim, Turkish Muslim, Pan-Islamist and Pan-Turkist until the Early Republic period. These different identities, which Ağaoğlu has acquired in the historical process, suggest at first sight that it will be very difficult to identify him and to explain his identity crisis. However, it is not hard to identify Ağaoğlu and make sense of his identity change, if his identities and his actions related to his identities are examined by considering the period and circumstances in which he lived. In other words, it makes sense when his identities and thoughts are assessed under the conditions of his period.

There is a constant and consistent thought hidden under the identities that Ağaoğlu constantly changes. This thought is that Ağaoğlu wants to strengthen and correct the position of his own community (Muslims and Turks) against the West. It would not be wrong to say that his whole life has been shaped around this ideal.

It can easily be seen that the identities acquired before the Early Republican Period are not the basic elements that accompanied his whole thought life. Ağaoğlu, who believed that the West is superior to the East in all aspects of political, social and economic areas, tried to bring the society which he is included in into existence against the West through these identities. He accomplished this by writing numerous books, publishing articles, publishing newspapers, giving foreign language, literature, law, history lessons in Turkish (Ottoman Turkish and Azerbaijani Turkish), French, Russian and Persian, serving as a government

official and engaging in politics in three different countries. Throughout his life in Turkey, Aġaoġlu assumed the Turkist, Westerner, Kemalist, and eventually liberal identities. Ahmet Aġaoġlu is the most remarkable person who can be described as liberal, especially in the Early Republican Period of Turkey, in terms of the values he advocated, as well as his commitment to these values.

In this period, Aġaoġlu was seen as a liberal intellectual because of his involvement in the Free Republican Party, defense of liberal values, especially individual freedoms, and opposition to the Kemalist power after the FRP was closed. But these are the incidents that only make his liberal discourse to be seen more clearly. Because Aġaoġlu believes that the main objective underlying the ideas and identities that have been constantly changing according to the circumstances is the strengthening and improving the position of his own society, could only be possible with liberal values since the years of France. Aġaoġlu's liberal identity has become a matter of debate because of his relationship with the Kemalist power and his nationalistic view he has in every period of his life. Indeed, when Aġaoġlu's liberalism is examined, it appears that his attitude has held some dilemmas incompatible with classical liberalism. This initially gives the impression that Aġaoġlu's liberalism is “periodical”, which changes according to conditions like his Iranianism, Islamism and Turkism identities.

But the elements that seem to be contradictions in Aġaoġlu's liberalism stems from the fact that “liberal nationalism” rather than classical liberalism and its values are on the basis of his liberal values. He has always adhered to the concept of “liberal nationalism”, a synthesis of the “nationalism” and “liberalism” ideologies at every period of his thought life.

When we look at the views of Aġaoġlu, as in the liberal nationalism theory, we see that the individual gains a value within the society and nation rather than “an absolute category” alone. For him, the individual is the value that makes society and states progress. The progress of the Republic can be developed through a modernized state structure, a nation-state, national sovereignty, and a citizen individual whose rights are protected by a constitution. Aġaoġlu's liberal nationalist point of view continues on the issue of freedom. According to him, freedoms are necessary and important for the individual to reach the right

and duty consciousness. Freedoms of the classical liberalism which emerged due to classical liberalism's viewing of human personality as the most important value, has left its place to the idea of freedom within society in Ađaođlu.

The relationship between the concepts of individual, society and state in classical liberal thought has transformed into citizen-individual, nation, nation-state concepts in Ađaođlu. Therefore, the liberal contradictions of Ahmet Ađaođlu in the Early Republican Period are not in fact contradictions but characteristics arising from his liberal nationalist attitude. In fact the contradictions stemming from the fact that he is an organic intellectual of the state, which is assessed within the context of the Kemalist power-intellectual relationship, are also based on this eclectic ideology. Likewise, existence or building of a nation is one of the basic conditions of liberal nationalism, and Kemalist regime is building the Turkish nation.

