To My Mother,
Zafer Akgol

ANALYZING THE EARLY REPUBLICAN IDEOLOGYWITH SPECIFIC
REFERENCE TO THE TURLISH LITERATURE: 1930-1945

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

R. ÖMÜR BİRLER

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ART IN POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

In

THE DEPARTMENT OF
POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

September 2000

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is full adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Political Science and Public Administration.

    Assist. Prof. E. Fuat Keyman
        Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is full adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Political Science and Public Administration.

    Assist. Prof. Mehmet Kalpaklı
    Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is full adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Political Science and Public Administration.

    Dr. Necmi Erdoğan
    Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

    Prof. Ali Karaosmanoğlu
        Director

ABSTRACT

ANALYZING THE EARLY REPUBLICAN IDEOLOGY WITH SPECIFIC
REFERENCE TO THE TURKISH LITERATURE: 1930-1945
Birler, R. Ömür
M.A., Department of Political Science and Public Administration
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. E. Fuat Keyman

September 2000

Having taken for granted that there exists a certain but nonlinear relation between political ideology and literature, this thesis seeks to trace the early republican political project *vis a vis* development of the Turkish literature. In this respect, two fundamental dimensions of the republican ideology, modernization and nationalism are considered; and the reflection of these two motives on the political agenda is analyzed through both the works and the debates of period's Turkish literary world. Further, this thesis attempts to develop a proper theoretical framework derived from the Post-colonial literature theory in order to have a better understanding of the investigated case.

Keywords: Literature, Turkish Poetry, Turkish Novel, Modernization, Nationalism, Homi Bhabha

ÖZET

ERKEN CUMHURİYET İDEOLOJİSİNİN TÜRK EDEBİYATI ÜZERİNDEN
İNCELENMESİ: 1930-1945

Birler, R. Ömür

Master, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. E. Fuat Keyman

Eylül, 2000

Siyasi düşünce ve edebiyat arasında kesin, fakat doğrusal olmayan bir ilişki olduğunu temel alarak, bu tez erken dönem cumhuriyet politikaları ve Türk edebiyatı arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemiştir. Modernleşme ve milliyetçilik düşüncelerini cumhuriyet idolojisinin iki temel dayanağı olarak alıp; her iki düşüncenin siyasi gündemki yansımalarının hem Türk edebiyatının gelişme sürecine hem de oluşan tartışmalara olan etkisi araştırılmıştır. Bu tezde incelenen konunun uygun bir çerçevede anlaşılabilmesi için, sömürgecilik sonrası edebiyat teorilerinden faydalanılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Edebiyat, Türk Şiiri, Türk Romanı, Modernleşme, Milliyetçilik, Homi Bhabha

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I: Introduction

The overall aim of this thesis is to understand the role of literature in the construction of the republican ideology. While most of the studies conducted on the foundation years of the Turkish Republic, had focused either on the institutional structure or the political economy of the period, with the starting of the 1980s the general vein of the academic researches turned their attention to the investigation of the cultural formation of the republican ideology. In this respect this thesis could be located in the latter line since it examines particularly the political role of poetry and novel in the process of nation building in Turkey.

Considering the two-fold idea, founding of a nation-state and attempt to civilization, as the basic motives in the building of the Republic, it would not be a mistake to define the essential subject of the Turkish Republic as a new concept of 'Citizen'. This new identity search in the name of the people has necessarily employed the objective of developing a new culture, again, for the people (Tekelioğlu, 1996: 194, Keyman, 1995:103-104). Therefore, the cultural politics has been assigned a peculiar role in the process of nation building and national identity, as the articulating principle of which was the concept of citizenship.

The broad field of cultural politics has showed its effects in many different spheres, from the Turkish music to the development of sport activities. The Turkish literature, in this respect has constituted one of the major fields. Throughout the early years of the republican period, both the verse and the prose form have carried the effects of the conducted cultural politics, and they became political means to express the message of the republican ideology. Therefore, it might be said that the

1

construction of the nation-state and the idea of civilization constituted the two main themes of the Turkish literature.

In this thesis the development of the republican ideology is examined through the study of the Turkish literature. The notion of 'revolutionary' literature that addresses to the 'glorious' emergence of Turkish Republic is the main trait for both the poetry and the novel during the early years of the republican period. Therefore, this thesis is in fact an examination of the notion of 'revolutionary' literature that took part in the building of a nation-state with a strong attempt to civilization. This is also to say that the early republican literature mirrors us the underlying ideology of these two basic motives.

In this respect, throughout the thesis I argue that the Turkish nationalism and its political reflection were based on a self/other relationship. While this 'self' was composed of the notion of 'people', the Turkish nation and its culture, the 'other' basically referred to the recent Ottoman past and its cultural artifacts. In the examination of the 'revolutionary' literature this separation appears more apparently. The narration of the Turkish Republic, in both verse and prose forms becomes the point where the tension between the 'self' and the 'other' surfaces. In this respect the making of the 'self' that is included as opposed to the excluded 'other' in literary works is the primary point in this thesis to trace. While the case study conducted on the early republican literature presents the concrete examples of this process, the theoretical examination of the relationship between the 'self' and the 'other' is introduced to the reader in the following chapter. Following the line of Homi Bhabha's analysis on the post-colonial literature, I argued that the republican

literature can be analyzed as an example of Bhabha's concept of 'double narrative movement', which is also embedded in the construction of Turkish nationalism. In other words, the main trait of the literature, i.e. while promoting the theme of folk culture, rejecting the former Ottoman literary forms, is the reflection of the 'self/other' relationship, which is formed in a 'double time' based upon the tension between the present and the past.

Another important argument that is possessed in this thesis is related to the formation of the republican civilization model. As stated earlier, the notion of reaching to the level of 'contemporary civilizations' has constituted the other main motive of the republican ideology. Nevertheless, the republican modernization has differentiated itself from the previous Ottoman experience by taking the Western world not as a mere model of technology to be important but as a whole philosophy. This was, indeed, the basic reason behind the importance given to the cultural politics. However, the realization of this perception has created a form of civilization that mostly recognized in the formal transformation of the cultural elements. In this respect the Westernization of the Turkish music, as analyzed by Tekelioğlu (1996), depends upon the adoption of the Western music form into the Turkish music. The musical form that Ottoman in origin was rejected and a new musical form was introduced to the listeners. The emergence of the polyphonic Turkish music was the direct result of these cultural policies. It appeared that in the Westernization of the Turkish music, the form of the music, instead of its content was given primary importance. A similar tension can be recognized in the emergence of the 'revolutionary' literature. Particularly in poetry, the rising debate on syllabic (*hece*)

3

meter vs. prosody (*aruz*) meter is another representation of the same formal perception. Nonetheless, it should be bear in mind that the emergence of the republican literature was the result of simultaneous synthesis of rising Turkish nationalism and pro-Westernism.

Regarding this basic relationship between the literature and politics I develop this thesis in three chapters. In the second chapter, I mainly focus on the relationship between the emerging modernization movements in the Ottoman Empire and its reflection on the literature. The basic purpose of this chapter is to introduce a proper background for understanding both the development of the idea of modernization and the rise of the politicized literature. In the first part of the this chapter, the historical development the Westernization movements and the politics throughout the last century of the Empire are presented. Despite the fact that there was not a precise time for the beginning of the attempt at Westernization, I focused on the last century of the Empire due to the limited scope of this thesis. Together with the developing Westernization movements, I also examined the search for identity throughout the period. By looking at the political trends of Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism, I tried to explore the sources that initiated the idea of nationalism.

The second part of the chapter concentrates on the literary tradition of the Ottoman Empire. The Divan poetry, which later became the central of criticisms during the republican era, the *Tanzimat* literature, its successive movement the *Servet-i Fünun* literature, and finally the national literature movement are examined in accordance with the emerging politics of the period. The basic concern in the presentation of these literary movements is to figure out the association between the

political agenda and its reflection on the changing literary works. In this respect, the *Tanzimat* literature that reveals the ideas of Young Ottomans and the emerging quest for the identity search of the Empire's elites has been main point of release of this chapter.

A second concern of this section is to introduce the reader with the development of the conditions that led to the rise of 'revolutionary' literature during the early years of the republican period. With respect to the development of *Tanzimat* and *Servet-i Fünun* literary movements, the national literature movement was the main source for the emerging republican literature. Therefore, the national literature movement led by Ali Canip Yöntem, Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, Ömer Seyfettin and Ziya Gökalp is examined as a crucial turning point in the Ottoman literature. In essence, these writers were the first representatives of the romantic nationalism in the Turkish literature. The notion of 'people' that was firstly pronounced in *Genç Kalemler* journal would be the basis for the future theme of the republican literature. In this respect, the 'self/other' relationship, which could not be easily observed in the previously mentioned Ottoman literary traditions, would appear for the first time, in the national literature movement.

In the third chapter, I focused on the republican period, in particular between the years of the 1930-1945. The main issue discussed in the first part of this chapter is the ideological motives that differentiate the republican modernization process from the previous Ottoman experience. The strong notion of 'Turkish nationalism' and the 'will to civilization' rather then a mere Westernization were the basic elements in the construction of the republican thought that created a discontinuity in the

modernization practice. Considering these crucial factors, I tried to explore the roles of the introduced reforms and established institutions with respect to the underlying idea of constructing a national identity. Another critical point in the examination of the republican institutions is to understand the relationship between the designative functioning of these establishments and the emergence of the new Turkish literature. This is also important to analyze the attitude of the republican ideology towards the literature. In essence, understanding the formation of the key themes in the 'revolutionary' literature can be possible by looking at the works of these institutions.

The examination of the republican literature is the heart of the third chapter. Under three subtitles, the 'revolutionary' literature, the poetry, and the novel, I tried to present the reflections of the political agenda of the period on the literary works. In this respect, the script reform, which is separately analyzed, constitutes an important point in understanding the politization of the literature. The script reform, also exemplifies the formal concerns in the development of Turkish literature. In the following parts of the chapter, I tried to give the basic thematic of the republican literature that is the issue of the pure and simplistic usage of the Turkish language, and its reflections on poetry and novel. While the main subject in the republican poetry was the debate on syllabic poetry meter vs. prosody meter, the novel offered the unique narration of the 'self/other' relationship grounding the Turkish nationalism.

In the fourth chapter, I tried to present the theoretical framework through which the case of the republican literature and its relationship with the political agenda can be analyzed. Therefore, I initially look at the theories of nationalism in

order to set up a proper ground for the analysis of Turkish nationalism. Throughout the first section of this chapter, I briefly reviewed the theories that present a framework on the formation of the syntax of nationalism. In this respect, Renan's influential article, 'What is a Nation' and his emphasis on the national amnesia gave a fruitful starting base for understanding the formation of a nation. Following Renan, I mainly focused on the works of three important theoreticians, Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson and Partha Chatterjee. While Gellner, and Anderson are approaching to the construction of the idea of 'nation' as a result of development in the economical sphere of the Western world, (the concept of industrial society introduced by Gellner, as oppose to the Anderson's print-capitalism), Chatterjee basically criticizes these two theoreticians since they could not overcome the liberal dilemma of nationalism. Although I bear in mind the rightly criticisms of Chatterjee, throughout the theoretical framework of this thesis, the line developed by Anderson in *Imagined Communities* provides fruitful paths and clues to understand the points touched in this study. Moreover, the parallel points of his analysis with Homi Bhabha's study on the structuring of the post-colonial nationalism and its narration makes it possible to reach a consistent, if not completely integrated, theoretical framework for my study. Bhabha's theoretical framework constituted the basic ground for the analysis of the republican literature case. . In the fourth chapter, I tried to show the appropriateness of Bhabha's theory for understanding the dynamics in the emergence of the Turkish literature. Furthermore, in this context, I also reviewed a brief comparative case that tries to analyze the Greek literature. Gregory Jusdanis's book *Belated Modernity Aesthetic Culture* helped me to recognize and display the

similarities between emergence of the Turkish and Greek literatures during the process of nation building. Regarding, Jusdanis's argument on the relationship between the literature and the rising Greek nationalist discourse and attempted modernity, I would like to draw another picture of 'nationalism' to make the Turkish literature case more apparent. Of course, the question of how to make this theoretical framework intelligible should be posed at the end of this study for elaborated future studies.

Chapter II: The Last Century of the Empire: Westernization, Politics and Literature

2.1 Westernization Movements: 1808-1908

The start of the modernization movements in the Ottoman Empire did neither have a precise time and nor location. There is, rather, a vague answer to give. İlber Ortaylı states "it is not clear whether the Ottoman modernization starts with the establishment of printing office, or with the attempts at Westernization in Ottoman social and cultural life, or by the reforms initiated by Mahmud II, or with the announcement of *Hatt-ı Hümayun* (Imperial Rescript) (Ortaylı, 2000: 28). As a consequence, the fact that modernization attempts during the Ottoman era did not follow a straight path should always be considered in any analysis of the Ottoman reformation movements.

Most historians analyze the main objective of the politics of the last century of the Ottoman Empire as a committed attempt to construct an evolution in the structure of the system. This idea of evolutionary change arises from the military defeats of the Ottoman army, which had begun by the end of the 18th century.

In Ottoman Empire the army and state were totally intertwined. The economy was intimately tied to wars and territorial gains, and the Sultan was the natural head of the army. A strong relationship was established between economic organization, taxation, 'surplus appropriation' and military organization. Each of these was established as to complement each other. While all males were potential soldiers, training professional soldiers was a matter of great importance for the survival of the state. In the words of historian Albert Lybyer: "Ottoman rule had become an army

above all. The entire ruling institution kept itself governing, defending the Empire and enlarging it by being organized like an army" (Lybyer 1994: 93). Together with this strong emphasis on the army, the Ottoman Empire developed its own institutions and methods for structuring the army and provided the conditions necessary for the continuation of its military power.

Following the loss of the Empire's ability to grow in the 17th century, Ottoman administrators realized that one of the main reasons for the decline was the technical backwardness of the army against foreign armies. In order to change the situation, they focused on the re-organization of military units and the establishment of new ones whose officers were to be trained in military schools based on European model. These developments led the Empire into encounter with Europe and to developing a relationship with it different from previous relationships. A group of Ottoman political elite was determined to introduce European military techniques to the army and stop the decline of the Empire. It might be said that the idea of reform, which was initiated in the army became the first step of successive reformations that continued for a century (Rustow, 1973: 97, Ahmad, 1993: 24).

The attempts at reforming the army had started with Sultan Selim III and quickly continued with the abolishment of the Janissaries by Mahmud II. However, limiting the reform movement only with the concern for armed power would be wrong. The idea of reform was instead an effort to create a change in the social and cultural life of the Empire. Clearly, the Western world was not taken as a model only in the case of army. As Mardin (1992: 11) argues, "the aim to take the Western armies as a model had accelerated during the periods of Mahmud II, Abdülhamit and

especially Selim III, and this idea was strengthened by the establishment of the Empire's permanent embassies. Through the diplomatic relationship established by these embassies systematic evaluation of the European thinking and consequently the modeling of the Western world had developed".

It was true that the objective of 'Westernization' usually meant the mere imitation of the Western world. In this sense the Western world appeared mainly as the army, education, and communications institutions, and there was not much interest in the philosophy that lay behind the Western technical world. It was, in fact the missing element throughout the reforms enacted during the Ottoman era.

Mahmud II's reign and the reforms realized during his rule had a special importance for successive Ottoman modernization. In 1808, the first year of his reign, Mahmud signed the *Sened-i İttifak* (Deed of Agreement), which gave formal recognition to the *ayans* (the senates), feudal rights and autonomies in the Ottoman Empire (Lewis, 1968, 448). On the other hand, this agreement became the first formal sign indicating that the (political) authority no longer belonged only to Ottoman dynasty. While, the *Sened-i İttifak*, because of this feature, is mentioned as an example of a kind of Magna Carta, this, as Ortaylı (2000: 17) argues, would be an exaggeration, since a few years later it was to be abolished the sultan himself. However, the Deed of Agreement indicates an important turning point in the changing structure and balance of power of the Empire.

The crucial reform that Mahmud II accomplished was the abolishment of the Janissaries (*Vaka-ı Hayriye*) in 1826. The newly organized army, bringing to mind the revival of the *Nizam-ı Cedid*, was named the *Asakir-i Mansurre-i Muhammediye*

(Trained Victorious Soldiers of Muhammad). He continued his reforms in the fields of education, health and communications. However, the most important change that he engineered was the emergence of a new bureaucratic class (Ahmad, 1993: 25, Zürcher, 1993: 45). It was this class that brought about the subsequent modernization movements, most notably the *Tanzimat*, in the Ottoman period. As Ahmad (1993: 26) states, "these new officials, who launched a new program of reform and reorganization known in Turkish as the *Tanzimat*, were steeped in Western ideas and looked to Europe as their model and inspiration".

Another important transformation that occurred mutually with the emergence of a new bureaucratic class was the centralization of state affairs in opposition to the independent *ulema* class (Lewis, 1968: 443). The basic reason for an attempt at centralization was the realization of reforms without having to face the independent power of the opposing groups. The Janissaries were the most critical of them. After the abolishment of the Janissaries the ulema class constituted the important opposition group. For this purpose, the ulema lost its financial independence and their religious endowments were taken over and made the paid to the officials of the state. (Ahmad, 1993: 25).

Understanding the causes for the emergence of this new centralized state and rising bureaucratic class is important, since the leading figures and elements of the modernization movements that followed took their inspiration from this period.

When Sultan Mahmud II died in 1839, a new period was opened in the history of the Empire. The next sultan, Abdülmecit, called his reign as the *Tanzimat* (reform) period. Under Abdülmecit's rule the centralizing and modernizing reforms continued

essentially in the same vein. The *Tanzimat* edict was the announcement of this period of reform. It was a statement of intent on the part of the Ottoman government, promising the following four essential articles:

1- The establishment of guarantees for the life, honour and property of the sultan's subjects;

2- An orderly system of taxation to replace the system of tax-farming;

3- A system of conscription for the army; and

4- Equality of all subjects before law whatever their religion (Zürcher, 1993: 53).

It was apparent that the promised reforms symbolized the continuation of Mahmud II's intentions and policies. According to Zürcher (1993: 53), "[the] call for guarantees for the life, honor and property of the subjects, apart from echoing classical liberal thought as understood by the Ottoman statesman who had been to Europe and knew European languages, also reflected the Ottoman bureaucrats' desire to escape their vulnerable position as slaves of the sultan". In other words, the new class was demanding its emancipation from the absolute power of the sultan.

Another important feature of the *Tanzimat* edict was the economic statements it contained. At this point, it is worth remembering that the *Tanzimat* edict was declared only a year after the Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Convention of 1838. The treaty abandoned the economic protectionism policy and permitted foreign merchants to engage directly in the domestic trade for the first time[1]. According to Ahmad

---

[1] It should be noted that, for many, the 1838 treaty represented the hidden colonization of the Ottoman Empire. See, for example, N. Berkes, 1978. *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*, İstanbul: Doğu-Batı Yayınları, Avcıoğlu, D. 1969. *Türkiye'nin Düzeni: Dün-Bugün-Yarın,* İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi.

(1993: 27), the *Tanzimat* leaders had believed that the European economic penetration and the empire's absorption into the world market was the only way to continue its rule. However, this breaking apart of the state from the economy led *Tanzimat* authorities to enjoy a new kind of interventionism focusing on society. According to Ahmad since this new kind of interventionism was emerging to compensate for the state's break from the economy, it was something even more than regulating society. "Its purpose was now, broadly speaking, social engineering" (Ahmad, 1993: 27).

It was, in fact, this notion of 'social engineering' that gives the broad cultural dimension to the *Tanzimat* era. The bureaucratic class, many of whom had been acquired in the Translation Office or in the Foreign Correspondence Office of the Porte, was now exposing its knowledge (of the Western world) in the service of the cultural transformation objective of the *Tanzimat*. However, this attempt to realize the cultural reform was basically an up-down movement and was unable to accomplish set a structural transformation of society.

As a result of this inadequate formation, the policies of the *Tanzimat* did not gain wide popularity or acceptance in public. Rather, they were frequently criticized: First of all, one of the basic aims of the edict, keeping the non-Muslim societies living in the Empire united with it, could not be achieved. Instead, the spread of separatist nationalism among the Empire's Christian peoples rapidly gained ground. Secondly, the reforms were objected to, by a Muslim group known as the Young Ottomans. The Young Ottomans, in which Şinasi, Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha were the leading figures, defended the combination of Islamic values with liberal ideas. The French Revolution and its ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity were the basic sources of

inspiration sources for the Young Ottomans group. However, the philosophy of the French Revolution was combined together with the nostalgia for both the golden age of Islam and the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, the basic criticism that the Young Ottomans directed at the *Tanzimat* bureaucrats was that they applied superficial imitations of Europe without regard for traditional Ottoman and Islamic values. Moreover, they criticized Ali and Fuat Pasha, the leading bureaucrats of the Empire, as being subservient to European interests (Zürcher, 1993: 71).

The Young Ottomans, for the most of the part, tried to make their voices heard through the channels of the press and literature. The names mentioned in this group, especially Namık Kemal and Ziya Pasha, were important poets of the period. Another critical name, Şinasi, had published his own paper *Tasvir-i Efkar* (The Interpretation of Circumstances), and the paper had become an instrument for spreading criticism directed at the government. Şinasi, furthermore, made many translations from French literature into Turkish and contributed to the emerging French influence on Turkish literature and political thought.

It would not be wrong to say that the Young Ottomans movement was, indeed, the result of a growing identity crisis in the upper classes of the Ottoman Empire. As Mardin rightly puts it, the new Ottoman bureaucracy that could not form its social basis was unable to create a proper identity for itself. On the other hand, the Young Ottomans movement, which was influenced by the idea of 'liberty' and which combined this ideal with their thoughts of a great Islam-Empire culture, was able to create for itself a social base (Mardin. 1992: 86). In this respect, Mardin considers the

role of literature to be very important. "Literature is an social element that brings the idea of national 'unity' to the Ottoman Empire" (Mardin. 1992: 85).

Finally, the Young Ottomans movement had prepared the ideological basis for its succesor movement, the Young Turks. Their goal of introducing representative, constitutional and parliamentary government into the Empire was to be realized almost a decade later. Moreover, the failure of the *Tanzimat* ideal, uniting the communities of the Empire, i.e. Ottomanism, had led to the emergence of new political ideals shaped around the idea of Islam (Pan-Islamism), and idea of nation (Pan-Turkism).

The *Tanzimat* era ended in 1876 with the deposing of the Sultan Abdülmecit. This, in fact, was the beginning of the first constitutional regime experience of the Ottoman state. However, the parliament that was officially opened in 1877 was to be closed down a year later by Abdülhamit II. The absolute monarchy of Abdülhamit II continued until 1908. Throughout his reign some elements of reform were carried out. A spectacular development in the communications field was observed when telegraph technology was introduced (Zürcher, 1993: 81). Similarly, railway construction gained momentum. Sultan Abdülhamit II obviously benefited from the *Tanzimat*'s heritage of a centralized administration. However, the major failure of Abdülhamit II was the weak relationship he established with the bureaucratic class and the intelligentsia (Zürcher. 1993: 90). This situation, combined with the development of the most powerful opposition group in Ottoman history, was promised the end of Red Sultan's era: In 1908 the Young Turks' revolution put an end to the reign of Abdülhamit II.

The Young Turks can be analyzed as the continuation of the Young Ottomans movement. But, as a result of the centralizing reforms that had been continuing since the reign of Mahmud II, the Young Turks had originated with high- ranking bureaucratic class of the dynasty as opposed to the Young Ottomans who had strongly criticized the first generation of Ottoman bureaucratic class. The Young Turks pursued policies in virtually every sphere of life, from education to taxation. As Ahmad argues, "they not only change the political system but also attempted to refashion society by borrowing more freely from the West than ever before" (Ahmad, 1993: 31).

The Young Turks movement managed to combine many opposition groups against Abdülhamit's reign. However, in itself, the movement was divided into two principle camps: Liberals and Unionists. In general, the Liberals supported the constitutional monarchy controlled by high- ranking bureaucrats (Lewis. 1963: 202-204). The system they demanded took the British constitution as a model. They agreed with the continuation and further development of the *Tanzimat* policies. Similar to the *Tanzimat* leaders, who believed in the necessity of foreign help for successful modernization, the Liberals expected Britain to back their regime by providing loans and expertise to guide them (Ahmad, 1993: 34-35). The ideology that the Liberals espoused was Ottomanism, again was an artifact of the *Tanzimat* period.

On the other hand, the Unionists, members of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), also supported the constitutional regime, but for them the overthrow of the autocracy was the initial and necessary step in order to move on to a constitutional government (Ahmad: 35-36). The political model that the Unionists

aspired to was derived primarily from the German and also Japanese models, which were expected to bring about 'union and progress' in the Empire.

The Liberals organized a party against the CUP, namely the *Ahrar Fırkası* (Liberal Union) in 1908. However, the 1908 elections were a great victory for the CUP, and the Liberal Union won only one seat (Zürcher, 1993: 99). Following the 1908 election, it could be said that another period, the 'union and progress' era, started in the history of the Empire.

There were three main political views that bound the policies of the CUP and Ottoman politics together: Ottomanism, Islamism, and Turkism. Ottomanism was basically a result of the liberal policies of the *Tanzimat* period, which demanded assimilation with the West and hoped to save the multi- ethnic formation of the Ottoman Empire by granting equal rights to all of its citizens without regard to religion or race (Lewis, 1963: 326-327, Zürcher, 1993: 132). Islamism, or Pan-Islamism, on the other hand, referred to the clericalism of the orthodox Muslims who insisted that Islam must retain its fundamental role in politics, culture, and social life and serve as a link that could not be broken between the Muslim nations within the Empire, particularly the Turks, Kurds and Arabs, and those beyond its borders. Obviously, the word 'caliph' was expected to have a uniting influence within Muslim communities (Lewis, 1963, 340-343, Heyd, 1950: 71). Finally Turkism, or Pan-Turkism, was emergence of the nationalist thinking among the local originating intellectuals (Ahmad, 1993: 39).

As Zürcher (1993: 133) rightly pointed out, "neither of those ideologies was mutually exclusive: many Young Turks rationally supported the idea of Ottomanism,

were emotionally attached to a romantic Pan-Turkism and were devout Muslims at the same time". Nevertheless, it should be noted that these ideological debates stemmed from a fundamental problem of regeneration: Westernization. Therefore, it might be possible to summarize that all three of the political choices were, indeed, emerging from a fundamental question of Westernization while trying to find a proper identity for the future of the state.

Yusuf Akçura, in his article, Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset (Three Types of Policy), brilliantly describes the situation at the beginning of the 20th century. Basically, he compared the relative merits and fusibility of the Ottomanist, Islamist and Turkist policies while advocating the third one. The article can be considered as the first conscious manifesto of Turkism. Akçura (1994: 14) pointed out that the expectation of maintaining the integrity of the various nations within the Empire was nothing more than an illusion. Similarly, the formation of a political union among the members of Muslim nations was a project doomed to failure because of hindering on the parts of the colonial powers. However, by contrast the union of the Turkish and Turkic peoples emerged as the most appropriate policy, since it would have to get the support of all Turkic peoples and would face little opposition except from Russia (Akçura, 1994: 17-18).

The Turkism ideology developed quite rapidly as the failures of the other two movements became apparent. The establishment of the Turkish Hearths in 1911 as the official social and cultural organization of the CUP gave priority to expansion of its ideology. However, the genuine movement was not developing from the Pan-Turkist objective that Akçura proposed, but rather from a romantic idealization of the

Anatolian 'people' as the seed of the national solidarity. The immediate result of this understanding became the establishment of the organization *Halka Doğru* (Towards the People) in Izmir in 1917. Not surprisingly, the continuation of this 'populist' nationalism made its mark on the early years of the republican ideology as well.

Many important figures espousing to the Turkism ideology interestingly come from the literary world. Poets like, Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, Ali Canip Yöntem, Ziya Gökalp, or writers such as Ömer Seyfettin, and Fuat Köprülü were among the well-known names of the Turkist line of thought. The journal *Genç Kalemler*, in which many of the names above were mentioned, was the literary narrator of Turkism. The most important question raised by the writers was the language issue and the reflection of nationalist thought in literature. In this respect, it might be said that the national identity question was first posed in literary works.

Among these writers Ziya Gökalp exerted considerable influence on the future ideological foundations of the Turkish Republic. Similarly, the literary methodology –the use of the pure Turkish language, the revival of folk literature etc.- he proposed were to be the essential elements of the new republican literature. But more importantly, the modernization scheme, which he derived from his understanding of 'nation' and 'nationalism', became an important complement of the republican modernization. The influence of Gökalp is discussed in chapter 2 in detail.

In reviewing the notion of modernization in the last century of the Ottoman Empire, it is remarkable that the issue of Westernization had continuously brought about a question of identity into the political arena. Throughout the last century of the Empire the search for a proper identity that could accomplish with the attempt at

Westernization reflected in three different ideologies: Ottomanism, Pan- Islamism and Turkism. These lines of thought clearly constituted the political agenda. Therefore, the emerging identity question was a common feature of the Westernization movements in the Ottoman Empire.

Another common feature of all attempts at westernization was their emergence as a movement from the center, i.e. from the top down. As Ortaylı (2000: 32) noted, "[the] Ottoman modernization was an autocratic one. It is only the outcome of both the domestic and international developments that led the Empire from this autocratic modernization to the constitutional monarchy in the last forty years of its life".

Throughout the entire modernization experience of the Empire, there appeared a considerable number of literary men in the political arena. From Namık Kemal to Ziya Gökalp, these peoples played important roles in the formation of the agenda of Ottoman politics. The essential result of this situation was the politization of the literature, especially after the second half of the 19th century. The literary works of the period were not only reflections of the political agenda, but in many cases they were the determining figures of the ideological movements. It, therefore, becomes the relationship between politics and literature, which I attempt to expose in the following part. Regarding the main question posed in this thesis, the development of politicized literature in the Ottoman era could provide a meaningful groundwork for understanding the basic motives of the emergence of republican literature.

2.2 The Ottoman Literary Works

2.2.1. The Poetry

It is true that from the very beginning of the development of literature in Ottoman culture, poetry writing, or, in general, verse, became the major field of literature. Although there were examples of literary works written in prose, they were a type of verse written without the use of poetic meter. The first examples of writing in prose form, in the Western sense, do not appear until the 19th century. It is only after then that the novel form is accepted as a literary work and employed by Ottoman writers. Therefore, an analysis of the classical Ottoman literature is in facts an evaluation of the history of Divan.

Nevertheless, as Richard C. Clark says in the words of John R. Walsh, "a critical history of the classical Ottoman literature has not been written yet and moreover the sources are still not convenient for such a study" (Clark, 1999: 159). The history of the Divan poetry tradition was started to be written in the 18th century. Both Ottoman (later Turkish) and foreign scholars paid attention to the development of the Divan poetry. However, many works of foreign scholars appeared to be comprehensive bibliographies of the Divan writers. They usually did not contain a critical history of the Divan tradition. On the other hand, the Turkish sources on Divan usually contained strong criticisms directed at Divan poetry tradition, but unfortunately could not go beyond that. Most criticisms were directed by a new generation of writers who were influenced by Western literature. In addition to the effects of Westernization, the changing political ideologies of both Ottoman and republican period became another reason for raised criticisms. As a result, the history

of the Divan tradition was frequently criticized from a political perspective. The clearest examples of these critics were occurred in the republican period, which is examined in the next chapter.

The emergence of Divan poetry in the history of the Turks does not begin with the Ottomans, but rather, is a heritage of the previous Selçuk rule. Basically, Divan poetry was transformed from the Persian literary tradition. Its main feature was the prosody form, a poetry meter, and the rhyme requirement in the poem. Not surprisingly, this transformation, or better to say adoption of a literary form from the Persian culture has a close relationship with the acceptance of a general Islamic culture. As E. J. Gibb (1999: 55) points out,

> The Turks had immediately adopted the entire literary system of Persia in detail, just as they had adopted Islam without asking a single question. They had not even stopped to think about the suitability of Persian culture for their own, and besides they had not even tried to change it according to their own talents. On the contrary, they tried to adopt and understand texts in Persian language and they even tried to perceive everything from a Persian point of view.

The essential result of this adoption was the necessary fusion of Persian and Arabic into Turkish. Persian poetry, and the prosody form depending upon the length of the syllables, which within the context of the Turkish language was hard to adopt. Consequently, Persian and Arabic words started to appear in Divan works. Concerning the beginning period of Divan literature, Gibb argues that "It was not Turkish that was becoming Persian, but instead it was Persian that was becoming

Turkish (Gibb, 1999: 55). However, after three centuries those Persian words that became Turkish were at the same time turned into words in the Ottoman language. As stated in Giovanni Donado's analogy, "the Turkish language is decorated with Persian language, just as we are (the Italian language) with the Tuscan language" (Donado, 1999: 18).

Although in most of the literature the development of the Divan tradition is seen as corresponding to the growth of the Empire, it is not so straightforward (Ortaylı, 1999: 218). Throughout the classical period of the Empire, Divan poetry follows the Persian school and for most of the part it imitates Persian poetry. However, during the period of Süleyman I, Divan offers its most unique and precious works by Fuzuli and Baki. In the periods that followed, the tradition continued to present its important poets and their works. Among them, Nefi, Nabi, Naima, Şeyh Galip, and Yahya Kemal in the last years of the Empire are worth to mentioning.

It is true that Divan poetry always belonged to the dynasty or the upper classes of the Empire. It never gained a widespread popularity among the people. The basic reason for this was the Persian language, which was used heavily in poetry. A second reason might be the general themes of the Divan tradition. The essential mysticism founded in Divan poetry made it quite symbolic and allegoric. Combined with the linguistic difficulties it was almost impossible for Divan literature to become a widely used poetry form by the masses. Therefore, it should be remembered that in addition to the development of Divan literature, the folk literature always continued to produce its works.

Together with the beginning of the Westernization movements in the Ottoman Empire, the political agenda directly influenced developments in literature. By the second half of the 19th century, a new type of literature started to emerge. It is a fact that, the Westernization movements negatively affected the Divan tradition and that the tradition had lost its importance by the end of the 20th century. Although this was a necessary result of the changing culture, throughout the period of decline of the tradition it encountered strong criticisms, which were politically motivated. Divan literature became the target of many debates. In fact, it was this situation that makes the Divan literature and the debates surrounding it very unique. As a literary school, the Divan poetry form, and the prosody meter in particular, turned into an 'other' in discursive structure. In this respect, Divan literature plays an important role in understanding the development of the new Turkish literature.

By the end of the 17th century a new literary school emerged in the Ottoman cultural world. The *Tanzimat* literature was indeed the direct result of the Westernization movements that surrounded the Ottoman state. Among the important names of the *Tanzimat* literature, we see the critical figures of the political arena. Namık Kemal, Ziya Pasha, Şinasi, and Ahmet Vefik Pasha are only a few examples.

The French influence over the *Tanzimat* period politics also shows itself clearly on literature. Two basic characteristics identify *Tanzimat* poetry: the French Romanticism and attempts to simplify the poetry. Şinasi's important translations from French to Turkish prompted the change in poetic form. Starting with Namık Kemal, many poets transformed their style. In poetry writing the importance of the context

became apparent, and thus the formal requirements of Divan tradition decreased in importance. This necessarily led to a simplification in the poetry.

On the other hand, folk literature was gaining in importance, following the revival of Turkish words and syllabic verse of folk poetry. Many folkloric bards, such as Karacaoğlan and, dervish poets like Yunus Emre and Mevlana turned out to be crucial figures in the newly emerging poetry. However, there was still no instance of pure Turkish in poetry. *Tanzimat* poetry, in this respect, is the initial step for the purification and simplification of the language.

Another critical element of *Tanzimat* poetry was its becoming gradually politicized. Unlike Divan tradition, *Tanzimat* poetry involves issues such as liberty, rights, civilization, and state. From the *Tanzimat* period on political issues emerged as an inseparable part of the poetry.

Following *Tanzimat* literature, a new literary school emerged during the despotic monarchy of Abdülhamit II, *Edebiyat-ı Cedide* (New Literature). The new movement was basically an opposition to the growing tendencies of *Tanzimat* poetry. The members of the *Edebiyat-ı Cedide* movement were also regular writers for the journal *Servet-i Fünun,* edited by the gifted poet Tevfik Fikret. Therefore, for most of the part the *Edebiyat-ı Cedide* or *Servet-i Fünun* movements were used to refer to the same period of the Ottoman literature.

The *Servet-i Fünun* journal, beginning with the very first issue, had a certain literary interest in a Westernizing tendency and published translations, particularly from the French literature. The journal included many important writers of the period, such as Tevfik Fikret, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, and Cenap Şehabettin. It was, in fact

during Tevfik Fikret's editorship that *Servet-i Fünun* made its impact on Turkish literature (Lewis, 1968: 192). The group was conservative both on political issues and on the formation of literature. Rejecting the tendencies of simplification and purification of language in the *Tanzimat* period, they wrote in a style, which was intentionally complex and obscure, and full of Persian and Arabic words and expressions. Furthermore, as Mustafa Nihat Özön (1934: 91-92) states, the writers of *Servet-i Fünun* addressed only a highly educated elite.

Nevertheless, in *Servet-i Fünun* poems the Western influence, in particular the impact of the French school, was clear. Lewis (1968: 193) argues "They were not rejecting the literature of the West; there, on the contrary, under the prevailing influence of the French symbolists, they were able to find an aesthetic justification for the retreat into the ivory tower, which the Hamidian censorship had imposed upon them". Consequently, while the poems of *Servet-i Fünun* avoided politics, they simultaneously carried the conservative, and even reactionary agenda of the period's politics. It should be noted that many of its writers held strong political views, and they often had trouble with the authorities. Tevfik Fikret himself was in exile for many years.

The major contribution of *Servet-i Fünun* literature was, indeed a backward shift in the attempts of purification and simplification of literature. The ongoing debate of Ottoman literature i.e. whether art is for the sake of art or for the sake of the people, was came out on the side of concern for pure art. However, it is clear that *Servet-i Fünun* literature was part of the continuing Westernization attempts in the written world. The French influence on *Tanzimat* literature became clearer and more

pronounced in the *Edebiyat-ı Cedide* movement. Throughout the despotic rule of Abdülhamit II, the writers of *Servet-i Fünun* had produced unique pieces of Ottoman poetry, and they represented the idea of Westernization in a distinguished style.

The 1908 revolution initiated another period not only in political life but also in literature. The emerging ideology of Turkism started to show its first instances in literature. In this respect, Turkism became the main train of thought in literature. As a result the literary works, particularly poetry were created according to the 'principles of Turkism'. The *Genç Kalemler* journal, first published in 1910 and after renewing in 1911, was the most important literary journal that espoused the Turkism ideology.

The writers of *Genç Kalemler* strongly criticized the former literary movements, but in particular the *Tanzimat* and Servet-i Fünun schools. According to Yöntem the *Tanzimat* writers influenced by Western literature, had claimed to believe in the simplification and purification of the language but they had merely taken over heritage of the Divan literature and perpetuated it. None of the characters described in *Tanzimat* literature could be a part of Turkish culture. Similarly, the *Servet-i Fünun* movement had brought no Turkish element into the development of a national literature but rather emphasized the usage of Arabic and Persian elements (Arai, 1994: 51).

For the writers of Genç Kalemler, there was no longer any possibility of talking about an Ottoman literature. Turkish language, and Turkish culture should be the main ground for the emerging new literature. Therefore, the initial requirement was the use of pure Turkish language. Secondly, literature should be for the people

and thus the simplicity of the language was another requirement. They argued for a formal change in the language and in literature above all (Arai, 1994: 64).

The new language was required, first of all for the people of the Turkey of the day. Ömer Seyfettin claimed, "Turkish is a necessity for the awakening Turkish nation" (Arai, 1994: 63). The influence of Gökalp's thought was clear in the journal's arguments. In this respect, the notions of 'nation' and 'people' should be analyzed regarding Gökalp's theory of nationalism.