To summarize, Ahmet Ađaođlu is the most remarkable figure of Turkish liberalism during the Early Republican Period. When the concepts in which the liberal attitude of Ađaođlu is observed are examined, it is seen that in these concepts there are dilemmas that are incompatible with classical liberalism. These dilemmas observed in the liberalism of Ađaođlu in the Early Republican Period stem from the existence of "liberal nationalism" rather than classical liberalism and values on the basis of his liberal attitude. Therefore, the liberal contradictions of Ahmet Ađaođlu in the Early Republican Period are not in fact contradictions but characteristics arising from his liberal nationalist attitude. Contradictions such as the task of social engineering, moderate statism and government support which can be assessed in the context of Kemalist power-intellectual relationship are also based on this eclectic ideology.

REFERENCES

Ahmet Ağaoğlu's Works

Books

- AĞAOĞLU, Ahmet (1930). *Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde*. [In the Land of Free People] İstanbul: Sanayiinefise Matbaası.
- AĞAOĞLU, Ahmet (1933). *Devlet ve Fert* [State and Individual]. İstanbul: Sanayiinefise Matbaası.
- AĞAOĞLU, Ahmet (1942). *İhtilal mi inkılap mı?* [Revolt or Revolution]. Ankara: Ağaoğlu Külliyyatı.
- AĞAOĞLU, Ahmet (1959). *İslamlıkta Kadın* [Women in the Islamic World]. Trans: Hasan Ali Ediz. İstanbul: Nebioğlu Yayınevi.
- AĞAOĞLU, Ahmet (2011). *Serbest Firka Hatıraları* [Free Party Memoirs]. (2nd Edition). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- AĞAOĞLU, Ahmet (2013). *Üç Medeniyet* [Three Civilizations]. (3rd. Edition). İstanbul: Doğu Kitapevi.
- AĞAOĞLU, Ahmet (1939). *Ben Neyim?* [What am I?]. İstanbul: Ağaoğlu Külliyyatı.
- AĞAOĞLU, Ahmet (2010) *Mütakere ve Sürgün Hatıraları* [Memories of Armistice and Exile]. İstanbul: Doğu Kitapevi.

Articles

- "Açık Görüşler: Hâkimiyeti Milliye", Akın, 24 September 1933, p. 1.
- "Açık Görüşler: Tanin Başka Akın Başka", Akın, 18 September 1933, p. 1.
- "Hükümetten İcraat Bekleniyor. Bomonti Feshedilmelidir", Akın, 31 July 1933, pp. 1- 2.
- "İktisat Vekili Celal Beyefendiye, Gene Kömür Şirketi İçin" [To the Minister of Economy, Celal Beyefendi, Again for the Coal Company], Akın, 24 September 1933, pp. 1- 2.
- A. "Fazla Ucuzluk Ekincilerimizi Eziyor. Fazla Ucuzluk İyi Bir Alamet Midir?" [Over-cheapness Oppresses Our Croppers. Is Over-cheapness a good sign?], Akın, 12 June 1933, p.1.
- A., "Şeker İhtikârını Kim Yapıyor?", Akın, 13 July 1933, p. 1.
- Ağaoğlu Ahmet, "Ziraatimiz" [Our Agriculture], Akın, 20 June 1933, p. 1.
- Ağaoğlu, "Tarikatlarımız", Tercüman-ı Hakikat, 14 February 1915

- Ağaoğlu, “Aile Adını Taşıyan Müesseseler”, Akın, 10 August 1933
- Ağaoğlu, “Aile Münakaşası”, Cumhuriyet, 8 Birinci Kanun [December] 1934
- Ağaoğlu, “Ali İktisat Meclisi”, Akın, 26 July 1933
- Ağaoğlu, “Alman Kadınlığı”. Türk Yurdu. C.VIII, s: 5, 1331[1915], pp. 104-105
- Ağaoğlu, “Ocak Ülküsü”, Cumhuriyet, 26 February 1935
- Ağaoğlu, “Serbest Kadın”, Akın, 25 June 1933
- Ağaoğlu, “Türk Kadınına Verilen Seçme ve Seçilme Hakkı”, Cumhuriyet, 6 Birincikanun [December] 1934,
- AĞAOĞLU, Ahmet, “Gazetemizin Yolu, Dileği ve Tarzı”, Akın, 29 May 1933, p. 1.
- AĞAOĞLU, Ahmet, “Mecburi Bir İzah”, Akın, 3 August 1933, p. 1.
- Ahmet Ağaoğlu, “Parlamentarizm ve Şahsi Hükümet”, Akın, 19 July 1933
- Ahmet Agayef, “İsmail Bey Gaspirinskiy”, Türk Yurdu, No: 6 (12), 27 Teşrin-i Sani 1330 [10 December 1914].
- Ahmet Agayef, “Türk Âlemi” [The Turkish World], Türk Yurdu 1, 10 (1328-1912/13), p. 297.
- Akın, 3.6.1933, p. 1.