The ideology of the journal should be considered together with the political agenda of the CUP. After the 1910s, developments in the political arena showed that the emerging nationalism ideology, or Turkism, would be the dominant policy of the party. The immediate result of this political movement was the growing importance of Anatolia and the Turkish nation. The establishment of organizations such as the Turkish Hearths and Towards People were the best examples of this transformation. In literature, with respect to those changes, there occurred new trends. Folk literature and in particular folk poetry were accepted as the original poetry of the Turkish nation and they became the primary source for the writers of *Genç Kalemler*. The Divan tradition and its successive movements were rejected and criticized as having an artificial and cosmopolitan literary language that addressed only a limited class. Therefore every poetic form of the earlier Ottoman poetry, particularly prosody meter was rejected, instead the *Genç Kalemler* poets wrote in syllabic meter. Yurdakul's famous lines are important for seeing the correspondence between the literary form and the emerging Turkism: "I am a Turk, my religion, my race is noble" (Ortaç, 1941:

13). Similarly, Gökalp expressed his dream of a Pan- Turkist land with the following lines written in syllabic meter,

"The country of the Turks is not Turkey, nor yet Turkistan,

Their country is a vast and eternal land: Turan!" (Heyd, 1950: 45)

The writers gathered around *Genç Kalemler* published their manifesto of literary principles in the first issue. According to that manifesto:

1- Noun phrases from Arabic and Persian will never be used and with the exception of terms such as *sadrazam* (grand vizier) *kainat* (universe).

2- The prepositions from Arabic and Persian will never be used, with the exception of words that are used in the spoken language such as *yani,* (therefore, thus) *lakin,* (however, but) and *şayet* (if).

3- Words from Arabic and Persian can be used if there are no equivalent phrases in Turkish. Additionally the remaining foreign words have to be used in their daily spoken form, such as *kalabalık,* (crowded) and *hoca* (teacher).

4- In the written language pure and simple Turkish alone will be dominant.

5- In the spoken language, the Istanbul accent, which is clear for many Turks, will be used as a comparative pattern for the written language (*Çınaraltı*, 1941).

Regarding the development of republican literature it might be said that the writers of *Genç Kalemler* with their literary style and manifesto on the usage of language became the leading poets of the republican poetry. The two principal characteristics of the early republican poetry, i.e. the use of pure Turkish language together with the syllabic meter form and the emphasis of 'nation' in the themes of poems, are clearly continuing forms of the poetic style created in *Genç Kalemler*.

Throughout the last century of the Ottoman Empire, Ottoman poetry for the most part had retained the features of traditional Divan poems. However, the period starting with the *Tanzimat* had also influenced literature and led the poetry form to change gradually. While the formal transformations in poetic style, such as simplification and purification of language, were the results of an emerging idea of 'nation', the contextual changes in poetry were the outcome of the Western influence, in particular French poetry. In essence, the two important political dynamics of the Empire, Westernization and 'identity', had constituted the main reasons behind the changing form of Ottoman poetry. Poetry became an instrument in the expression of a political agenda. The continuity of this situation for republican poetry is discussed in the next chapter.

2.2.2. The Novel

The emergence of novel in the Western world as a new literary genre was a result of developments in class structure in Europe. In other words, for Marxist critics, of the novel form the bourgeoisie class played an important role in the emergence and development of the novel (Naci, 1999: 7, Timur, 1991: 14, Moran,

1998: 9). The novel, unlike narratives of the classical period, addresses the 'individual' who exemplify bourgeois society (Naci, 1999: 7-9). Therefore, it might be said that the novel appeared as an outcome of the economic and political development of the 18th century.

Nevertheless, the emergence of the novel in the Ottoman period was not a result of changes in the class structure; rather the novel as a new genre appeared as a direct consequence of Westernization (Finn, 1984: 12-13, Moran, 1998: 10, Naci, 1999: 9-11). The *Tanzimat* period, which had critical effects on the development and change of Ottoman literature, brought about the appearance of the novel. Clearly, the politics of the period and the development of the novel indicated a remarkable correspondence. In this respect, the role of the Young Ottomans is crucial for understanding this relationship (Moran, 1998: 13).

The novel form first appeared in Ottoman literature in translated examples, the first of which was *Telemaque* by Fenelon in 1859. In the following years many French novels of the Romantic movement were translated into Turkish. It was only the publication of the first Turkish novel *Taaşşuk-i Talat ve Fitnat*, written by Şemsettin Sami in 1872, that produced an example of a Turkish writer's novel.

From the beginning, the Ottoman novel dealt with the theme of modernization. The *Tanzimat* novel in particular reflected the issue of modernization in a critical manner. In this respect Ahmet Midhat's *Felatun Bey ile Rakım Efendi* and Recaizade Ekrem's *Araba Sevdası* were important examples of the novel.

In *Felatun Bey ile Rakım Efendi,* the reader encounters by two opposite characters who construct the satiric notion in the theme of the novel. "The main

theme of the novel is the description of the difference between an imitative, cosmetic Westernization, which is ridiculed as phony, and rather preferred one which is characterized by a relentless effort to hold on to indigenous cultural traits" (Kadioğlu, 1996, 181). Felatun Bey appears to be the stereotype of the former definition. On the other hand, Rakım Efendi represents the second type of Westernization. While Felatun Bey is the inheritor of a large fortune and spends his life on the European side of Istanbul gambling and expending unlimited amount of money, Rakım Efendi represents the virtues of diligence, modest lifestyle and honesty. In other words, in the character of Rakım Efendi the proper Westernization is portrayed as avoiding conspicuous consumption while retaining traits such as modesty. According to Berna Moran (1998: 39), the aim of the novel it is in fact traits such as laziness/diligence, and extravagant/thriftiness that Midhat contrasts as the proper/improper impacts of Westernization rather than making fun of Felatun Bey. In this respect, for Midhat the initial requirement of proper Westernization is a healthy development of economic class structure. As Mardin put it "According to Ahmet Midhat there was an inappropriate feature in the emergence of the *Tanzimat* nobles" (Mardin, 1992: 45). He basically rejected the values adopted by this class in the person of Felatun Bey. "He was on the side of the masses (i.e. little tradition) and wanted them to become enlightened" (Mardin, 1992: 45). In essence Midhat narrates the dichotomy of Ottoman society; on the one hand an elite stratum of the military and bureaucratic establishments, and on the other hand the folk stratum they administrated.

Another example of the novel that examines the dichotomy of Ottoman society is *Araba Sevdası*. Bihruz Bey, the counterpart of Felatun Bey, "is a man who

became a public official through his father's connections despite the fact that he was lazy, incompetent, fool for Western materialism" (Kadioğlu, 1996: 182). Similar to Felatun Bey, he lives on the European side of Istanbul, and spends his money on expensive clothes tailored in the Western style. He constantly makes remarks in French. In short, he behaves like a French snob in Istanbul at the end of the 19th century. According to Mardin, the character of Bihruz Bey is another instance of Oblomov. "The same sickness of civilization is seen in both these characters: the lack of origin and identity" (Mardin, 1992: 38).

In many instances, the *Tanzimat* novel that developed under the influence of French literature was critical towards over-Westernization. However during the *Servet-i Fünun* period, Ottoman novel had given the examples of opposing characters. Safveti Ziya's *Salon Köşelerinde*, published in 1898, is a good example of such novels. The character of Şekip Bey is as a young Ottoman who usually spends his time with European families living in Istanbul. He shows great enthusiasm in trying to impress these foreign families and wants to show that how a young Ottoman man is 'modern' and knows the traditions of the 'West'. He is confident about the way he speaks French, the way he dances, and the style of his clothes. Nevertheless, one day this 'unfortunate' young man falls in love with an English girl, Miss Lydia Sanşayn. This was an unrequited love, and the strong feelings he had led him to examine his thoughts on his 'nation'. At the end of the story, Şekip Bey leaves Miss Sanşayn for his 'nation'.

Although its literary value is not significant, Safveti Ziya's *Salon Köşelerinde* is important for showing a strange instance of 'Westernization' and simultaneously

the emerging ideology of 'nationalism'. In this respect, it presents us a portrait of Istanbul, which during the republican period is cursed. Almost all characters would appear in Yakup Kadri's *Sodom ve Gomore* just after a few decades later.

The novel writing that developed since the *Tanzimat* period exhibited some common features. The themes of Westernization and the social status of women were examined in most of them (Mardin, 1992: 31). Similar to traditional Ottoman literature, the novel chose to set its story in Istanbul. Up until the emergence of the republican novel, it is almost impossible to see an instance from Anatolia. This centrality of Istanbul as an important novel setting was broken, again by Yakup Kadri, after the character in *Sodom ve Gomore* finds salvation in Anatolia.

In the 1900s, with the emerging Turkish nationalism, many writers placed importance on folk stories. Ziya Gökalp collected and revised many folk tales such as Deli Dumrul, Dede Korkut, Keloğlan etc. He also wrote a book entitled *Kızılelma*, by using the themes and motives founded in those folk tales. This growing interest in folk narratives would continue during the republican period and gave its best examples in the re-written forms of traditional tales.

The novel form that emerged in Turkish literature as a result of Westernization movements became a genre that reflected the dilemmas of social change in Ottoman society. In most of the examples the issue of identity was critically examined. Although the over-Westernization of the Ottoman upper-class male was criticized, the themes of modernity and civilization were never disapproved of. The moral of the story was 'how to find the way for proper Westernization?' In this respect, the novel in the Ottoman period developed as a figure examining cultural

transformation, rather than being a political instrument. In the republican period, the novel kept its characteristics of being critical, but for the most part it judged the previous era's characters.

Chapter III: The Republican Period: 1923-1945

3.1 The Republican Project: "Will to Civilization"

After the end of World War I, with the armistice of Mundros in 1918, the Ottoman Empire was completely defeated by the Allied forces. The Treaty of Sevres signed in 1920 left the Empire merely a miniaturized state in northern Asia Minor with Istanbul as its capital. However, even Anatolia was under the threat of partition. In response to these dangers, many chapters of the Association for the Defense of Rights (Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyetleri) were founded in different regions of Anatolia. These associations were, indeed, the initial steps in the organization of a national struggle (Berkes, 1978: 480-485, Zürcher, 1993: 153-157).

The politics during the years of national struggle represents the preparatory steps for the future republic. When the Turkish Grand National Assembly met in Ankara in 1920, the founding cadre of the republic was almost fully shaped. Understanding the essential characteristics and basic objectives of this cadre, which was led by Mustafa Kemal, is crucial to evaluating the republican project. The 1920 Assembly was founded under extraordinary conditions. Most of the representatives (232 of the total seats) were elected by the local branches of the Defense of Rights movement, while only a few of them (92 of the seats) were parliamentarians from the closed assembly in Istanbul (Zürcher, 1993: 158). The composition of the national assembly indicates that most of the support for the national struggle was coming from provincial notables and clerics, as well as some representatives of professions, the bureaucrats and army officers. (Ahmad, 1993: 52). However, the deputies from the

Istanbul assembly who had either a military or bureaucratic background were in the dominant position. Nevertheless, the opposition movements that we see in the first and second assemblies launched against the radical reforms of the Kemalist group originated with both local and urban elites. Therefore, the distinguishing element of the opposition movements in the assembly was the extent to which they would accept the policies presented by the Kemalist group rather than simply the socio-economic, educational or professional background of the deputies[1].

The Kemalist group had two basic objectives: to secure national independence and then establish a proper regime under which modernization ('the way to civilization') could be realized. While it would be much easier to agree on the former, the latter was a very strong source of tension and disagreement. Nevertheless, a strong combination of these two points was to become the determining ideas of the new Republic. Therefore, the idea of 'nationalism' and the attempted modernization in the making of Turkey required to be closely examined.

The nationalist discourse, which finds its initial ideological sources in the Pan-Turkist movement of the early 1900s, was the critical element that differentiated the Kemalist project from any attempt that would have sought the independence of Ottoman subjects and the Empire. Right from the beginning, the Kemalist movement had the notion of 'nation' as its demarcating line. It is clear that after the end of the

---

[1] A detailed study on the demographic figures of the deputies in the assembly can be found in Frederic Frey's important book, *Turkish Political Elite* (Frederic, F. 1965. *"Turkish Political Elite"*, Massachusetts: The M.I.T Press). Although in his book Frey does not reach any specific conclusion on the characteristics of the opposition movements, his figures supply a vast amount of data, which support the idea that there was no direct relationship between the demographic, socio-economic etc. characteristics of the representatives and their political position in the assembly.

War of Independence, Turkish nationalism found its political haven in the creation of a nation-state.[2]

In this regard, a review of some general points on the emergence of the concept of 'nation- state' would be illuminating. The idea of nationalism, to the development of which the 1789 French Revolution has been attributed a significant role, formed itself in the political arena in the shape of emerging nation-states. In Europe however, as discussed in 3.1, although the idea of 'nation' was common to all, it is possible to trace different formulations on the question of what makes a nation a nation-state, or what kind of elements unite the people of a specific geographical area. In this respect different philosophies/ideologies may, therefore, lie behind the different practices of nation-states, and French and German nationalism in particular represent the two principal lines of thought. As Kadıoğlu states,

> The French nation-state that was established in 1789 emerged concomitantly with such a nationalism, which represented to the rest of continental Europe the modernity of a nation is based upon individual liberty, equality and a cosmopolitan outlook. German nationalism, on the other hand, which emerged about half a century prior to the formation of German nation-state in 1870, acquired an ethnic and cultural character with anti-Western, anti-Enlightenment and romantic premises. The nationalist youth movement in Germany at the turn of the nineteenth century was fraught with the purpose of

---

[2] In fact, the first political indication of the approaching Turkish state was the adoption of *Misak-I Milli* (National Pact) in 1920. The fact that the new Assembly in Ankara had no disagreement, but in fact was in total agreement with the borders and political purposes defined in National Pact is also worth noting. The abolishment of the Sultanate in 1922 meant the official end of Ottoman rule and anything concerning the Ottoman Empire on the political scene.

reconstructing the *Volk* along more genuine and natural principles than modernity had offered (Kadıoğlu, 1996: 178-179).

However, as Kadıoğlu rightly points out, the distinguishing element of German nationalism, its being loaded with the idea of *Volk*, creates the dilemma of the emerging nation-states, which attempts to combine the mission of both the French and German models. Perhaps the distinction between the culture (as an entity with 'soul') and civilization (as external and 'artificial') made by German nationalists can present an example in understanding the conflicting models of German and French nationalism that led to the paradoxical emergence of nation–states[3].

In this respect, the emergence of the Turkish nationalist discourse and the idea of nation-state were strongly influenced by German nationalism. The official definition of the nation as a community having cultural unity also signifies this influence. Therefore, in the construction of a nationalism ideology, the republican elites specifically used the notion of 'Turkish culture' in a highly monolithic way. In the building of a nation-state and a national identity in Turkey, cultural construction and promotion of (Turkish) cultural identity played a very significant role.

The writings of the early republican period's intellectuals provide evidence about the importance attributed to cultural unity and the process of cultural construction. Ahmet Ağaoğlu, for instance, who was one of the prominent figures of the intellectual elite, finds the basic ties that form a nation in six elements: language, literature, religion, education, legislature and economy. He wrote, "The definition of a nation is appropriate only for the communities which united their cultural values and

---

[3] Ziya Gökalp, who later became one of the most important ideologues of the Republic, made the same distinction.

moved according to them" (Ağaoğlu, 1925: 391). Similarly, Mustafa Şekip Tunç, from Faculty of Theology of İstanbul University, argued, "The mass of humanity which claims to be a nation should initially aim for cultural unity" (Tunç, 1924: 100). In the texts of the era many such examples can easily be found.

The other important question of the \Kemalist project was the claim about reaching the level of contemporary Western civilization. Indeed the issue of modernity/modernization was not brand new; rather, it was a question taken from the Ottoman past. However, the republican model for modernization has elements quite distinct from those of previous models sought in earlier decades. Although both movements started as a deliberate policy, for Ottoman modernizers Western civilization had initially appeared as a new technology that should be imported in order to regain military and economic superiority (Ahmad, 1993: 25-27, Rustow, 1993: 96, Kadıoğlu, 1996, 179).

It was only after the *Tanzimat* Edict in which there were reforms that were directly concerned with civilian matters that the Western world started to be perceived as a total civilization rather than merely a technology. For Ottoman reformers to whom protecting Islamic tradition was an important issue, it was impossible to realize the acceptance of Western civilization in full scale (Berkes, 1978: 228). Therefore, in the minds of Ottoman reformers the Western world preserved its meaning, and as a result 'civilization' appeared only as a practical model to be implemented, rather than a whole world view. (Meriç, 1983: 236, Mardin, 1992:27).

On the contrary, the republican elite understood the 'West' as an entire culture, and instead of only importing the material/technical side of it, the Kemalist project aimed to construct this civilization together with its philosophy[4]. Therefore for Kemalist modernizers, Turkey had to possess secularity and rationality while employing 'reason' to initiate the progress (Keyman, 1995: 102). In this respect, the primary goal of the Kemalist project was to remove the Islamic tradition, which was regarded as the main reason for backwardness, from the political arena (Ahmad, 1993: 53). At this point the republican modernizers display an important difference from previous efforts.

Moreover, what was lacking in the Ottoman reformation was the development of an institutional structure in the process of modernization. All through the early years of the Turkish Republic, the state institutions such as, People's Houses, universities, Ministries of National Education and National Culture and later the Village Institutes played crucial roles in the construction of a new, 'civilized' culture.

Nevertheless, the process of nation-state building and the creation of a national identity, as discussed above, should be seen as the distinguishing features of the Kemalist modernization. Keyman points out to the fact that "The primary objective of Kemalist nationalism was to initiate modernization 'in the name of the 'people''" (Keyman, 1995: 103). For the Kemalists the realization of modernity could only be accomplished through a transformation into a nation-state. After that, as Mustafa Kemal said, "Turkey would live as an advanced and civilized nation in the

---

[4] Therefore it could be said that while Ottoman reforms were an 'attempt to Westernization', the republican modernization was an "attempt to civilization". In other words as de Ferro puts it Kemalism was a "will to civilization" (de Ferro, 1995: 89-103 cited in Keyman, 1995: 96).

midst of contemporary civilization" (Ahmad, 1993:53). The notion of the 'people' in the construction of the nation-state, as Ahmad argues, was perceived as "a social category close to the Third Estate of the revolutionary French [where] 'people' implied the coalescing of the various social forces against the old order. The principal task of this collective was not merely to destroy the old society but to collaborate in the creation of a new one" (Ahmad, 1993: 79). However, as opposed to Ahmad's argument, the Kemalist modernization primarily aimed at the creation of the 'people' that form the nation. Therefore the notion of 'people' appears to be the subject of the entire civilization process rather than contributing to its development. As a result, the method followed in the process of achieving civilization becomes the implementation of reforms 'handed down from above'. Yet it is important to realize that the 'will to civilization' in Kemalist thinking was based on an idea of a nation and its cultural transformation.

In examining the issues of the 'Turkish attempt to civilization' and 'the construction of a nation-state as one of the fundamental dimensions of the Republic', one has to examine and understand the critical influence of Ziya Gökalp and his line of thought. Although, his intellectual relationship (better to say his entire political paradigm) with the Republic, rather with the political thought of the Republican elite, is far from being straight and easy, it appears that Gökalp remains the best intellectual formulator of the main trends of the Turkish Republic. Despite the fact that he died in 1924, before many contours of the new Republic were to come into daily politics, his influence can easily be observed.