Archive documents

- TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, d.I, C.22, p. 601.
- TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, d.I, C.23, pp. 63-66.
- TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, d.II, C.8, p. 662.
- TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, d.III, C. 17, p. 99-101.
- TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, d.III, C.12, pp. 56-66.
- TBMM Zabıt Ceridesi, d.III, C.17, pp. 103-109.

Books and Articles about Ağaoğlu

- AĞAOĞLU, Samet (1940). *Babamdan Hatıralar*. Ankara: Ağaoğlu Külliyyatı.
- AKÇURAOĞLU, Yusuf (2009). *Türk Yılı 1928*. Tekin, A. and İzgöner, A.Z. (Ed.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- CENGİZ, Yasin (2008). “*Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası ve Kapanışı Sonrasında Mutedil-Muhaliif bir Kimlik Olarak Ahmet Ağaoğlu ve Basındaki Sesi: ‘Akın’*”. Selçuk

Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tarih ABD. Yakınçağ Tarihi Yüksek Lisans Tezi– Konya.

- COŞAR, Simten (1997). “Ahmet Ağaoğlu: Türk Liberalizminin Açmazlarına Bir Giriş”. Toplum ve Bilim. Türk Muhafazakârlığı, no: 74, pp. 155-175
- DEVLET, Nadir (1998). *Rusya Türklerinin Milli Mücadele Tarihi (1905-1917)*. (2nd Edition). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu
- ERCİLASUN, Bilge (2000). “XX. Yüzyılın Esiğinde Dört Türk Aydını: Gaspralı İsmail, Hüseyinzade Ali, Akçuraoğlu Yusuf, Ağaoğlu Ahmet”. In Güzel, H. C (Ed). *Türkler*. Vol: 15 İstanbul: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları. pp. 859-868.
- ERİMTAN, Can (2008). “*Hittites, Ottomans and Turks: Ağaoğlu Ahmed Bey and the Kemalist Construction of Turkish Nationhood in Anatolia*Author”. *Anatolian Studies*, Vol. 58 (2008). British Institute at Ankara. pp. 141-171.
- GEORGEON, François (2013). *Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi (1900-1930)*. Trans: Ali Berktaş. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- GÜLSEVEN, Fahreddin (1989). “Ahmet Ağaoğlu’nun Hayatı, Fikirleri, Fikirleri, Siyasi ve Sosyal Mücadeleleri”. *Azerbaycan Türk Kültür Dergisi* 38 (268), pp. 99-116
- KADIOĞLU, Ayşe (1998). “Laiklik ve Türk Liberalizminin Kökenleri”. *Defter*, 11/33, Spring, pp. 41-63.
- ÖZAVCI, H. Ozan (2015). *Intellectual Origins of the Republic Ahmet Ağaoğlu and the Genealogy of Liberalism in Turkey*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- ÖZCAN, Ufuk (2010). *Yüzyıl Dönümünde Batıcı Bir Aydın Ahmet Ağaoğlu ve Rol Değişikliği*. İstanbul: Kitapevi.
- SAKAL, Fahri (1999). *Ağaoğlu Ahmet Bey*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- SHISSLER, A. Holly (2002). *Between Two Empires Ahmet Ağaoğlu and the New Turkey*. London: I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd.
- SOYSAL, Ayşe Gün (1995). “*Ahmet Ağaoğlu (1869-1939) The Life and Thought of a Turkish Nationalist During 1908-1918*”. Unpublished PhD thesis, Institute of Atatürk’s Principles and the History of Turkish Revanation in Boğaziçi University.
- SWITCOWSKI, Tadeusz (2004). *Russian Azerbaijan 1905-1920 The Shaping of National Identity in a Muslim Community*. Cambridge University Press.
- ÜLKEN, Hilmi Ziya (2014). *Türkiye’de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- UYAR, Hakkı (2013). “Ağaoğlu Ahmet’in “Liberal Muhafif” Gazetesi: Akın (1933)”. In Bora T. and Gültekingil, M. (Ed). *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce* (2nd Edition). Vol: 7, Liberalizm, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp. 224-231.