The fundamental theme of Gökalp's writings can be summarized as the question of combining ethnicity (Turkishness) and religiousness (Islam) in a special way that neither denies Western civilization (i.e. open to universality) nor gets lost within it through a corrupted mixture (i.e. non-cosmopolitan). In his book, *Turkification, Islamization, Modernization*, Gökalp summed up his 'social ideal' in a single sentence: "We are of the Turkish nation (*millet*), of the Islamic religious community (*ümmet*), of the Western civilization (*medeniye*t)" (Gökalp, 1914: 23, cited in Parla, 1985: 25). In this respect, three main issues, Westernization, Turkism and the Islamic tradition required to be carefully studied in Gökalp's philosophy[5]. Under the influence of Durkheimian sociology, the matter of *nation* stood as the central inquiry of his social thought and ideology[6]. The sociologist Gökalp, who had a positivist understanding of social science, takes the ethical, religious, and aesthetic values as social phenomena and attempts to explain them with the help of social 'social laws'. Despite this common methodology, however, Gökalp modifies the key concept of Durkheim's sociological theory in a way that the notion of *society* is substituted by the notion of *nation* in Gökalp's writings. For the French sociologist, however, *nation* was only one of the various social groups to which modern man belongs. Consequently, the concept of *nation* in Gökalp's writings appears to have

---

[5] Gökalp's understanding of Islam, though it is not discussed here, should be briefly stated. Parla (1985: 26) argues that Gökalp was arguing for an unorthodox, Sufi brand of Islam, with its emphasis on ethics rather than politics, which reinforces solidarity. This approach might be labeled as a folkloric Islamic tradition. Therefore in Gökalp's writings as Parla rightly puts it, "Islam appears as the moral in his societal model" (Parla. 1985: 26). Nonetheless, only two elements of Gökalp's thinking – Turkification and Westernization - were taken as the basis for the republican ideology. The notion of Islam in Gökalp's writings remains excluded from the official discourse.

[6] It is known that the French philosophers and their conceptualization of the nation that formed the basis of Gökalp's teaching. In addition to those thinkers Renouvier, Boutroux, and Fouilled made contributions to his early writings (Heyd, 1950: 43)

all the qualities that Durkheim attributed to *society*. Remembering the divine qualities

that Durkheim attributed to society, in Gökalp's philosophy, replacing the 'society'

with 'nation', thus replacing the belief in God with the belief in nation, nationalism

becomes a religion (Heyd, 1950: 57). His belief in the nation as the perfect form of

society can be observed in many of his writings, and especially in the early ones. In

Yeni Mecmua, for example, he states "Humanity finds its expression today in the

notion of nationality" (Gökalp, 1911: (25) 484; cited in Heyd, 1950: 59). Apparently,

in adopting Durkheimian sociology and his notion of society, Gökalp finds scientific

support for his belief that the nation is the highest level in human development.

It should be noted that the definition of nation in Gökalp's writings mostly

refers to a cultural unity instead of blood ties, i.e. racial unity. For him, nation is "a

society composed of people who speak the same language, have had the same

education and are united in their religious, moral and aesthetic ideals"[7] (Gökalp,

1976: 18)[8]. The term 'culture' as the basis for nationality constitutes an important

element in Gökalp's thinking. To define the basic aspects and borders of culture was

an initial question for him. Basically, Gökalp limits 'culture' (*hars*)[9] to the

composition of all national elements. He was also aware of that every nation

processes spiritual and material values that are not peculiar to it but are common to

---

[7] It must be noted that a similar definition of *nation* is presented in the 1931 program of the Republican People's Party. Accordingly, "The nation is a political and social body composed of citizens who are bound together by unity of language, culture and ideal" (RPP program, 1931: 134). However, the element of religion, which had an important place in Gökalp's definition, was carefully dropped. This point supports the argument that the republican ideology was influenced by Gökalp whereas excluding his understanding of Islamic tradition.

[8] The first publication of the *Principles of Turkism* was in 1924.

[9] Heyd (1950: 63) rightly points out that Gökalp formulated the term *hars* from an Arabic root as an exact equivalent of the French term 'culture' which refers to general knowledge (*irfan*). However, after the word *hars* was accepted into the contemporary Turkish vocabulary, it was replaced by the term *kültür*. Nevertheless, the meaning of *irfan* included in *hars* cannot be found in the term *kültür*.

different nations. Such values, according to Gökalp, cannot be a part of 'culture' *(hars),* but they form 'civilization' (*medeniyet*), which has an international character, as opposed to culture. The distinction between the two terms plays a significant role in Gökalp's theory. Yet, these two terms, rather than representing completely antithetical and mutually exclusive entities, appear as closely related and complementary traits of social reality (Berkes, 1954: 384). Civilizational elements can only assume meaning and function in the life of a people when they enter into the service of culture. "Without a cultural basis, civilization becomes merely a matter of mechanical imitation, it never penetrates into the inner life of people or gives fruit of any kind" (Berkes, 1954: 384). For Gökalp, 'culture' remains as referring to all feelings, values, judgments and ideals, while rational and scientific knowledge or technology were considered as belonging to civilization. Therefore, these two terms also address a group of dichotomies such as national/international, emotional/rational etc. which do not always have to be opposing but rather are essentially different.

Heyd, in his study on Gökalp, brings to mind that the distinction between culture and civilization is not unique to Gökalp but seems to have been borrowed from German sociology, possibly from Tönnies. Although it is known that Gökalp had studied a group of French sociologists, he might have recognized the philosophy of Tönnies from the critical writings of Durkheim on his distinction between the terms 'culture' and 'civilization'. Such an influence of German philosophy and social thought on Gökalp's thinking can help to explain his strong emphasis on nation and his conceptualization of 'national'.

In addition, Heyd points out that Gökalp's ideology of Turkism includes the flavor of romantic German nationalism, especially in terms of its emphasis on the superiority of the *German*. Gökalp's studies on the history of the pre-Islamic and early Islamic period of the Turkish tribes and their culture conclude with the superiority of Turks and Turkish culture over Chinese and Arab cultures. Heyd notes, "Gökalp's ideas of the traditional Turkish virtues are quite alike to Herder's claim that Germanism means 'faithfulness and simplicity, loyalty and courage'". Moreover, "apart from his belief in the noble descent of the Turkish nation", Heyd writes, "Gökalp makes use of another type of myth common to many nationalist ideologies-the myth of its great mission"(Heyd, 1950: 114) [10]. Regarding his positivist approach to the social sciences, Gökalp's analysis contains the premises of both the Enlightenment (the French influence) and Romanticism (the German inspiration). As Kadıoğlu puts it, "[Gökalp's ideology] includes elements of both a cosmopolitan French nationalism and an organic, anti-Western and anti-Enlightenment German nationalism" (Kadıoğlu, 1996 184). These two different sources of ideology that shape Gökalp's theory of nationalism, which in turn becomes the primary line of thought in the construction of the Republic, creates a problematic understanding of the nationality question. Again, as Kadıoğlu argues, "this paradoxical synthesis (French- German nationalisms) first of all, posed the national question in the Turkish context as an insolvable; secondly it assigned a particular role to the redefined intellect in transforming the popular consciousness by an elitist project from above.

---

[10] Gökalp, in his *Principles of Turkism,* writes, "The historical mission of the Turkish nation is to realize the highest moral virtues and to prove that the sacrifices and heroic deeds which are generally regarded as impossible are not beyond human strength" (Gökalp, 1976: 81).

The latter had paved the way for the evolution of an official Turkish identity within the confines of a peculiar Turkish nationalism that was adopted in the course of the formative years of the Turkish Republic" (Kadıoğlu, 1996 184).

Having developed a sociology based on the concept of nation as the primary inquiry of sociology and having understood the nation as the precise and ultimate level which a modern society can reach, Ziya Gökalp proposes his claim for Turkish modernization through the construction of Turkish nationality, which was also to be a re-discovery. He called this ideology Turkism. In his *Principles of Turkism*, Gökalp develops two principal slogans, which indicate two basic concerns of his thinking: 'Towards the People' (*Halka Doğru*) and 'Towards the West' (*Garba Doğru*). These two appear in harmony with Gökalp's distinction between culture and civilization, since while the slogan *Halka Doğru* aimed to secure national unity through the moral, cultural, religious and aesthetics values of common people (*Volk*), *Garba Doğru* implies a requirement to reach the level of Western civilization for the Turkish nation. In this respect, national consciousness emerges prior to a universal consciousness; or in other words, it is necessary before an attempt to civilization. In this context, Gökalp criticizes Ottoman modernization and in particular the *Tanzimat* movement, since it lacked national elements.

In addition, Gökalp argues that proper Westernization demands the acceptance of Western civilization in full. In his criticism of the *Tanzimat* leaders, he opposes the imitation of Western civilization only in part and again accuses Ottoman modernizers of maintaining only the inferior and external elements of European civilization. He objects to borrowing the elements that belong to the cultural sphere of the West. Only

the universal (i.e. fitted to civilization) features of the Western world should be borrowed. Apparently, Gökalp's distinct conceptualization of culture and civilization serves as a touchstone in order to determine the proper kind of relation (of the Turk) with the West, or what is to be borrowed from there. However, his conceptualization of the 'culture/civilization' relationship and its being put into practice remain ambiguous.

Gökalp's influence on the building of Turkish nationalism and especially in its becoming the official discourse of the Turkish Republic is clear. It is not simply his emphasis on Turkishness, but his ideas and studies on Turkish culture, history, language and literature as well, that make him an important figure. Moreover, his studies provided the principal elements in the formation of some republican institutions such as the Turkish History Association and the Turkish Language Association and aided in the understanding of the aesthetic sphere as well[11]. As one of the basic points of examination of this thesis, his contribution to the construction of republican literature and especially to the development of *hece* (syllabic) poetry meter is discussed in section 3.3.3.

Having stated that throughout the establishment of Turkish Republic, Gökalp and his nationalist thought played an important ideological role, one last thing should be addressed: Gökalp's analysis of the Ottoman state and its cultural values. His ideas on these issues were important and became as influential as his nationalism, since

---

[11] It is impossible not to recognize the effect of Gökalp's writings on the pre-Islamic and early-Islamic history of the Turks. If one examines the presentation in the First Turkish History Congress, this influence becomes more apparent. Many republican thinkers followed the ideology of Gökalp in their articles. Fuat Köprülü ("Türk Edebiyatına Genel Bir Bakış", pp. 308-320), Şemsettin ("İslam Medeniyetinde Türklerin Mevkii", pp. 289-307), Hasan Cemil ("Ege Medeniyeti Menşeine Umumi Bir Bakış", pp: 199-214) are best illustrative examples of such articles.

they complete and support each other. Gökalp perceives the Ottoman tradition of moral, aesthetic and social values as degenerated, cosmopolitan and representing a set of worthless cultural codes. According to him, Turkish culture is that which contains none of the degenerated aspects of Ottoman culture. He writes that the two cultures, Turkish and Ottoman, are completely contradictory to each other. In *Principles of Turkism* he asks, "Why, as Turkish culture possesses such beautiful elements, does Ottoman culture remain so ugly?" (Gökalp, 1976: 33). If we put this issue in terms of another terminology, Gökalp approaches Ottoman culture as a form of 'other' and demands the exclusion of Ottoman elements in the construction of the Turkism ideology. In his words: "Turkish culture, which is sincere and pure, never incorporated itself with the cosmopolitan Ottoman culture. Therefore, it is the (Turkish) national literature that can create civilization" (Gökalp, 1976: 36-37).

The denial of Ottoman tradition in all fields of cultural elements continues during the period of the Republic and perhaps reaches its peak with the institutionalization of the 'otherness' discourse[12]. The impact of Gökalp's ideology on the republican period, specifically on the issues of language, aesthetics and morality is very apparent. In this respect, the republican institutions such as the Turkish History Association and Turkish Language Association, the Turkish Hearths, and the People's Houses, which are discussed in the next section, and the reforms accompanying the process of nation-building created a simultaneous action that anticipates the exclusion of Ottoman identity as the 'other' while including the

---

[12] Gökalp's program of Turkism, which argues for the implementation of the ideology (i.e. the exclusion of Ottoman values) in eight unique fields of culture, appears as a pre-statement for the republican period. Tezcan, on the program of Turkism, argues that the institutional structures and practices of the Republic were built systematically on Gökalp's ideology (Tezcan, 1998: 54).

Turkish identity as 'self'. As Ahmad states, "[Kemalists] were expected to lead to the creation of a totally new society, and for such a society they knew that they had to create 'a new type of Turk very different from the Ottoman'" (Ahmad, 1993: 77).

The Islamic identity and its cultural tradition, which encompasses the Ottoman identity, was the main reason for the rejection and exclusion of Ottoman society. As discussed earlier, the Islamic state was perceived as the major cause for the backwardness of Turkey. Therefore the Ottoman state tradition, and specifically the Caliphate, appeared as the artifacts of an inferior civilization that should be removed from the history of the Turks. In this new era *Turkishness* defined itself in contrast to the rest of the Islamic world (Zürcher, 1993: 199). The principle of secularism hence became the key notion in the process of exclusion/inclusion.

Another feature of Ottoman culture that was denied was that of its lack of a national spirit or its having a cosmopolitan culture[13]. It is worth noting that the Turks occupied a place in the Ottoman Empire not as its founding people but rather as an ethnic group, meaning an ethnicity of unsophisticated and common peasants. "People, if they had a choice, preferred to be identified as 'Ottomans'" (Ahmad, 1993:78). After the emergence of a national consciousness and especially the success of the War of Independence, the undermined status of the Turks under Ottoman rule was brought on to the agenda several times and became a point of criticism towards the Ottomans. This situation led to an understanding that continuously promoted pride in

---

[13] Most of the time the notion cosmopolitan refers only to the 17th century onwards of Ottoman history.

the history of the Turks[14] while simultaneously degrading the Ottoman past.

The exclusion of Ottoman culture resulted in the construction of a cultural transformation under the Republic. This transformation, for the most part, was realized through reforms that were imposed from above. In the following part a review of those reforms and the institutions that were significantly involved in the process of national identity-building is made.

3.1.1 The Roles of the Republican Institutions and Reforms in the Process of Making a Modern Nation

In the examination of the twofold question of the Republic, the making of a modern state and nation(al)-state, a study of Kemalist reforms and republican institutions is also necessary. It should be noted that after the proclamation of the Republic the completion of the planned reforms was accelerated, and then, in the following years, various institutions were founded. Regarding the importance of these two, first a concise review of the reforms and then discussions on the republican institutions are presented.

The reforms carried out during the first decade of the Republic indeed constitute the essential steps in the Kemalist program of modernization. After the establishment of the second Assembly in 1923, the first action was the declaration of the Republic and, significantly the second important decision of the assembly was the abolishment of the Caliphate on 3 March 1924. In fact this strategic action, on the one

---

[14] The pre-Islamic and early-Islamic periods were the main subjects of this new understanding. In reality the history of the Turks was rediscovered and for the most part were rewritten. It is worth emphasizing that Gökalp's studies on the same historical era become the initial source for the intensification of the new Turkish history writing.

hand, was taken against the conservative group that was still insisting on maintaining the Islamic tradition; on the other hand, it indicated the will to eliminate (or at least disempower) Islam from the political arena. The abolition of the Caliphate was the initial step for further secular reforms (Ahmad, 1993: 54, Zürcher, 1993: 195). The year 1924 also witnessed the abolition of the functioning of the *Şeyhülislam* and of the *Ministry of Religious Affairs*. In place of these two, a new directory was created, the *Diyanet Işleri Müdürlüğü* (Directorate of Religious Affairs). The establishment of this new directory, as Zürcher correctly points out, shows that the state was demanding control over religion (Zürcher, 1993: 195). Instead of separating the two worlds, the religious and political, from each other, the aim was to establish the domination of the latter over the former. In this way, it was possibly thought, the centuries-long situation/balance would be redeployed. The final reform on the issue of Islam was enacted in 1925. Dervish orders were dissolved and their monasteries (*tekke* ve *ocaklar*) were closed down.

The other reforms focused on the organization of the daily life of the common people. From clothing styles to the regulation of official holidays, these reforms clearly indicated the strong "will to civilization". In brief, all of the reforms were oriented towards establishing a thought-style and life-style similar to that which Western people were believed to have had.

The hat reform represents a good example of such reforms. In 1925, the assembly enacted a law, which required the replacement of the *fez* with the hat. This formal change in the appearance of male Turks symbolized a cultural transformation, from Islamic fez to European hat in the minds of the Kemalist modernizers.

Following the hat reform, a new calendar was introduced[15] in 1926. In the same year the Islamic code of law, the Sharia, was abolished and the government introduced the Civil Code based on the Swiss model. In addition a Penal Code and a Commercial Code were borrowed from the legislatures of Italy and Germany.

The changing of the Civil Code had a great effect on the legal position/status of women in society. Just four years after the enactment of the Civil Code, women were given the right to vote in municipal elections in 1930. In 1934, they were allowed not only to vote in legislative elections but to be candidates as well (Ahmad, 1993:89). The rise in the political and social status of Turkish women was one of the important achievements of the Kemalist modernization program. Improving the status of women and creating a modern identity for them, in the mind of the reformers, represented an image of civilization.

Although all of the reforms were intended to fulfill a cultural transformation, since they were simply constructed on formal transformations in the appearance of daily life, the essence of the very term 'civilization' and its acceptance by the masses could not be achieved through them[16]. This was the mistaken point throughout the Kemalist period. Despite all the 'rationality' employed in the process of building a modern nation-state, the reforms 'imposed from above' resulted only in formal changes rather than in altering thinking.

---

[15] Ahmad underlines that the same reform was enacted during the French Revolution too (Ahmad, 1993: 80). This similarity indicates the rational mind of the Kemalist project, which employs reason in order to achieve the level of contemporary civilization.

[16] The sudden popularity of the Free Republican Party during the second trial in the transition to the multi-party system, in 1930 was accepted as a signifier of the rejection of the masses for the radical secularist program and reforms. The FRP was closed only within a few months due to the rise of its supporters against the RPP. After that, the Kemalist elite concluded that it was too early to have a multi-party system. Perhaps a second conclusion derived was that unless institutionalization was realized, the consolidation of the cultural transformation of the nation remained a challenge.

By the 1930s, the republican institutions started to thrive. Among them the Turkish History Association and the Turkish Language Association, the Turkish Hearths and later the People's Houses and Village Institutes enjoyed positions of prominence. The main function of these institutions was to strengthen the construction of the national identity while concurrently assisting in the consolidation of the Kemalist project of 'civilization'.

The Turkish Hearths was established in 1912 when Turkish nationalism was transforming its essence from a cultural trend to a political movement. Within a short period, it became the vanguard of the institutions, which argues for a strong Turkish nationalism. Especially during the years of World War I, the hearths appeared to be supporting the Pan-Turkist ideologies. Following the end of the war, the prominent figures of the Turkish Hearths joined the Anatolian resistance and moved together with the Ankara Assembly (Yeğen, 1995: 39).

According to Yeğen, after the establishment of the Republic, the association of the Hearths with the new system was completed with the Kurdish rebels in 1925 (Yeğen, 1995: 39). The officers of the Hearths were stating that their initial duty was making each and every person a Turk. It appears that the extreme Turkish nationalist discourse of the Hearths led the government to perceive it as a spokesman on behalf of the Republic. This organic relation between the government and the Turkish Hearths lasted until the takeover of the Hearths by the RPP. This takeover stemmed from the regime's need to be central (Yeğen, 1995: 40, Çeçen, 1990: 105).

The Turkish Hearths had prepared both the institutional framework and the functioning principles for its successor, the People's Houses. Yeğen states that by

1930 there were 250 branches of the Hearths dealing with the construction of modern Turkey through improving issues such as health, agricultural development, social assistance, theater, music, culture and economic development all over the country (Yeğen, 1995: 39). In this respect the Turkish Hearths formed the first model of a republican institution, which primarily aimed to strengthen the constructed modern national identity.

After the closure of the Turkish Hearths in 1931, the need for an official institution that could be the cultural agent of the republican transformation was apparent. One year later the People's Houses were introduced. Çeçen says that the mission of the Houses was to restructure the public mind according to the cultural strategy of the regime. He lists the objectives of the People's Houses as follows:

1- To organize society to the level at which people are conscious, understanding and respecting each other and devoted to the same ideal.

2- Providing strength for the unity of the culture, the ideal and the purpose.

3- Revealing and developing the cultural figures that shape national unity.

4- Improving relationships between villagers and the elite.

5- Being the central institution between the RPP and the public.

6- Promoting the cultural and social evolution in order to help the modernization attempts (Çeçen, 1990:122-123).