Other Works and Articles

"Maksad ve Meslek", Türk Yurdu, Year: 1, No: 1, p. 1.

AKÇURA, Yusuf (2014), *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* [ThreePolitics]. (6nd Edition) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

AKPINAR, Yılmaz (2005). *İsmail Gaspıralı Seçilmiş Eserleri: 2 Fikri Eserleri*. İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.

AKYOL, Taha (1993). "Cedidcilik". *İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Vol: 7). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, pp. 211-113

AKYOL, Taha (2012). *Atatürk'ün İhtilal Hukuku*, İstanbul: Doğan Yayıncılık.

AYDEMİR, Ş. Süreyya (1932). *İnkılap ve Kadro*. Ankara: Ahmet Halit Kitapevi.

AYDEMİR, Ş. Süreyya (1934), "Programlı Devletçilik". *Kadro Dergisi*, no: 34, Ankara.

BERKES, Niyazi. (2014). *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

BERLIN, Isaiah (2002). "Two Concepts of Liberty". *Liberty: Incorporating Four Essays on Liberty*, Hardy Henry (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 166-217.

BERLIN, Isaiah. (1969). *Two Concepts of Liberty, Four Essays on Liberty*. London: Oxford University Press.

BOLAT, B. Salman, DEMİRASLAN Tekin (2013). "Lozan Görüşmeleri Sırasında Mecliste Ortaya Çıkan II. Grup Muhalefeti Ve Basına Yansıması". *Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*, pp. 29-60.

BORA, Tanıl (2017). *Cereyanlar Türkiye'de Siyasi İdeolojiler*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık.

CEBESOY, Ali Fuat (2011). *Siyasi Hatıralar Büyük Zaferden Lozan'a Lozan'dan Cumhuriyete Vol: I-II*. İstanbul: Temel Yayınları

ÇETİN, Halis (2015). "Liberalizmin Temel İlkeleri". *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(1), pp. 219-237.

ÇİĞDEM, Ahmet (1997). "Muhafazakârlık Üzerine", *Toplum ve Bilim*, no: 74, Autumn, pp. 32- 51.

DEMİRTAŞ, Zülfü (2007). "Osmanlı'da Sıbyan Mektepleri ve İlköğretimin Örgütlenmesi". *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* [Fırat University Journal of Social Science], 17(1), pp. 173-183

DUMONT, Paul (1998). "Türk Yurdu dergisi ve Rusya Müslümanları 1911-1914" [La revue Türk Yurdu et Les Musulmans de l'Empire russe], Trans: Saime Selamga Gökgez. *Türk Yurdu*, Cilt 1 (1-2): 1911-1912: 17-28, 1998, Ankara, Tutibay Yayınları.

EKİNCİKLİ, Mustafa (2012). "Türk Demokrasi Kültürünün Gelişim Sürecinde Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası'nın Kuruluşu". *Akademik Bakış*, 6 (11), Winter, pp. 151-163.

- ERDEM, Hüsametdin (1994). “*Deizm*”. İslam Ansiklopedisi (Vol: 9). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, pp. 119-110.
- ERDOĞAN, Mustafa (1988). *Liberal Toplum Liberal Siyaset*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitapevi.
- ERDOĞAN, Mustafa (1990) “Liberal Düşünce Geleneği”, Yeni Forum, 11(252), pp. 20-34.
- ERDOĞAN, Mustafa (1999). “Milliyetçilik İdeolojisine Dair”, Liberal Düşünce, no: 15, Summer, pp. 89-98.
- ERDOĞAN, Mustafa (2004), “Muhafazakârlık: Ana Temalar”, Liberal Düşünce Dergisi, no: 34, Spring, pp. 5-9.
- ERDOĞAN, Mustafa (2013). “Liberalizm ve Türkiye’deki Serüveni”. In Bora T. and Gültekingil, M. (Ed). *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*. Vol: 7, Liberalizm. İstanbul: İletişim, pp. 23-41.
- ERTAN, T. Faik (1994). *Kadrocular ve Kadro Hareketi*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- FİLİZOK, Rıza (2005). *Ziya Gökalp*. Ankara: Akçağ.
- GÖKALP, Ziya (1977). *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*. İstanbul: Kadro Yayınları.
- GRAMSCI, Antonio (1971). *Selection From The Prison Notebooks*. Q. Hoare ve G.N. Smith (Edt. /Tran.). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- GÜNDÜZ, M., BARDAK, M. (2010). *Eğitimci Bir Jön Türk Lider: Ahmet Rıza Bey ve “Vazife ve Mesuliyet” Eserleri*. Ankara: Divan Kitap
- HAAS, Peter M. (1992). “Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination”. In International Organization, 46 (1), Winter, Knowledge, Power, and International Policy Coordination, pp. 1-35.
- HACALOĞLU, Yücel. (1993). *Türk Ocakları ve Atatürk*. Ankara: Türk Yurdu Neşriyatı.
- HANİOĞLU, Şükrü (1985), “*Osmanlıcılık*”. Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyete Türkiye Ansiklopedisi. İstanbul, 1389-1390.
- HEYWOOD, Andrew (2012). *Political Ideologies An Introduction*. (5th edition). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- HROCH, Miroslav (1990). “How Much Does Nation Formation Depend Upon Nationalism?”. East European Politics & Societies, 4 (1), Winter, pp. 101-115.
- HROCH, Miroslav (1993), “From National Movement to the Fully-Formed Nation: The Nation Building Process in Europe”, New Left Review, no: 198, pp. 3-20.
- KARABULUT, Tolga (2014), “*Yurttaşlığın Krizini Yeniden Düşünmek: Liberal Milliyetçilik ve Anayasal Yurtseverlik Kuramları*”. Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, 69 (4), pp. 871-890.

- KARAMAN, Hayrettin (1994). “*Efgani, Cemaleddin*”. İslam Ansiklopedisi (Vol: 10). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, pp. 456-466.
- KINACI, Cemile (2016). “*Kazak Aydın Mirjakip Duvlatuli'nin (1885-1935) Balkiya (1922) Tiyatro Eserinde Ceditçi Düşünce ve Dönemin Sosyal Meseleleri*”. Gazi Türkiyat, no: 18, Spring, pp. 171-194.
- KINROSS, Lord (2006). *Atatürk*. Trans: Necdet Sander. İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar Yayını.
- KÖKTAŞ, Mümin (2014). “American Aydınlanması: Bir Giriş Denemesi”. *Liberal Düşünce*, 19(73-74), pp. 109-134.
- KRIEGER, Leonard (1972). *The German Idea of Freedom*. Chicago and Londra: The University of Chicago Press
- KURAN-I KERİM MEAALİ [Holy Koran and Turkish interpretation with explanations] (2011). Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları.
- LOCKE, John (2002). *Uygar Yönetim Üzerine İkinci Deneme Sivil Toplumda Devlet*. Trans: Serdar Taşçı, Hale Akman. İstanbul: Metropol.
- MacCORMICK, Neil (1999). *Questioning Sovereignty: Law, State and Nation in the European Commonwealth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MANNHEIM, Karl (1969). *Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- MARAŞ, İbrahim (2002). *Türk Dünyasında Dini Yenileşme (1850-1917)*. İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.
- MARDİN, Şerif (2008). *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri 1895-1908*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları 15. Baskı.
- MILL, J. Stuart. (1972). *Essay on Liberty*. London: Dent [1859].
- MILLER, David (2000). *Citizenship and National Identity*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers
- MILLER, David (2006). “Nationalism”. In Dryzek, John S., Bonnie Honig ve Anne Phillips (Ed). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 529-545.
- ÖZKIRIMLI, U. (2010). *Theories of Nationalism A Critical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- POPPER, Karl (1967). *Açık Toplum ve Düşmanları I*. Trans: Mete Tunçay. Ankara: Türk Siyasi İlimler Derneği Yayınları.
- RENAN, Ernest (1890). *Life of Jesus*. Trans: Charles Edwin Wilbour. New York: G. W. Dillingham,
- RENAN, Ernest “*What is a Nation?*”, text of a conference delivered at the Sorbonne on March 11th, 1882, in Ernest Renan, *Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?*, Paris, Presses-Pocket,