The People's Houses would handle the question of modernization within the line of the revolution. The ultimate aim was realizing the modernization project at each level of society. This social-based organization aimed primarily at constructing the society and the type of people that was demanded by the party and the state.

The organizational structure of the People's Houses is the indicator of this objective. The houses had nine sub-units. These were the language, history and literature units, the fine arts unit, the performance unit, the sport unit, the social aid unit, the public education unit, the villagers unit, and the museum and exhibition units. According to Yeğen, these sub-units had an undeniable importance since they had the mission of national integration (Yeğen, 1995: 41).

The People's Houses rapidly spread over the country and within the space of one year their numbers increased from 14 to 55. Most of these Houses were located in Anatolian cities. But the need to reach rural areas led to a new institution, the People's Rooms. By the end of the year 1946, 4521 People's Houses and People's Rooms had been activated. After the end of the single-party regime, in 1951 the Houses were closed down. However, as Yeğen states, the People's Houses were perhaps the most important institution of the Kemalist period. They established a strong organizational structure that contributed to the consolidation of Kemalist values.

The other two institutions, the Turkish History Association and the Turkish Language Association, were established one after the other, in 1931 and 1932 respectively. These two associations played crucial roles in the building of national identity, which was defined on the basis of cultural unity. Apparently, the elements of history and language were the major constituents of the notion of cultural unity.

As Yeğen argues, the re-writing of history had become inevitable for the nationalists, who were attempting to create a new national identity. "In this respect Turkish nationalism was not an exception (Yeğen, 1995: 41). The initial motive in the

re-writing of Turkish history was the exclusion of the Ottoman cosmopolitan tradition. Therefore the new history thesis of the Republic mainly focused on the pre-Islamic period. According to this 'exaggerated' history thesis, the Turkish race was the constitutive element in the emergence of all civilizations. It was argued that the emergence of the Mesopotamian, Egyptian, Anatolian, Chinese and Byzantine civilizations was due to the large-scale immigration of the Turks from Central Asia. In doing so, the Turks had created those civilizations mentioned above (Zürcher, 1993:199)[17].

It is worth noting that the Turkish history thesis, no matter how extreme and even ironic it was, which claimed that the Turkish race was the founder of all other civilizations, indicates how vital it was believed to be provide a national (Turkish) identity to the people of Anatolia. The thesis-specific reference to the pre-Islamic past of the Turks and its claim to being the source of all 'civilized' societies, of course, was not accidental. The apparent relationship between the secular and modernist Kemalist project and the elements shaping the history thesis indicates an outstanding example on the roles of the republican institutions.

The Turkish Language Association was established in order to accompany the creation of a pure Turkish language, especially after the script reform of 1928. Yet, the ideology behind its foundation was the same as the foundation of the Turkish History Association. The primary emphasis was placed on two projects: the collection of the words used in the everyday speech of the people of Anatolia, and the search for

---

[17] In this respect, the 1st Turkish History Congress constitutes an important source of information. The common element of all the presentations was to attribute a sense of pride in the history of the Turks and their national identity, separate from the immediate past of the Ottoman era.

genuine Turkish equivalents of foreign words (primarily Arabic and Persian), or words of foreign origin that had been borrowed daily usage (Tachau, 1964: 197). In sum, these projects were oriented towards replacing the Ottoman vocabulary with the pure Turkish language (Zürcher, 1993: 198)[18].

Another important project of the Turkish Language Association was the adoption of the *Güneş-Dil Teorisi* (sun-language theory). The sun-language theory presents much the same aspect as the earlier Turkish history thesis, which claimed that Turks of Central Asia developed early civilizations. Similarly, the sun-language theory argued that, "all languages were originally derived from a primeval language spoken in Central Asia, to which Turkish was the closest of all languages, and that all languages had developed from this origin through Turkish" (Zürcher, 1993: 198).

Apparently, the utopian sun-language theory, just like the Turkish history thesis was intended to serve much the same purpose of bolstering national pride. In the construction of the theory, the Ottoman vocabulary, which included a mixture of Arabic and Persian words, was excluded. This time, instead of referring to the Islamic tradition in the immediate past, the sun-language theory addressed the cosmopolitan character of Ottoman culture and claimed to reject it through formation of a superior language theory.

The final institution to be examined is the Village Institutes. Although their primary functions were described as the education of the young population in villages and accelerating economic development in rural areas, the close relationship between

---

[18] The outcome of the project, the collected 130.000 items, was published in 1934 with the title *Turkish Equivalents for Ottoman Words*. Heyd refers to this collection as "the peak of purism" of modern Turkish language reform (Heyd, 1950: 29).

the modernization attempt of the state and the principles and functioning of these Institutes is evident (Yeğen, 1995: 43). The Village Institutes were located in designated rural regions, not in cities. Feroz Ahmad argues that they were a simple step in the intended modernization: "Teach them about Kemalism and the revolution the new Turkey was undergoing so that they could take the message back to the village … Such men and women would then return to the village, bringing with them modern ways which they would pass on" (Ahmad, 1993: 83).

Just as the other institutions, the Village Institutes became a part of the construction of the modern nation-state. However, as Yeğen notes, considering the positioning of the Institutes from the central-periphery relationship perspective would also be useful (Yeğen, 1995: 44). Following Mardin's argument (1973), Yeğen offers to analyze the Village Institutes practices as a form of a center-periphery relationship; in other words, as a new attempt of the center to obtain control over the periphery. (Of course, this attempt created its resistance too.) The Institutes, in this respect, functioned as a monitoring and control mechanism of the state over the rural population.

The Village Institutes project, nonetheless, did not succeed in its objectives. Both in the political arena and in the daily life of the villages, the project faced strong opposition. Between 1940 and 1948 only 20 Institutes were established; then in 1950, the newly elected Democrat Party government abolished the Institutes (Zürcher, 1993: 202-203).

Up until this point I have tried to present the principal ideas and practices behind the Turkish Republic. The modernization/Westernization and nationalism

discourses, here, appear as the ideological bases of these attempts. Although not all of the fields covered may always be directly linked to the literature issue, most of them do have links and are essential in enabling the reader to capture the spirit of the time and the state of affairs.

3.2. The Republican Literature

3.2.1.The Script Reform

In order to understand the general features of Turkish literature in the early republican period, one should recognize that the emergence and development of a new Turkish literature –'a revolutionary literature' if it can be called as such- did not occur through reforms/policies concerning specifically the ideology of a new literature, but instead was indirectly shaped by the general objective of a reform in language. Therefore, the formal appearance in terms of using the language and words/terms rather than the context in literary works became a more principal issue in the emergence and development of a new Turkish literature. It is within such a framework that Turkish script reform needs to be analyzed in detail.

The first major step in the field of language was the adoption of an alphabet "based on Latin sources" in 1928. Ahmad (1993: 80) refers this adoption as "the most iconoclastic reform of the period". Similarly Zürcher (1993: 196) argues, "The adoption of the Latin alphabet was the most drastic measure of the era." Of course, the script reform was not accomplished without opposition. The main opposing argument was that it would break with the heritage of the past. For example, it was written, "The reform will lead to utter confusion and eventual loss of contact with a

great holy, religious and historical literary tradition" (*Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, 1923; cited in Heyd, 1954: 134).

On the other side of the debate, the Kemalist elite responded to the above arguments by bringing to mind the country's low rate of literacy. The Arabic alphabet was presented as the main obstacle to a higher level of literacy. The initial purpose of the adoption of Latin script was to accelerate the process of literacy and education in Turkey. The Arabic alphabet was said to have an unsuitable phonetic structure for the Turkish language. For Mustafa Kemal, centuries-long usage of Arabic was an error of the past. He said in his speech on script reform, "It is time for us to eradicate the root and branch of the errors of the past. We shall correct these errors and in doing so I want all citizens to play an active role. As a result Turkish society must learn the new alphabet within a year or two" (M. Kemal, 1929; cited in Ahmad, 1993: 81). To put it more succinctly, if the script reform meant the loss of a great historic and religious tradition, for Kemalists, this was simply the cost of modernization, and they had no objection to paying this price.

Apart from the concern about the rate of literacy and education, the script revolution aimed to create a gap/break between classical Ottoman-Islamic culture and the new secular-nationalist Turkish culture. The effect of script reform in terms of rejecting the past was more visual than other reforms. As a result, the new script formally loosened Turkey from the Islamic world and again formally moved her towards the Western world (Tachau, 1964: 195). İzzet Ulvi Aykurt (1928: 42), editor of *Türk Yurdu*, interprets this change with the following words: "There is no need to be afraid of breaking off our relations with the Islamic world. If there was any benefit

to obtain from this relationship, we would be an honorable example for them so that they also would adopt the Latin script". A decade later, Fuat Köprülü, (1938: 1-2) the editor of *Ülkü*, in evaluating the reform from a similar perspective, stated that the adoption of the Latin alphabet had created two important transformations in the national language. These were:

1. For a nation to abandon an old alphabet and adopt a new one means the abolishment of the previous cultural style while integrating into the contemporary one. We, by abandoning Arabic script, have indicated the will to enter into the contemporary Western cultural world.

2. The new alphabet, with its form that represents only Turkish phonetics, would not permit old Arabic and Persian grammar and patterns to survive in pure national Turkish.

The consequences of the reform came about as planned. The rate of literacy indicated a dramatic increase from about 8 percent in 1928 to 20 percent in 1935 (Zürcher, 1993: 196). Most of the efforts of the state, however, were expended in the cities while towns and the countryside continued to lag behind.

The second immediate goal of the script reform was also evidently attained: Access to Ottoman-Islamic written culture, which was intended to be set apart from the new Turkish culture, became difficult for those who did not know the previously used Arabic script. At last, a sharp dividing line was drawn between the old and the new, moving people even more forcefully towards the new.

The essence of the script reform, undoubtedly, was in harmony with the nationalist thinking of the Kemalist project. The Latin alphabet, on the one hand, was

presented as much more functional than Arabic script (in terms of its effects on education), and on the other hand, it played a supportive role in the cultural transformation of 'Turkish' society from a religious-cosmopolitan to a secular-nationalist one.

In the development of the new Turkish literature, script reform does not indicate straight impact. However, it should be noted that both the functional and formal logic of the reform could also be seen in the development of republican literature. Most of the literary debates of the period, for instance syllabic (*hece*)-prosody (*aruz*) poetry meter, reflect a similar reasoning. In general, this perspective represents an understanding of language, which is seen as one of the processes in the making of a nation- state. Script reform comprises one part of this issue. The question of republican literature, which is another dimension of the matter, is examined in the next section.

3.2.2. The "Revolutionary" Literature

Starting with the 1920s, the possibility of creating a national literature became an issue on the agenda of the elite of the period. Evidently, the previous arguments on the national literature and the debates of the republican period were to be the basic elements of the same continuum. As could be expected, the primary emphasis of the republican literature was on the idea of Turkish nationalism. This common ground was the fundamental connection between literary works at the beginnings of the 20th century and the republican period.

The basic question in the development of a new Turkish literature arose chiefly from two sources: how to handle the traditional Ottoman literary tradition, and how to create a Western-style literature from folk material (Özkırımlı, 1983:580). The two subjects however, should be examined separately. Therefore I will first focus on the attitude of the republican writers towards Ottoman literature, and then on the issue of the making of a 'revolutionary' literature.

In the formulation above, which was basically derived from the nationalist ideology, the use of a purified Turkish language became the essential element of the literary world. Literature, consequently, was seen as the basic element in the functioning of the Turkish language. Therefore, the formal appearance of the newly emerging literature, rather than its content, became of primary importance for the period's elite. Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu (1925: 13) wrote that, " […] Turkish literature is firstly a matter of 'Turkish language' and the essence of Turkish language is only involved in Turkish culture[19]".

Apparently, this emphasis on the language resulted in the rejection of the Ottoman literary tradition. The Divan literary tradition was the main target of the rejection both because of its language, which carries Arabic and Persian elements, and its cosmopolitan notion. Furthermore, the general themes of the Divan works, such as love, belief in God and the beauties of nature, were seen as both inadequate and improper for understanding and narrating the characteristics of the modern world.

---

[19] In the original Turkish text, Karaosmanoğlu uses the word *hars* instead of *kültür*, which in fact has been used since the 1920s. As discussed earlier in Ziya Gökalp's thinking the word *hars* occupies an important place. I think this intentionally selected word is an interesting example for realizing the influence of Gökalp's thinking on national literature.

The republican literature needed to narrate 'modern' themes in order to take part in the level of contemporary civilization.

Although earlier criticism towards the Divan literary tradition had already started in the *Tanzimat* era*,* as discussed earlier, none of these criticisms were aimed at eliminating the Divan literary practices. The only challenge to the old tradition had limited itself to the concern about purified Turkish.

The Turkism ideology and its leading element, the national literature movement, perhaps directed the most crucial critics towards Divan literature during the *Tanzimat* period. Primarily, the works of the past tradition were rejected, since they were not written in pure Turkish forms. The manifestation of the *Genç Kalemler* magazine, as presented in 2.2.1, attributes a nationalist sense to the Turkish language usage question. Therefore, the collected works of the Divan tradition were rejected as belonging to a cosmopolitan culture.

During the republican period, especially in the 1920s and the 1930s, the spirit of the national literature movement was dominant. Moreover, the cultural politics of the official ideology supported the denial of the Ottoman literary tradition. Most of the period's writers were opposed to continuation of the Divan tradition for the sake of the creation of a new national literature.

Ali Canip Yöntem (1941a: 8-10), a regular writer of *Çınaraltı*, argues that the attempts to renovate the written language after the *Tanzimat* period were similar to a bad adaptation of the Renaissance. He claims that "The Renaissance had emerged as a result of important movements of ideology and philosophy. Therefore it was an up-to-

down directed revolution and this essential feature made the movement successful". Whereas, according to Yöntem, since the *Tanzimat* was carried out by a number of unqualified administrators, the reforms could not achieve the desired outcome. "The literary movements that followed, he adds, such as *Ebebiyat-i Cedide* or *Fecr-i ati Society* were too far away from generating a national literature that characterizes itself with a pure Turkish written form".

According to Yöntem (1941c: 15) "the only movement that could reflect the emerging nationalism question in literature before the republican era was Turkism". Their attempts to create a purified written language could have been the only ground that the new Turkish literature was growing out of.

Similarly, Sadri Etem (1933: 50), who used to write in *Varlık*, finds the basic sources of "revolutionary" literature in the national literature movement and claims that simplicity and purity of language are genuine expressions of a reform in literature. This also entails "the difference between Ottoman and Turkish". Etem argues, "revolutionary literature is the one that carries the spirits of neither the cosmopolite nor the nostalgist" (Etem, 1933: 50).

Another writer from *Varlık,* Necip Ali (1933: 65) analyzes Ottoman literature as being as artificial as its society. The reason behind his statement is the inadequacy of the literature as representing the society. He says, "From the windows of Baki and Nefi, the only things seen were the dynasty, the soldiers and the nobles. It is impossible to see the whole nation". Similarly, according to Ali, the schools of *Servet-i Fünun* and *Fecr-i Ati* could not express the living spirit of the Turkish nation.

"Because, despite that the issues and the personalities narrated in their works were national, the stories have nothing in common with national life".

Yöntem, Etem and Ali were not the sole supporters of the idea behind the revolutionary literature. Nearly all writers positioned themselves as opposed to the old Divan tradition, whereas the ideal of the purified and simplified Turkish language had a considerable number of advocates. Furthermore the principles of the national literature movement were seen as the only source that could give rise to the glorious reformist literature of the Republic. Yusuf Ziya Ortaç (1941: 13), the editorial writer of *Çınaraltı*, argued that the correct answers to the discussions on the new form of Turkish literature could be found in the principles of Gökalp's thought. Accordingly, the new form of Turkish literature had to be pure in formal appearance and simple and didactic in spirit, so that it could make contact with the masses and transmits the ideals of the Republic. As Halit Fahri Ozansoy (1934: 183) states, "The Revolutionary literature will be and should be a populist (*halkçı*) literature which brings today's Turkey from the simplest village house to the highest society". Evidently, such a definition of literature would explain the concern for the issue of language. It appears that the Republic's elite approached literature as the main subject of the Turkish language and therefore it equated the development of 'revolutionary' literature with language reform.

It was clear that another basic element in the creation of the new literature was the idea of Turkish national identity, which was defined at the level of contemporary civilizations. Having been the basic emphasis in the previous national literature movement, Turkism and pure Turkish as the national language provided a powerful

background for the emerging literature. Moreover the basic tension in Gökalp's writings, the East-West synthesis, turned out to be the other side of Republican literature.

The Western literary world was another influential source in the development of the new literature. French and German literatures were the major schools that had had a considerable impact on Turkish literature since the *Tanzimat* era. As was discussed earlier, Namık Kemal and Şinasi in particular were two prominent poets and writers in whose works the effect of the French literary tradition was strongly felt. In the following years the impact of French romanticism became clearer (Moran, 1998: 18, Oktay, 1993: 125).

German literature, on the other hand started to show its effects in the beginning of the 1900s. The nationalist sense in German literary works resulted in an increasing interest especially among the defenders of the Turkism ideology. The effect of German nationalism in literature continued during the republican period. In a survey conducted by *Yeni Adam* magazine on the issue of 'national literature' Abdülcebbar (1934: 6) states that Turkish literature should take as a model two essential features of German literature. "First of all, examining the techniques and aesthetic features of the folk literature categories, such as tales, legends, poetry, and shadow plays, is needed. Following this, the living conditions, the worries, the attitudes towards life, and the psychology of the people from different classes should be investigated".

The effect of the European-originated literary school became the primary basis for the notion of 'civilization', while the emphasis on folk literature constituted the 'culture' component. The attempted modernization in the literary field, according to the many writers of the period, could only be realized by following the literary movements in the Western world. Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil (1934: 121), in a *Varlık* survey, stated that, "The modernization in the national literature requires the young generation's ability to know Western languages and follow Western literature". Of course the 'classics' played an important role in the development of the new literature. Furthermore, classic languages such as Latin and Greek languages began to be seen as the roots of civilization. Therefore, many writers argued for the teaching of these languages in high school literature classes. For instance, Halit Fahri Ozansoy (1935: 146-147) supported this view with the following words: "In modern countries, the curriculum of the high school literature class, which also involves ancient Greek and Latin literature, is composed of the entirety of the universal classics and teaches the stages and prominent figures of French, English, Italian, Russian, Spanish and Swiss literature. Therefore, it should be the same in our country".

Ali Canip Yöntem too raised a similar argument. He states, "The theme of 'love of the nation' in our literature can be observed only in the works of literature which were written after the encounter with the Western world. Therefore, the continuation of the pursuit of the Western literary world is required" (1927: 4).

The state institutions, in particular the People's Houses, played an effective role in the development of 'revolutionary' literature. For the most part, they reflected the Kemalist attitude towards literature. This attitude, as previously discussed, was

shaped mainly by a populist objective, and hence the issue of language was conceived as being extremely important. As a result of this populist understanding, as Karpat (1960: 35) rightly observed, "A new reformist and artistic education of society became the main responsibility of literature".

As Karpat states "the Turkish Hearths and later the People's Houses were used as the main channel in implementing populism, one of the fundamental principles of the Republic. … Culturally, populism aimed at reorienting Turkey's literature towards life and nature by utilizing folklore and the vernacular Turkish spoken by the masses as the source of inspiration" (Karpat, 1960: 34). The People's Houses evidently supported the literary works that pursued the regime ideology. After 1933 the Houses started to organize contests in poetry, short stories and drama. The requirements for the winning work of art were as follows:

> Promoting love of nation and country, strengthening enthusiasm for reforms, reviving the past glory of Turkish history, praising bravery in the War of Liberation, describing the beauties of cities, towns, villages and each corner of the country in order to create interest in them, focusing attention on the ugliness and ridiculousness of bad traditions, stressing, with examples, morality in every field of awakened interest and an inner predisposition for populism (*Ülkü*, 3(13): 76).

To sum up, the requirements listed above were the basic elements of 'revolutionary' literature. In the next section, I focus separately on Turkish poetry and the novel of the republican period.