1992. (Trans. Ethan Rundell)
[http://ucparis.fr/files/9313/6549/9943/What_is_a_Nation.pdf Accessed 2.11.2016]
- RIASSANOVSKY, N. V., STEINBERG, M. D. (2011). *Rusya Tarihi Başlangıçtan Günümüze...* Trans: Figen Dereli. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitapevi.
- RICARDO, David (1871). *The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. Kitchener: Botoche Books, 2001.
- SABINE, George H. - THORSON Thomas L. (1973). *A History of Political Theory*. (4th Edition). London: The Dryden Press
- SAID, Edward W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books
- SARINAY, Yusuf (2004). *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Tarihi Gelişimi ve Türk Ocakları*. İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.
- SERTEL, Zekeriya (1968). *Hatırladıklarım*. İstanbul: Yaylacık Matbaası.
- SKOUSEN, Mark (2003). *İktisadi Düşünce Tarihi*. Trans: Ekrem Erdem, Metin Toprak, Mustafa Acar. İstanbul: Adres Yayınları.
- SMITH, Adam (1776). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Edwin Cannah (Ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- TAMIR, Yael (1993). *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- TEKELİ, İ., İLKİN, S. (1982). *Uygulamaya Geçerken Türkiye’de Devletçiliğin Oluşumu*, Ankara: ODTÜ Yayınları
- TİMUR, Taner (2001). *Türk Devrimi ve Sonrası*. Ankara: İmge Kitapevi.
- TÖKİN, İ. Hüsrev (1933). “Milli Kurtuluş Devletçiliği 2”. Kadro Dergisi, no: 19, Ankara.
- TUNAYA, Tarık Zafer (1952). *Türkiye’de Siyasi Partiler: 1859-1952*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi.
- TÜRÇAN, Talip (2010). “Şura”. İslam Ansiklopedisi (Vol: 39). İstanbul. Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, pp. 230-235.
- TÜRKEŞ, Mustafa (1999). *Kadro Hareketi, Ulusçu Sol Bir Akım*. Ankara. İmge Kitabevi.
- ÜSTEL, Füsün (1997). *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği Türk Ocakları (1912-1931)*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- VINCENT, Andrew (2013). *Modern Political Ideologies*. United Kingdom: A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Publication
- YAYLA, Atilla (1992). *Liberalizm*. Ankara: Turhan Yayınları
- YUZEYEV, Aydar (2004), “Ceditçilik İdeolojisi: Tarihi ve Bugünü”. In Kırımlı H. (Ed.). İsmail Bey Gaspıralı İçin. Ankara: Kırım Türkleri Kültür ve Yardımlaşma Derneği Yayınları, 239-254

ZURCHER, Erik Jan, (2010). *Cumhuriyetin İlk Yıllarında Muhalefet Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası (1924-1925)*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayını

ZURCHER, Erik Jan, (2014). *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi* [Turkey: A Modern History]. Trans: Yasemin Saner. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

E- Bibliography

Allegory (2016, 27 November). <http://literarydevices.net/allegory/> Accessed on 27 November 2016.

Altruism (2016, 27 November). <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/altruism> Accessed on 27 November 2016.

Armistice of Mudros (2003, October). In Encyclopædia Britannica. <https://global.britannica.com/event/Armistice-of-Mudros> Accessed on 27 November 2016.

Auto-da-fé (2016, 18 November). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Auto-da-f%C3%A9> Accessed on 27 November 2016.

Bolshevik (2016, 27 November). <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Bolshevik> Accessed on 27 November 2016.

LITTLE, Donald P. (2009). “*Muawiyah-I*”. In Encyclopædia Britannica. <https://global.britannica.com/biography/Muawiyah-I> Accessed on 27 November 2016.

Mirza (2016, 24 November). In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mirza> Accessed on 27 November 2016.

Mujtahid (2016, 27 November). <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mujtahid> Accessed on 27 November 2016.

ROMER, Christina D., PILLS, Richard H. (2014). “*Great Depression*”. <https://global.britannica.com/event/Great-Depression> Accessed on 28 November 2016.

Satire (2016, 27 November). <http://literarydevices.net/satire/> Accessed on 27 November 2016.

STENDON, Doris Marry (2016). “*Magna Carta*”. In Encyclopædia Britannica. <https://global.britannica.com/topic/Magna-Carta> Accessed on 27 November 2016.

Utopia (2016, 27 November). <http://literarydevices.net/utopia/> Accessed on 27 November 2016.