3.2.3. The Poetry

In the previous chapter the history of poetry writing in the Ottoman period was discussed. As stated in 2.2.1, while Divan literature constituted the major part of the 'elite' literary tradition. The republican literature on the other hand, was developed independently from both the form and the themes of the Divan tradition. The basic formal difference between these two literary traditions was poetry meter, which appeared in Divan poetry in the form of *aruz* (prosody), and in folk literature in the form of *hece* (syllabic) meter.

The literary debate on the form of Turkish poetry meter, again as discussed in the same section, started after the *Tanzimat* period and had reached its high point by the 1900s. The debate, in which syllabic meter was proposed instead of prosody meter, was carried a nationalist sense (specifically among the writers of *Genç Kalemler*), and since syllabic meter refers to a notion of 'folk', it was strongly defended.

The debates on prosody meter *vs.* syllabic meter became a hot topic during the early years of the Republic. The same issue rose again after the 1930s and the problem was not at all different from the previous one. But this time syllabic meter had acquired the label of the 'national meter'.

In order to understand the roots of the debate some points must be noted. First of all, the arguments on the form of the new Turkish poetry focused mainly on the appearance of the poems, or verse form, while the essence of the poetry was perceived as a subject of secondary significance. Therefore, the debate on syllabic

meter *vs*. prosody meter could not go beyond a comparison of the writing style of syllables between the two poetry meters. Evidently, the issue of language (as a result of the question of nationalism) was of primary importance in the structure of the arguments.

In this formation, a second point is worth discussing: Prosody meter represented a concrete example of (now rejected) Ottoman tradition. Prosody, by its nature, belonged to the cosmopolitan culture. It should be recognized that the prosody meter as a poetry form, became the signifier of the whole Divan poetry tradition. The republican understanding, which claimed to create a nation-state, certainly had to promote a different form of poetry in order to build its 'self'. In this respect, syllabic meter that has its origin in folkloric poetry emerged as a proper form of poetry that corresponds to the requirements of the republican nationalism and labeled as the 'national meter'. That is to say, prosody meter as an artifact of the Ottoman literary tradition was excluded as the 'other', while syllabic poetry meter was included as 'self'. In other words, the form of the poetry was understood as a means of political representation and consequently this led to the politicization of the poetry.

Another important reason for the promotion of syllabic meter lies in the uncomplicated verse form it implies. Syllabic meter, in its basic form, depends on an equal number of syllables in a single line of a poem. Therefore, as opposed to the works of Divan literature, poems written in syllabic meter are straightforward in promoting an understanding of the rhythm that they include. Such a simpler kind of poetry was appropriate for the populist and educational mission of 'revolutionary' literature. The form of poetry created could easily reach the people and disseminate

73

the principles of the Republic[20]. Therefore, this formal concern played an important role in the promotion of the syllabic meter. It could be said that the in the creation of the republican poetry the form of poems was perceived as primary importance to indicate the quality of the poetry.

After stating these crucial points, can now present the major arguments of the period's prominent writers on the issue of syllabic-prosody debate. While searching for relevant articles in the literary journals of the era, it was interesting to observe that there were numerous articles written on the issue. Therefore a classification is needed in the presentation of those articles. First, the supporters of syllabic meter will be introduced. Following this, the traditionalist writers who argued for the genuineness of prosody meter will be presented.

It appears that it is possible to analyze the supporters of syllabic meter in two different categories: the radical syllabists and the moderate syllabists. While both categories accept that syllabic meter is the only national poetry meter, the moderate syllabists, comprising the majority, do not reject the Divan tradition and prosody meter, as opposed to the radicals who totally deny prosody poetry meter and demand the abolishment of the complete works of the Divan tradition from the curriculum of the literary classes.

Among the radical advocates of syllabic meter, Besim Atalay, Kazım Nami and Behçet Kemal are foremost. On the other side, names such as Orhon Seyfi Orhon,

---

[20] Rıza Tevfik (1944: 8-10), a well- known thinker of the period, says "certainly, the national poetry meter is the syllabic one, namely the finger count. […] The essential element that makes syllabic poetry meter national is its simplicity".

Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Yusuf Ziya Ortaç, Halit Fahri Ozansoy are among the moderate supporters of the national meter.

Orhon Seyfi Orhon, a member of the *Beş Hececiler* (Five Syllabists) movement, in *Çınaraltı* journal (1944: 8), poses the question of "national poetry meter". After briefly presenting the history of the debate, Orhon says, "In a nation's literature two different poetry meter systems cannot be used simultaneously. This can only happen in literature that addresses different groups, like Divan and folk literature. However after the emergence of a national language, which encompasses the whole community, we should adopt one of those two poetry meters. Our language is in harmony either with syllabic meter or with prosody meter".

Following Orhon's invitation, *Çınaraltı* journal published a questionnaire that included the period's important names such as Edip Ayel, Rıza Tevfik, and Süleyman Şevket Tanlı. As expected, the survey resulted in the acceptance of syllabic meter as the national meter.

Similarly, in *Uyanış* (*Servet-i Fünun*) journal, Ozansoy (1936: 210) evaluates prosody meter as inadequate for expressing the genuine national feelings of the Turks and concludes, "syllabic meter can be the only national meter not just because it suits our national language, but also because of its simplicity in expressing the true sentiments of the Turkish nation".

While the moderate syllabists were admitting the worth of the Divan tradition and trying to protect it, they demanded only a transformation in the writing styles of

the poetry. However the radical advocates of "national meter" insisted on the whole rejection of the old poetry tradition.

In *Çınaraltı,* Besim Atalay (1941: 7) claims that usage of prosody meter was an act against Turkish language reform. Therefore, any publication written in prosody form should be forbidden, and in addition, examples of Divan poetry had to be immediately removed from literature books. "It is only nonsense trying to teach a literature that belongs to a different taste, feeling and more importantly a different age, to each student in each school. […] Instead our initial duty is to give real Turkish literature to Turkish children. I believe that trying to teach that mildewed literatures in schools is nothing but leading our youth into the torrent of oldness and backwardness".

Atalay was not alone in expressing such a radical view. In one of his article, Kazım Nami (1933: 68) demanded a prohibition of poems written in prosody. The reason underlying his claim was that prosody was an obstacle for the cultural modernization of the new generations. Thus it had to be terminated as soon as possible. "I do not desire any reference to Nedim in literature courses. There are better examples of poetry to give our children. I want the removal of Divan literature from the school curriculum not only because of *mahbupçuluk mazmunları*[21]*,* but because I find this whole literature to be insincere, artificial and bare".

The arguments above are the most extreme examples from the syllabic side. The main argument of the syllabic defenders appeared to be a formal concern about

---

[21] A kind of pun in Divan literature.

poetic form. Yet this concern immediately gained a political dimension since the national language was the subject matter. Interestingly, the state and its institutions had presented the most moderate (of course they were not pro-prosody) attitude towards prosody meter. Many articles about the harmony and the quality of prosody were published in the *Ülkü* journal, the official publication of the People's Houses.

However, the dominant discourse had always been a tendency to prove that syllabic, as the national meter was always superior to prosody meter. Therefore, many poets who had written in the prosody style in the past were implicitly forced to write in syllabic meter. Yahya Kemal is an important example of these poets. Similarly, the *Ülkü* journal celebrated the 100th anniversary of Namık Kemal's birth by publishing his poems written in syllabic meter rather than his masterpieces in prosody (Abdullah, 1940:319-325).

On the other side of the debate were the masters of the *Servet-i Fünun* tradition. Among them, Cenap Şehabettin distinguished himself with provocative articles defending prosody. In one of his articles, Şehabettin (1933:5) strongly rejected that syllabic meter was the national meter. "The claim that syllabic meter is national clearly has been formulated without a reasonable basis and therefore is speculative". He criticizes syllabic meter as lacking in harmony and perceives it as having no artistic value. "Syllabic meter is nothing but simply counting on the fingers, which lacks the basic rhythm of the poetry".

Similarly Halit Fahri Ozansoy (1933:92) defends the prosody tradition and objects to the idea of prohibiting it. On the other hand writers like Nurulah Ataç,

İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu and Vahdet Gültekin support prosody as a poetic form yet perceive the issue as a question of art rather than a political one. For those writers the only national literature can be the one that is produced for the public. Therefore, the only requirement is a pure language whether in prosody or in syllabic form.

Neither the government nor the state institutions directly intervened in literary production by means of a special policy such as prohibition. As was discussed earlier, they seemed to have a moderate attitude in daily debates, while on the other hand supporting the national meter, syllabic, which was no surprise. There are two possible explanations for such a position. First is that the dominant ideology did not perceive literature as an obstacle within the whole cultural reformation and therefore the government (republican elite) did not intervene in poetry as it did in music. An alternative explanation could be that national language reform was seen as equivalent to a literary reform. I think the main line of the syllabic-prosody debate gives us a strong reason to consider the second explanation more seriously.

Nevertheless the members of the literary world itself initiated an interesting practice in 1930. At conference held by Turkish literature teachers, it was decided that the collected works of Divan literature would not be included in the high school curriculum (*Uyanış* journal, 1930: 278-279/288). "The literary culture of Turkish youth has to be protected from the old, ordinary and low-aesthetics understanding of the Divan literature and should be illuminated by an international art perception. Therefore, high school literature curriculum should include primarily Western literature". As a result of this conference, examples of Divan literature were removed

from senior classes' Turkish literature curriculum until 1936. After that a limited part of Divan literature was included in literature courses for senior classes.

The debate on the form of verse meter lasted until the mid-1940s. However, the main period of argument on syllabic-prosody meter was the 1920s and early 1930s. In the second emergence of the debate, the effect of World War II and the rising nationalist movements should also be considered (Kolcu, 1993: 284-290). In this respect, the above-mentioned survey published in the *Çınaraltı* journal was the final example of the discussions.

Nevertheless the officially supported syllabic meter form of poetry was unable to create a deep tradition in Turkish literature and indeed it could not reach the masses. Rather, the free meter that was introduced to Turkish literature by Nazım Hikmet Ran, starting from the mid-1930s, reached a much wider range of readers. It is worth mentioning that following Nazım Hikmet's style and as a reaction to the subordination of artistic goals, a new literary stream, namely, the 'Second New' (*İkinci Yeni*) movement, eventually developed.

As Ahmet Oktay (1993: 107-112) points out, the syllabist poetry movement, in essence, was a reaction to the old traditional poetry. At the core of this reaction was a question of purified Turkish and, accordingly, a notion of nationalism[22]. Therefore, the primary concern of the movement was the formal representation of the poetry rather than an artistic objective (Lewis, 1991: 100). Perhaps as a result of this

---

[22] Karpat (1960: 35), in his article on contemporary Turkish literature, analyzes the 'nationality' problem with following words; "Many found the idea of a notion of nationalism in literature rather ridiculous, since anything written by a Turk in Turkish was *ipso facto* 'national'".

reductionist artistic perception of art, future poets abandoned syllabic meter. Nevertheless, the syllabic-prosody debate has remained a rich and concrete example in understanding the republican perception of the making of a new literature.

3.2.4 The Novel

The novel writing as discussed in chapter 1 was a recently emerged genre of literature in the Tanzimat period. Throughout the last century of the Empire Turkish novel writers expanded their knowledge and experience in forms of novels through the translated examples of novels from European literature. The basic theme of the period was modernization and its outcome.

However, following the end of World War I and the War of Independence, the theme of the Turkish novel shifted to a 'national' context. All through the early republican period the novel preserved its 'national' emphasis and gave examples from the developing new republic. On the other hand, the republican novel never lost its notion of 'civilization', and similar to the Ottoman novel it examined formation of the republican modernization.

Herkül Millas, in his book *Türk Romanı ve "Öteki"*, evaluates the emerging novel form of the early republican period as the representation of the nationalist ideology (Millas, 2000: 83). He argues that the nationalist thinking that based itself essentially on the distinction between 'self' and 'other' became the most influential element in the formation of republican novel (Millas, 2000: 83). However, it is not merely nationalist thinking that creates the distinction of 'self' and 'other'. The idea

of modernization that the republican ideology handles differently from the Ottoman experience led to the creation of a distinctive 'other' form. While the 'enemies' of the Turkish Republic appear as the 'other' form of nationalist ideology, the Ottoman tradition, particularly Islam, constitutes the 'other' of the republican project. In this respect, the Ottoman modernization is strongly criticized by republican writers. Regarding this two separate forms of 'other', three examples of the republican period novel are examined, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu's *Yaban* (The Stranger) and *Sodom ve Gomore* (Sodom and Gomorrah) and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* (The Clock Adjustment Institute).

The War of Independence brought the intellectuals in Anatolia, where for the first time they saw the benighted existence of the great majority of their countrymen who had never been thought about before. The devoted writers of the Kemalist movement narrated this unfortunate situation under the influence of naturalism, keeping away from Romanticism (Moran, 1998:154). Yakup Kadri, as one those writers, published his great Anatolian novel, *Yaban,* in 1932.

Yaban tells of Ahmet Celal Bey, an officer who lost his arm in World War I and who quits Istanbul to settle in the native village of his batman, Mehmet Ali. He believes that Anatolia is the home of the Turkish nation, men and women with noble hearts free of the evils of the capital. Ahmet Celal Bey, represents the romantic Ottoman intellectual who is newly aware of his nation and especially of Anatolia as the land of this nation. However, later he realizes that all of his romantic images about Anatolia, and village life are completely wrong. In reality what he finds are ruined huts where human beings can barely survive, a life of steady, unproductive,

uneducated, and even uncivilized villagers. For Ahmet Celal Bey the reason behind these unbearable conditions is the intellectuals like himself. He bitterly apostrophizes the Turkish intellectual:

> You are to blame for this! What have you done for this ruined land and these destitute human masses? After sucking their blood for centuries… now you think you have the right to come here and find them disgusting.

> The people of Anatolia had a soul, which you have not enlightened. They had a body, which you have not been able to feed. They had a land on which they lived; you have not let them work it. You have left them in the grip of brutishness, ignorance, poverty and famine. They have grown like weeds between the hard earth and the parched sky. Now, in sickle in hand, you have come here for the harvest. What have you sown? So what do you expect to reap? (Karaosmanoğlu, 1990: 136).

Certainly, Yakup Kadri wanted to represent the detachment between the 'people' and the intellectual through the character of Ahmet Celal. The intellectual, obviously Ottoman, who has the culture of Istanbul, a culture that possesses either Persian or Arabic words or a couple of French phrases with which to address the West. This is, in fact another rendition of Felatun or Bihruz Bey, after the end of Word War I. Now, Ahmet Celal is aware of his mission as an intellectual and he examines his understanding of 'nation' and 'people'.

Another important element of the book is the War of Independence. The reader, departing gradually from Ahmet Celal's world of thought, meets the war at the end of the book. This is, in fact a personal review of the process from Ottoman

civilization to the newly established republican culture. In this respect, the painful experience of Ahmet Celal is a reflection on the loss of Ottoman culture.

On the other hand *Yaban* constructs the 'self/other' relationship through the narrated image of Greek soldiers. The enemies are portrayed as the building blocks of national unity. The existence of an enemy army threatening the land becomes the factor that joins the 'people' living in this 'nation'. In fact, the notion of 'nation' is created through this threat. Moreover, the definition of 'other' at the same time appears as a self- defined figure. The relationship between the villagers and the Greek soldiers is described in set dichotomies such as good/bad, superior/inferior, and unjust/just (Millas, 2000: 80).

The book evoked powerful emotions. Many criticized it for its hostile depiction of peasant life, although for Yakup Kadri the intellectual has the primary responsibility for conditions in the village. *Yaban*, first of all represents a brake from the chain from the Ottoman novel tradition. For the first time, Anatolia was portrayed together with its neglected side. This inspired many authors to write their own Anatolia books. However, the village novel movement of the later decade, for the most part evaluated peasant life from a romantic point of view. Nevertheless, *Yaban* represents one of the first examples of the new republican novel.

Yakup Kadri's other novel, *Sodom ve Gomore,* written four years before *Yaban*, recounts the years of Istanbul under occupation. The characters of the novel are selected from uncaring intellectuals, bureaucrats, Levantines, and the high-ranking commanders of the occupation armies. In other words, the novel tells about the occupiers and the collaborators. Yakup Kadri had used the religious theme of

Sodom and Gomorrah not only to refer to the decadent social life of the Ottoman elite, who had a great affection for the Western culture, but also to refer to the morally corrupt life of those people. To this end, he narrates the love affair between Necdet and Leyla, in which the male character appears as weak and lacking of national consciousness, while Leyla, the fiancée of Necdet, is portrayed as the pretentious fan of an English commander.

The first part of the book describes the immorality of these people. Many of the Turkish female characters are having affairs with the officers of the English and French armies. Both women and men are portrayed as having strong sexual passions, or with Yakup Kadri's words, "they are bestial creatures lost in lust" (Karaosmanoğlu, 1999: 107). Gerald Jackson Reed is a snob who is surrounded by women, Marlow is a homosexual, and Will has dishonorable passions, as do the female characters. Yakup Kadri chooses to tell of the decay of the Istanbul elite through their illicit sexual life.

Necdet and Leyla are a part of this group too. We learn that Necdet is an intellectual who lacks a national awareness, alienated from his origins. He is passionately in love with Leyla but this love proves to be like handcuffs for him. On the other hand Leyla, the daughter of a high-ranking bureaucrat, is characterized by her pretentious, materialistic thinking. Although she is engaged, she desires to be admired by the English officer. To achieve her goal, Leyla is ready to forgo everything, including Necdet.

The ill-fated affair between Necdet and Leyla is over when Necdet recognizes the illicit relationships that surround him. His awareness runs parallel to the

development of the national struggle in Anatolia. On the contrary, Leyla's transformation is just the opposite of this. While Necdet searches for his salvation in Anatolia, Leyla thinks that her emancipation lies in the West.

Sodom ve Gomore appears to be a preparatory stage for *Yaban*. In another Istanbul-centered story Yakup Kadri tells about the degenerate elite of the city. Once again Westernization is misunderstood, but this time Yakup Kadri's criticism is crueler than before. On the one hand he presents the immoral lives of the Ottoman upper classes who are able to abandon every moral principle in the name of 'Westernization'. They represent the final stage of Ottoman modernization, which depends on the mere imitation of Western culture. Consequently, the deteriorization of values is not surprising. The Ottoman elite had misunderstood the essence of Western civilization and this, corresponding to the decline of the Empire, finally led to the collapse of every traditional value.

On the other hand, Yakup Kadri criticizes the intellectual, who has neither an idea of nation nor an awareness of identity. He accuses the intellectual of having an irresponsible attitude towards his nation. The clearest expression of his criticisms of the intellectual appears in *Yaban*.

In *Sodom ve Gomore*, Yakup Kadri gives the reader a profile of the 'other' i.e. the Ottoman elite and intellectual. For him they are immoral, ignorant of their origins and worst of all, they are unaware of the awakening of the new nation. Yakup Kadri does not attribute these characteristics only to the last generation of the Empire. He argues that the events during the occupation of Istanbul are the final stage of the Westernization performance of the Ottoman Empire. Unfortunately, this performance

lacked the notion of 'national values' from the beginning. The result is a degenerate group of bureaucrats, Levantines, intellectuals, women, and men.

In this respect, *Sodom ve Gomore* appears to be the exact reverse of Safveti Ziya's *Salon Köşelerinde*. The character of Şekip Bey, praised in Ziya's novel, is criticized in the person of Necdet by Yakup Kadri. In essence, it is the criticism directed at the Ottoman mind, at the 'other'. Şekip Bey, once desperately love with Miss Sanşayn, now is suffering pain because of his lighthearted fiancée. The national feelings that forced Şekip Bey to stay in Istanbul appear to be painful obstacles for Necdet. He cannot decide to go to Anatolia to join the national struggle. In brief Yakup Kadri presents the story of Ottoman tradition, which cannot be a part of the national awakening.

The construction of the 'other' with respect to the emerging nationalist thought finds its true characters in the narration of Yakup Kadri. The notion of modernization as the second emerging source of differentiation between the 'self' and the 'other' is told by Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar in his *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*. He approaches the modernization experiences of both the Ottoman and republican periods critically. The book recounts Hayri İrdal's memories of childhood, youth, and adulthood. The corresponding four sections of the novel, *"Büyük Ümitler"* (Great Expectations), *"Küçük Hakikatler"* (Little Truths), *"Sabaha Do*ğru" (Towards Morning), and *"Her Mevsimin Bir Sonu Vardır"* (Each Season has an End) is a time continuum starting from the pre-*Tanzimat* period. While the second part considers the *Tanzimat* period, the third and fourth sections are about the early republican period and the years following it (Moran, 1998: 224).

The noble writing style of Tanpınar presents us with unique representations of the formation of the 'other' and the 'self'. In his script, the 'other' of the republican modernization period appears in the form of Ottoman tradition and Islamic figures in particular. The characters appearing in the childhood memories of Hayri İrdal, clearly refer the Islamic figures in the Ottoman period. And, interestingly, in the last part of the novel they are analyzed by a psychologist, representing 'science' and 'reason' (Moran, 1998: 227-228). Another image of the 'other' appears with the notion of '*eşiktekiler*' (of the doorway). He basically addresses the people who do not possess the requirements for the new modern life. Those people are the characters of the coffeehouse. When İrdal talks about the people of the coffeehouse, he indeed tells about the 'in-betweeness' of society following the *Tanzimat* period. "In reality, the life lived here was a life outside of the actual door. And the people living it, in this fashion i.e. without thinking of going in, are living it with a foot always in the doorway" (Tanpınar, 1992: 108). The image of the door is the one that opens into contemporary civilization, and these people are those who could not enter that door (Moran, 1998: 229).

The construction of the 'self' and 'other' is seen in many republican period novels. In general, the 'other' is either a national enemy or a reactionary power, which is the anathema of the Kemalist project. In novel writing there occurred no debate on the formal characteristics of the republican novel. Similarly, there is no 'other' form of writing a novel, as opposed to the case of poetry writing. In this respect, the arguments on the 'national novel' focus on the content of the novel rather than its form.

With respect to the concern for the themes of the novel, the republican model wanted to develop the Turkish novel in a framework of a classical, humanistic tradition (Karpat, 1960: 39). In order to provide the basis for the emergence of such a novel, the translation of classical works from foreign languages was considered as a basic necessity, not only for acquiring the humanistic spirit, but also as a means of developing a Western-style novel tradition. The government itself embarked on a translation program in 1940 (Karpat, 1960:39). "The program resulted in the translation of over 600 classical works ranging from the ancient philosophers to contemporary novels in every language which has produced worthy literature" (Karpat, 1960: 39). The Translation Office, established to accomplish the goals of program, played an important role in the encounter of the masses with the novel. In this respect, it might be said that the Office had a designative authority over the reader. Considering the broad range of translated novels, from Stendhal to Maxim Gorki, the functioning of the Translation Office in Westernizing the literary world was appropriate to the objectives of the republican 'modernization' process. Moreover, the literary style and dynamism of these novels affected many Turkish writers and led to the development of Turkish novel in a Western form.

The republican novel, which was influenced by both the emerging ideologies and the translated novels, became a critical part of Turkish literature in a relatively short time. It highlighted the ideological origins in the establishment of the Turkish Republic. The emerging characters representing the 'other' were narrated either in the form of threats to national unity or by addressing to the cosmopolitan, collaborator, and reactionary elements of the Ottoman past. Therefore, the Turkish novel fills an

important niche in understanding the relationship between the politics of the day and its reflection on literature.

Chapter IV: Emergence of National Identity and Literature –A Theoretical Framework

4.1 A Review of the Nationalism Theories

In this chapter, the relationship between Turkish literature and the newly emerging Turkish national identity in the early republican period is analyzed within a theoretical framework. Yet, in order to dissect the components of the relationship analytically, it is necessary to briefly look at nationalism theories.

Hans Kohn, in his book *The Idea of Nationalism,* refers to (1960: 10) nationalism as "first and foremost a state of mind, as an act of consciousness". The words 'nation' and 'nationality', according to Kohn, first manifested themselves in the French Revolution and by the end of the 18th century they had found different expressions in a number of widely separated European countries. Nevertheless the French nation-state, established in the revolution of 1789 as the fruit of the Age of Enlightenment, became the guiding model for many other countries. It basically represented a new and powerful dynamic in the political formations of various states and became the signifier of a modern nation based upon individual liberty, equality and a cosmopolitan outlook.

As opposed to the French idea of nationalism, the German nation-state had emerged from a different ideal, which had an anti-Western, anti-Enlightenment, and Germanophile attitude (Kohn, 1967: 3). In essence the distinguishing characteristic of German nationalism was its rejection of the cosmopolitan and humanistic components of the Enlightenment idea. Despite the differences between the two models of

nationalism, both the French and German genres became influential in the character of emerging nation-states everywhere.[1]

By the second half of the 18th century, many countries across Europe as well as America referred to themselves as nation-states, and scholars had started to define the boundaries of nationalism. Among them, a French thinker, Ernest Renan, stands as an important figure for comprehending the foundations of the European understanding of nationalism.

In 1882, Renan presented a seminar titled "What is a Nation?"[2] His speech on the emergence of a nation has become, perhaps, one of the most influential theoretical frameworks of the subsequent century's nationalism theories. Renan, in fact, supplied a simple description of the process for forming a nation. Throughout this process even though the natural requirements of formation of a nation, such as race, a common language, religion and territory play essential roles, for him, 'non-natural conditions' are also essential for the emergence of modern nations. These 'non-natural elements' constitute the shared memory of the people. However the basic feature of this memory is not only recording a common history, but also forgetting particular parts of that history. In his words, "Yet, the essence of a nation is that all individuals have many things in common, and also that they have forgotten many things" (1990: 11).

---

[1] Turkish nationalism was also influenced by both ideological models. As was discussed earlier, while the French model, with its ideas of liberty and equality was dominant in the first part of the emerging national thought, German nationalism became a more powerful ideology in the early years of the republic.

[2] Renan, as a French philosopher was one of the most influential figures for the period's Ottoman intellectual world. His ideas on the nation and nationalism that essentially were a result of the French Revolution and its ideals of liberty, equality and fellowship made his theory important especially for the Young Turks movement. However, Renan's thoughts on the eastern world and in particular about Islam and its culture were strongly criticized and rejected by Namık Kemal. Kemal's *Renan Müdafaanamesi* (Renan Defense) was written against Renan's article on "Islam and Science" in 1908.

First of all, Renan pays attention to the 'spiritual principle' of forming a nation. "A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle. Two things, which in truth are but one, constitute this soul or spiritual principle. One lies in the past, one in the present" (Renan, 1990: 19). The shared past, which is indeed the shared forgotten memory of the people, is the required non-natural element in the emergence of a nation. "A nation is therefore a large-scale solidarity, constituted by the feeling of 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, 1990: 19-20).

The 'will' to be a nation for Renan is beyond the identities of race, language or territory. It is this will that is shaped by the unified historical memory of the members. This will, Homi Bhabha states (1994: 160), is indeed the articulation of the nation-people. Through the syntax of forgetting, imagining the nation-people becomes more visible. "Being obligated to forget is the basis for remembering the nation, peopling anew, imagining the possibility of other contending and liberating forms of cultural identification" (Bhabha, 1994: 161).

Since Renan's definition of nation, the formation of nation has also been ascribed as being parallel with the process of modernization. Therefore creation of a national identity developed into a necessity for the modernization/Westernization of countries. The very implication of this was the discourse on nationalism as the modernization understanding, emerged as an epistemological knowledge that differentiates the world as the 'Western' and the 'non-Western'. Or in other words,

the nationalist discourse has created itself on the basis of the differentiation between the 'self' and the 'other'.

As a result of this distinction, there have appeared different theories of nationalism investigating 'Western' nationalism and 'Eastern' nationalism. Many theorists, such as John Plamenatz and Hans Kohn developed their theories of nationalism on the basis of East-West distinction, and for them the basic difference was emerged from the cultural differences between the two worlds. Plamenatz refers to two types of nationalism in which the concept is "primarily a cultural phenomenon although it often takes a political form" (Plamenatz, 1976: 23-24). While one type is 'Western', having emerged primarily in Western Europe, the other type of nationalism, the 'Eastern', is found in Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa and also Latin America. Both types, according to Plamenatz, were to be analyzed by a common set of standards, by which the state of development of a particular national culture is measured. It is that set of standards in which the difference between the 'Eastern' and the 'Western' types of nationalism appear. Plamenatz argues that for the 'Western' type, although there is the feeling that the nation is at a disadvantage with respect to others, it is nonetheless already 'culturally equipped' to make the attempt to remove those deficiencies (Plamenatz, 1976: 30). However. For 'Eastern' nationalism there is no notion of being 'culturally equipped', but rather the national consciousness of those states emerges as they become aware of their backwardness with respect to the standards set by the advanced nations of Western Europe. "The 'Eastern' type of nationalism, consequently, is accompanied by an effort to re-equip the nation culturally, to transform it" (Plamenatz. 1976: 50).

Similarly, Hans Kohn studies the concept of nationalism by distinguishing not only between the 'Western' and 'non-Western' types, but also between 'good' and 'evil' nationalism (Kohn, 1929: 5-6). Kohn's separation between 'good' and 'evil' nationalism is dependent upon the notion of the liberal and progressive ideal of the Enlightenment. For him, nationalism represents the actualization of the universal urge for liberty and progress, which were the fruits of the French Revolution and the Age of Enlightenment (Kohn, 1962: 25-26). Consequently, the 'Western' or 'good' nationalism is the pure one that constitutes a historical unity with European history and becomes the paradigm of liberal rationality. On the other hand the 'non-Western' or 'evil' nationalism, in Kohn's theory, appears as a deviant form of the liberal-rationalist nationalism and is investigated as a special model. This special type emerges under different (different from the Western European experience) historical circumstances (Kohn, 1929: 11). The very reason to experience these special conditions is the cultural differences between the two worlds. The deviant form (of the east) that is lacking the liberal notion of 'Western' nationalism, for Kohn, is a result of the historically articulated culture of the 'East'. Yet, "[the] fundamental tendency of the Oriental fellowship of common destiny is Westwards. It may be that this Westernism is not accidental, not merely the effect of influence, but that rather the historical consciousness of mankind evolves through inevitable epochs and in that case it is the European fellowship to be the model" (Kohn, 1929: 12). It is apparent that the discourse on nationalism and national identity is established on the basis of a simple distinction between the 'Western' and the 'non-Western' world. The nation that founds its roots in the emergence of non-natural elements defines itself as not

only dependent upon being obliged to forget but also dependent on the differences between the 'self' and the 'other'.

4.1.1 Gellner, Anderson, and Chatterjee revisited

In particular, the crucial effect of this distinction was experienced in the fabrication, construction, or inventions of national identities. The nationalist discourse, which claims the unification of culture, seeks the homogeneity of identities. Consequently, the nationalist discourse takes its roots from the differentiation of the 'self' and the 'other'. The process of the emergence of national identities is mainly resolved by the inclusion of the 'self' and exclusion of the 'other'. Besides, the nationalism discourse calls for a 'universalistic spirit' as Ernest Gellner argues (1983: 1). However, this 'universalistic spirit' is not a result of "the awakening of self-existing nations, but rather invention of nations where they do not exist" (1983: 34). And this point constitutes the basic dilemma of the nationalist discourse.

Gellner returns to Renan's point of the 'will to be a nation' and criticizes his definition of nation in terms of a shared culture and history (1983:54). For Gellner, this definition addresses a general theory of "nationalism, which brings it in far too rich a catch". He argues that it is almost impossible to search for a culturally pure society in order to have the essential structure for the emergence of nationalism. "It is nationalism which engenders the nations, and not the other way round. Admittedly, nationalism uses the pre-existing, historically inherited proliferation of cultures or cultural wealth, though it uses them very selectively, and it most often transforms

them radically. Dead languages can be revived, traditions invented, quite fictitious pristine purities restored" (1983: 55-56)[3].

Gellner, rightly points out that the emergence of nations is not a result of awakening self-consciousness dependent purely upon shared cultural values, but instead it is essentially the general imposition of a high culture on society. However, he is also aware of the fact that it is the very opposite of what nationalism affirms. "Nationalism usually conquers in the name of a putative folk culture. Its symbolism is drawn from the healthy, pristine, vigorous life of the peasant, of the *Volk*, of the *Narod*. If nationalism prospers, eliminates the alien high culture, but it does not then replace it by the old local low culture; it revives, or invents a local high culture of its own" (1983: 56). Gellner rightly puts forward the basic dilemma lying within the structure of nationalism. However, he does not develop his theory as a criticism to that point. Although Gellner is aware of the contradictions in the structure of an understanding of nationalism based upon the modernist, progressive and liberal ideas of the Enlightenment, he simply reduces those dilemmas into the universal acceptance of the industrial society. As Partha Chatterjee argues, "[the] nationalist thought does not pose any special problems for either epistemology or political philosophy. All its problems can be reduced to the sociological requirements of industrial society whose universal sway provides the context for the understanding of nationalism" (Chatterjee: 1986: 6).

---

[3] Gellner, in fact backs Renan's notion of "forgetting". He states "[the] nationalism discourse has its own amnesias and selections, which can be profoundly distorting and deceptive"(1983: 56). However, it appears that Gellner is not criticizing Renan's previous conceptualization. Regarding this point, Gellner is not far from Renan's understanding of nationalism.

Another thinker, Benedict Anderson, also points out this dilemma and argues against an epistemological knowledge of 'nation', since the term, for him, can only constitute an 'imaginary community' (Anderson, 1991: 6). Nations are imagined as possessing four features: having unified members, being limited in number, being sovereign and being a community (1991: 6-7). Departing from the classical Marxist perception that national affiliations are merely inventions or fabrications, Anderson, instead, claims, "communities are to be distinguished not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined" (1991: 15). [4]

According to Anderson the development of a capitalist marketplace for printed books (print-capitalism) in the European vernacular was essential to the emergence of national consciousness (1991: 71-73). Print-capitalism gave way to the rise of a connection among people through writing. Anderson states that the modern and national conception of subjectivity is embodied particularly in two textual genres essential to imaging the nation: the novel and the newspaper.

Another role that Anderson attributes to print-capitalism in the emergence of the nations (imagined communities) is the creation of a profound change in the capture of time. During the Enlightenment period along with the emergence of the notion of nation, the novel and the newspaper maintained the 'homogeneous, empty time' of European history. The measurement of time by calendar and clock helps to produce the structure of an 'imagined nation' which protects the features of a modern nation and at the same time presents itself like the plot of a novel. "The acts, which

---

[4] At this point it would be useful to remember the 'imagined people, villages and cities' appearing in both the poetry and novels of republican literature. Similarly, the 'self/other' relationship is formed in an imaginative way in literature. Against the constructed heroes of the new republic – the genuine people- the artifact characters of the cosmopolitan Ottoman dynasty exit.

are performed at the same clocked, calenderical time, are performed by actors who may be largely unaware of one another. This shows the novelty of the imagined world conjured up by author in his readers' minds. The idea of a sociological organism moving calendrically through homogeneous, empty time is a precise analogue of the idea of the nation" (Anderson, 1991: 26)[5].

As can be easily recognized, for Anderson the narration activity occupies a fundamental place in the emergence of imagined communities. The association of the time-awareness and the emergence of newspapers and novels, i.e. print-capitalism, constitute the central theme in Anderson's conceptualization of nationalism. "The imagined linkage derives from two obliquely related sources. The first is simply calenderical coincidence. The date at the top of the newspaper, the single most important emblem on it, provides the essential connection –the steady onward clocking of homogeneous, empty time. The second source of imagined linkage lies in the relationship between the newspaper, as a form of book, and the market" (Anderson, 1991: 33)[6].

It is important to recognize how Anderson's notion of the association between 'print-capitalism' and the emergence of nationalist thought corresponds to the development of nationalism in Turkey. Hans Kohn, in his book *A History of Nationalism in the East*, emphasizes the relationship between the publication of

---

[5] Anderson's notion of modernity, which is signified by the conception of time and elements such as calendar, and clock, finds its concrete reflection in republican reforms of adopting Western-style calendar and measurement units.
[6] At this point it is worth remembering, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*. If one considers the story and the characters appearing in this satiric novel, in particular the clock *Mübarek*, together with the modernization process of Turkey, then the puzzle would appear to be completed. Perhaps while *Mübarek*, the stopped clock, represents the abandoned (thus stopped) past of the Turkish Republic, it is at the same time the symbol of a consciousness to be repaired in this new era (Moran, 1998:227-229).

newspapers in Turkish and the emergence of nationalist thought. "In Turkey as elsewhere modern nationalist sentiment arose simultaneously with the creation of a new, unaffected, and natural literary language akin to the vernacular" (Kohn, 1929: 225). Kohn specifically refers to the works of Şinasi Efendi and states that "[he] was the father of the new language, which he was the first to use in his translations and his newspaper *Tasvir-i Efkar* (The Interpretation of Circumstances)" (1929: 226).

In fact, Şinasi Effendi and his works are not the only examples worth mentioning. By the end of the 19th century, the Turkish press had developed quite rapidly. Of course the impact of the Young Turks movement is undeniable in the emergence of the numerous publications. In 1862, the newspaper *Müşbir*, edited by Ali Suavi, in 1867 the paper *Hürriyet*, and later in 1870 the newspaper *İbret* edited by Kemal Bey became the important elements of the nationalist movement in Turkey and acted as a fermenting of democratic influence (Kohn, 1929: 227).

Apparently, among the important newspapers and journals of the period, *Genç Kalemler* edited by Ali Canip enjoys the most prominent position. The journal, doubtlessly, was the rising voice of Turkish nationalism. Moreover, the relationship between the ideology of the journal and its emphasis on language and literature provides significant insights if we employ Anderson's theoretical framework. According to Anderson, the language and in particular certain vernaculars are the most important elements of print-capitalism. Since print-capitalism requires a new fixity in the language, and since certain dialects, e.g. the Istanbul dialect, are inevitably closer to print language, print-capitalism helped in the formation of a 'national language' with respect to the emergence of the idea of 'nation' (Anderson,

1991: 44-45). Regarding the issue of language and literature, the role of *Genç Kalemler* in the formation of Turkish nationalism becomes clearer in light of Anderson's conceptualization of print-capitalism.

Anderson evaluates the formation of nations with respect to developments in capitalism, in particular print-capitalism. He argues that the involvement of time consciousness in the written world and the association of the market with this world, have created the possibility of the idea of 'nation'. "It is," Anderson argues, "the hallmark of modern nations, when the newspaper reader is continually reassured that the imagined world of the community is visibly rooted in everyday life" (Anderson, 1991: 35-36). It is apparent that in Anderson's theory the emergence of nation-states coincides with the possibility of modernity regarding the ideals of the Enlightenment. Similar to Gellner's industrial society, Anderson conceptualizes print-capitalism. Yet, his theory does not end with a separation between the 'West' and the 'non-Western' world. Rather, Anderson creates models in order to investigate nationalism. The first model he argues is the 'Creole nationalism' of the Americans, which was built upon the ambitions of classes whose economic interests were ranged against the metropolis. The second model was that of the 'linguistic nationalisms' of Europe, a model of the independent national state. The final model is 'official nationalism', the 'Russification', which involved the imposition of cultural homogeneity from the top, through the state's actions.

Although Anderson's theory faced much criticism in both Marxist and post-colonial literature, his theory is well structured for understanding the ambivalences and contradictions in the emergence of nations. As Homi Bhabha states, "Despite the

certainty with which historians speak of the 'origins' of nation as a sign of (the) 'modernity', the cultural temporality of the nation inscribes a much more transitional social reality. And Anderson's book paved the way to expressing this unsure emergence with great clarity" (Bhabha: 1990: 1).

Furthermore, I think that Anderson's *Imagined Communities* provides a different perspective in understanding the sources of the emerging Turkish nationalism in the early and mid 20th century and its reflections. In particular, his emphasis on the relationship between the national consciousness and print-capitalism appears to be an appropriate theoretical framework regarding the basic question put forward in this thesis. In this respect Anderson's theory of nationalism should be carefully read to understand the relationship between the emergence of Turkish identity and literature.

Finally, Partha Chatterjee's influential critique of nationalism theories should be mentioned. His evaluation of nationalist discourse as having been constructed on a historically and culturally biased conception of the Western world and the non-Western one is similar to Edward Said's critical investigation of Orientalist discourse. Chatterjee opposes the universalistic claim of liberal thought as criticizing theorists such as Gellner, Plamenatz, and Kedourie. The goal of reaching cultural homogeneity as discussed by Gellner is not the reality of nationalist discourse. He points out that "nationalist thought did not even need to investigate 'the general logic' of the kind of the society it was trying to build: that logic was given it objectively. […] Nationalism 'uses some of the pre-existing cultures generally transforming them in the process,

but it cannot possibly use them all. It often defines itself in the name of the some putative folk culture. But this is a myth, a piece of self-deception"(1986: 5)

Chatterjee opposes the idea of the path of development to modernization, which is assumed to be universal. In addition he does not agree with the post-Enlightenment values that basically represent the way to modernization. Then nationalism, Chatterjee argues, appears as a particular manifestation of the 'bourgeois-rationalist' conception of knowledge, which in fact is based upon a cultural essentialism. Chatterjee (1986: 14-15) states that the development of the positivist social sciences that form a rational knowledge of human beings in the post-Enlightenment period, indeed, created knowledge of 'self' and 'other'. Consequently knowledge that is put in rational terms turns out to be a means to establishing a power relationship (in a Foucauldian reading) between the 'self' and the 'other'. Therefore, it is the rational knowledge indeed causing the cultural essentialism that divides up the cultures as pre-rationalist (scientific), and rationalist while referring only to Western thought. Chatterjee argues that nationalism, as an ideal of Enlightenment, cannot be universal since the Enlightenment is in need of the 'other' to actualize itself. So this is the liberal-rationalist dilemma.

On the other hand, the Marxist reading of the nationalist discourse seems questionable to Chatterjee. In particular, he criticizes Anderson because of his close theoretical position to the liberal nationalist thought. According to him, while Anderson departs from the orthodox Marxist understanding of nation, he "seals up his theme with a sociological determinism" (1986: 21). Consequently, for Chatterjee, Gellner's 'industrial society' and Anderson's 'print-capitalism' become synonymous

with respect to their reference to a cultural homogeneity to be imposed on a newly emerging nation. Hence Anderson's theory, like the liberal dilemma of the nationalist discourse (Gellner), perceives third-world nationalism as 'modular' in character. In a sense Anderson relates the modernization process and the emergence of national identity in a manner similar to liberal thought.

Nationalism theories, of course, widen to such an extent that I cannot pose a discussion of the entire literature in such a brief review. Nevertheless, I suppose that these three theorists, Gellner, Anderson and Chatterjee, would present different approaches in order to understand nationalism. However, although each of them might help to understand the issue of 'nation', Anderson and his notion of 'imagined communities' appears as the most applicable theory for the construction of a national identity as found in the Kemalist example. In the following section I will try to present a theoretical exploration of the relation between the rising national literature movement and the construction of national identity.

4.2 The Nation and the Narration

Since the 15th century, literature as an autonomous aesthetic field played an important role in the formation of national narrations. Without distinguishing the literary works as 'Western' or 'Eastern' in style, one can argue that the narration activity has always taken part in the formation of a common cultural ground in a society. Perhaps the first point that should be made in this section is that the question raised is neither on the beginnings of a specific kind of literature nor is it the conducting of a qualitative analysis on the relationship between nations and their

literature. Rather, focusing on 'nationalism' as a part of the modernity discourse, this theoretical section is an attempt to explore the roe of the literature in the construction of the nationalist discourse.

The critical literary theory that is grounded mainly on post-Marxist literature has become a crucial part of cultural studies. In the emergence of literary theory, the effect of post-colonial studies and the increasing number of examinations of cultural politics cannot be denied. In fact, literature, considering it in the modern sense (rise of the novel and modern poetry), turned out to be an autonomous aesthetic field in which the reflection of the modernization theory could be examined and questioned. For that reason, the post-colonial studies as a critique of modernization theory attributed to the literary field an enormous importance and has opened up a rich ground for analysis in recent decades.

The essential feature of the narration is the construction of 'otherness' by writing activity. The literary form, hence, is again the representation of binary relationships between the 'other' and the 'self'. Pursuing this element of the written form, within the framework of critical literature theory, an examination of national identity that is in essence an analysis conducted on the dichotomies of 'self/other', 'modernity/tradition', 'religious/secular' can be accomplished. As Homi Bhabha states: "The study of a world literature might be the study of the way in which cultures recognize themselves through their projection of "otherness" (1994: 12).

The construction of 'other' in the literary context has been analyzed through different cases. While in Orientalist discourse, as Edward Said (1979) argues, the 'other' appears in the ontological and epistemological existence of the 'East', in the

post-colonial literature the 'self' is formed through a search for national identity which excludes the 'West' as the 'other' (Carey-Webb, 1998: 4). The second important note to this theoretical section is that in Turkish literature the case for the republican period, the construction of the 'other' differs considerably from Orientalist or post-colonial discourses. While in the former examples the 'self' is formed in the course of exclusion of another culture, in the latter Turkish instance the creation of the 'other' precisely derives from a historical epoch within its culture, i.e. the Ottoman Empire and its artifacts. Therefore, while using the post-colonial literary theory approach for the examination of the association between the emergence of national identity and literature, it should be kept in mind that building of the Turkish national identity never excluded the 'Western'. Even though the republic's relationship with the West might sometimes have carried tensions, such as the discourse of having battled against imperialism shows, it never directly conflicts with the West. Rather it defined contemporary civilization, (*muassır medeniyet*) as the goal to be reached. Nevertheless, the applicability of post-colonial literary theory for the case of Turkish literature is discussed in the next section.

One of the influential studies on the relationship between nationalism in general, and post-colonial nationalism in particular, and the emerging literature is Homi Bhabha's book *The Location of Culture*. Bhabha mainly focuses on the concepts of national identity and culture and questions the methodology by which national identities are constructed and realized in the cultural realm. Regarding the history of colonial and post-colonial nationalism as the basis, the theories of nationalism are naturally involved in Bhabha's studies.

The points and criticisms developed by Said, Chatterjee and Anderson constitute the initial points of Bhabha's analysis of post-colonial modernization and nationalism. For him the nation's claim to modernity as an autonomous form of political rationality is an awkward issue, as Chatterjee argues as well. He accepts the idea that "the nation may exemplify modern social cohesion" but considering Gellner's phrase (Gellner, 1983: 56) "nationalism is not what it seems, and *above all what it seems to itself…The* cultural shreds and patches used by nationalism are often arbitrary historical inventions. But in no way does it follow that the principle of nationalism … is itself in the least contingent and accidental" (Bhabha. 1994: 142). According to Bhabha, the claim to cultural homogeneity that a nation prepossesses and the claim to universality are the problematical points in the construct of the history of nationalism. "Historians transfixed on the event and origins of the nation never asked, and political theorists possessed of the 'modern' totalities of the nation never pose, the essential question of the representation of the nation as a temporal process"(1994: 142). For Bhabha the fabrication of a nation is a chronological question, and indeed the nation's modernity only lays the nation's narration in the disjunctively projected time. "To write the story of the nation demands that we articulate that archaic ambivalence that informs the *time* of modernity" (1994:142).

The two key traits in Bhabha's understanding of nationalism, the 'narrating' activity and the consideration of 'time' lead us to have a proper connection between Bhabha and Anderson's thinking. Bhabha's concern for the role of 'time', in the structuring of modern nations is intensified by Anderson's conception of the national temporality of the 'meanwhile', as he borrowed from Walter Benjamin

'homogeneous empty time'. "This is the time of cultural modernity that supersedes the prophetic notion of simultaneity-along-time," says Bhabha (1994:158). The symbolic means of the modern 'time' in Anderson's thinking, the clock and the calendar, that produces the structure of the nation as 'imagined communities' and the narrative of 'meanwhile', as a result, permits the realization of sociological solidity of the nation. However, at this point Bhabha goes a step further in his critique of Anderson and argues that the 'meanwhile' creates an unfilled point in the narrative of national time. It is, according to Bhabha, not a coherent single-homogeneous time, but instead a doubleness that arises from the ambivalent splitting of the 'pedagogical' and 'performative' time. He states "the narrative of the imagined community is constructed from two incommensurable temporalities of meaning that threaten its coherence" (1994: 158). Leaving the last argument of Bhabha aside, it is clear that Anderson's conceptualization of 'imagined communities' emerges as a proper theoretical background for Bhabha.

For Bhabha, the entire literature on nationalism is an essentially questioned field of thought since according to him, "the very concept of homogenous cultures, the consensual or contiguous transmission of historical traditions, or 'organic' ethnic communities are in a profound process of redefinition" (1994: 5). Throughout this process the narrations of the nations will assist us in understanding the motives of the transformation of nationality, which is bounded by the basic tension between the 'self' and the 'other'. Literature, therefore, constitutes the main ground in his study in order to explore the sources of national identity.

Bhabha, in his article "Dissemination: Time, Narrative and the Margins of the Modern Nation", looks at the relationship between the nationalist discourse in the post-colonial world and the emergence of modern literature. He says, "What I am attempting to formulate in this essay are the complex strategies of cultural identification and discursive address that function in the name of the 'people' or the 'nation' and make them the imminent subjects of a range of social and literary narratives" (Bhaba, 1994: 140).

Indeed the initial theoretical source that inspires Bhabha is an earlier post-colonialist theoretician, Franz Fanon. Fanon's now classic book *The Wretched of the Earth* deals with the question of the creation of national culture in the struggle for liberation from colonialism in Africa. His main source of investigation is the African narrations and narratives. His conceptualization of nationalism and national culture is far away from the classical 19th century writers. Rather, Fanon derives his definition of nation from within the existing contingent and performative time. In "On National Culture," Fanon proposes a definition of national culture as follows:

A national culture is not a folklore, nor an abstract populism that believes it can discover the people's true nature. It is not made up of inert dregs of gratuitous actions, that is to say actions, which are less and less attached to the ever-present reality of the people. A national culture is the whole body of efforts made by a people in the sphere of thoughts to describe, justify and praise the action through which that people has created itself and keeps itself in existence. A national culture in the under-developed countries

should therefore take its place at the very heart of the struggle for freedom these countries are carrying on (Fanon, 1963: 237).

It is apparent that Fanon's view of national culture refers to the term 'national' in its most present-oriented sense (Carey-Webb, 1998: 101). It is in fact this very point, Fanon's conception of engaged and ongoing construction of the national identity, which Bhabha reconciles with his theory of performative/pedagogical actions.

In order to understand the connection between Fanon's definition of 'present-oriented national culture' and Bhabha's conceptualization of performative/pedagogical actions, one point, his notion of national time-space, should be explained. While the concept of national time is related to the building of national identity within a double time, that is construction initially in the national past in order to create the 'self' and the 'other', and afterward forming the national identity in the present; the national space refers to the shift in which the fabricated identity transforms itself from the past to the present space of the nation[7]. The attempted modernity, Bhabha argues, appears as the initial reason for this ambivalent national time-space consideration. The language of the culture, then turns out to be a *signifier*, which articulates the rhetorical figures of the national past with the constructed identity of the present.

Within the framework of the national time-space conception Bhabha questions the location of the people in the nationalist discourse:

---

[7] The notion of 'doubleness' in the concern for the national time should be understood regarding Bhabha's critique to Anderson.

It is precisely in reading between these borderlines of the nation-space that we can see how the concept of the 'people' emerges within a range of discourses as a double narrative movement. The people are not simply historical events or parts of a patriotic body politic. They are also a complex rhetorical strategy of social reference: their claim to be representative provokes a crisis within the process of signification and discursive address. We then have contested a conceptual territory where the nation's people must be thought in a double-time; the people are the historical 'objects' of a nationalist pedagogy, giving the discourse an authority that is based on the pre-given or constituted historical origin *in the past*; the people are also the 'subjects' of a process of signification that must erase any prior or originary presence of the nation-people to demonstrate the prodigious, living principles of the people as contemporaneity (1994: 145).

For Bhabha there occurs a split between the continuist, accumulative temporality of the *pedagogical* and the repetitious, recursive strategy of the *performative* as creating the national narration. While the former founds its narrative authority in the tradition of the people, the latter intervenes in the sovereignty of the nation's self-generation by creating a discourse of the people as the 'self' and the outside as the 'other'. "The nations interrupted address articulated in the tension between the signifying the people as an priori presence. A pedagogical object and the people constructed in the performance of narrative, its enunciatory 'present' marked in the repetition and pulsation of the national sign" (Bhabha, 1994: 147). The performative action, according to Bhabha, gives rise to increasing tension within the

110

nation itself, since the nature of the action, being in between the 'self' and the 'other' disrupts the homogeneity of the people. Therefore the problem is not the signification of a nation as opposed to a created 'other', but rather that the performative action causes "a split within a nation itself articulating the heterogeneity of its population" (1994: 148).

Bhabha derives the ideas of 'performative nationalism' and 'pedagogical nationalism' from Fanon's thinking of the separation between the intellectual's description of a fixed national culture and the performance of national culture. He identifies the 'pedagogical' with the stereotype, which is institutionalized as reproducible knowledge. The 'performative,' on the other hand, refers to Fanon's conception of national culture, a conscious present-oriented activity intimately connected to the struggle for liberation and justice. Consequently, the concept of performance focuses on ever-changing moment of resistance. "Bhabha identifies the performative with instability, that which through struggle, seeks to alter the terms of identity" (Carey-Webb. 1998: 104). Nevertheless, it should be noted that in Bhabha's terminology, there is not a clear separation between the pedagogical and performative actions. The occurrence of the pedagogical and performative actions have no separate time and space. It is rather an ambivalent process in which the emergence of the pedagogical becomes a precondition for the performative action. It is precisely the notion of 'modernity' in the conceptualization of nation-state that enables this dependent relationship between these two types of nationalism. "The liminal figure of the nation-space would ensure that no political ideologies could claim transcendent or metaphysical authority for themselves. This is because the subject of cultural

discourse –the agency of a people- is split in the discursive ambivalence that emerges in the contestation of narrative authority between the pedagogical and the performative" (Bhabha, 1994: 149).

The national subject constructed in the double time-space finds its most appropriate reflection in narration activity. Literature, in the most general sense, becomes a natural basis in which the consequences of the pedagogical and performative nationalism, that is the 'self' and the 'other,' are made apparent. Although Bhabha's theory of double narrative movement is mostly structured based upon the examples of post-colonial nationalism and its revolutionist literature, the applicability of the theory for the question that this thesis poses appears possible. However, I would initially like to draw a comparative framework in order to strengthen the argument of Homi Bhabha on national literature before the case of Turkish literature is examined.

4.3 A Comparative Framework: The Case of Greek Literature in the 20th Century

Gregory Jusdanis, in his book *Belated Modernity and Aesthetics Culture*, searches for the relationship between the emergence of the new Greek literature and the sources of Greek nationalism and modernity. His focus is on the notion of the possibility of a national literature and the theoretical reasons behind such a formation. Indeed, the book implicitly examines "how and why a society defines itself as modern and Western", as Jusdanis admits (1991: xii).

The Greek experience of the process of modernization and transition to a nation-state model had begun by the late 18th century. When the Ottoman Empire was struggling for continuity in the integrity of its territories, the Greek nationalist movement demanding independence for its country was about to obtain the projected freedom. In fact, long before the struggle for independence started, Greek nationalism had taken root among the elite and the intellectuals. Most of them had knowledge of Western culture, and they were claiming the revival of Greek national culture to be an independent community (Jusdanis, 1991: 17-22).

The essential figure in the emergence of Greek nationalism was, Jusdanis states, the image of ancient Greek culture and its undeniably great influence on the ideas of the Enlightenment. The Greek community that was in need of an image of modernity had found its basic element in its classical age, which constructed the foundation of contemporary European culture, and by using this new self-imaging Greek nationalism had proved to be Western ideology (Jusdanis, 1991: 26)[8].

The issue of language, the vernacular, just as in the other nationalist movements appears to be an important instrument for the construction of the national consciousness. However, in the Greek case the movement was faced with a number of registers (the vernacular, the archaic language of the patriarchate and scholarship, and classical Greek) competing for the national language. "The question of diglossia, the contemporaneous presence of the two registers of the same language, resulted in departure from the nationalist program set in Western countries" (Jusdanis, 1991: 41).

---

[8] Referencing the ancient Greek heritage as a source lying in 'national history' is a valuable argument. Later, in the 1930s many Turkish historians repeated the same argument, but a generation after, claiming to have the initial sources of the Ionian culture in Anatolia, which means the ancient Greek culture is the creation of the Anatolian people, the Turks.

Diglossia developed into a political problem during the 18th century as a result of attempts to construct a nation-state. The national language problem was emerging between the two registers, namely between the *demoticist* (the vernacular) and the *purist* (classical Greek) camps. Jusdanis argues that "the clash over the national idiom was about national education, and more important, the relationship of Greeks to their classical and Byzantine past, and their self-definition as a Western society. The classical idiom was nothing, but primarily it was the signifier of the ancient Greek" (Jusdanis, 1991: 42).

The issue of national literature, quite similar to the Turkish case, emerged from the debate between the *demoticist* and the *purist*. It was apparent that both sides alike had understood that literature and language were the key components of a national culture. As a result the Greek literature emerged as a conflicting subject in the process of nationalism. Both groups developed their own literary works and presented them as the national literature. While the *purists* in Greece designated an artificial code as the official language of the nation, the *demoticists* elevated the dialect of Peloponnisos as the new national tongue.

Jusdanis evaluates the development of modern Greek literature from the perspective of 'literary canon'. "The literary canon", he argues, "as a collection of texts recounting the story the nation, facilitates the experience of solidarity by allowing people to see themselves as citizens of a unified nation" (Jusdanis, 1991: 49). From a theoretical standpoint, a search for literary canon in the Greek case is important since, as Jusdanis rightly points out, the constitution of the canon is related to work investigating the emergence of art and literature and their roles in the

construction of cultural homogeneity. Moreover, for Jusdanis the emergence of the canon and its fundamental sources are crucial to discovering the 'time' of the modernization process. Therefore "the canon not only represents national identity but also participates in its production by instilling in people the values of nationalism" (Jusdanis, 1991: 49).

The notion of canonicity in Jusdanis' study on Greek literature can be read from Bhabha's conceptualizations of pedagogical and performative nationalism. Although he does not refer to the work of Bhabha, the essential historicism in the canonicity and the notion of 'time' in the formation of a national culture can provide a proper background for the contribution of Jusdanis' study to Bhabha's theory.

Jusdanis' words on the necessary function of the canon might clearly show the correspondence of canon within Bhabha's theory. Jusdanis (1991: 49) says,

> The canon records –in the vernacular- the history of nation, articulating a chronological continuity that helps members of the community overcome the shortcomings of an uncertain present. In the temporalized order of modernity the canon, a utopian projection into the past, longs for a time rather than a place. In a period of disintegrating identities and differentiating social relationships, the canon looks back to the previous plentitude, offering hopes of cultural revival.

The literary canon, which performs the transmission of the past into the present, functions as a double narrative movement, in Bhabha's words. First of all it signifies the literature as a national subject in a constructed double-time, in the past and in the present. By referring to an emergence of national canon, the people and its

narratives are removed from being only a part of historical events. They become a complex rhetorical strategy of social reference. The canon, at the same time, acts as a part of the pedagogical and performative nationalism processes. It comes out from the nations' past, the pedagogical action, and encounters the constructive nationalist discourse of the present, the performative action. The 'time' notion that Jusdanis emphasizes in the construction of national canon does not refer to anything but to the repetitious character of the performative action because of its dependence on the past. In the end, the literary canon functions as a means to construct the double narrative movement. At this very point, the case of Greek national literary canon can be examined as the paradigm of Homi Bhabha's theorem.

The similarity between the Greek and Turkish modernization experiences and their reflections on national literatures is quite striking. The debates on Greek literature, as in the case of Turkish literature mainly derived from a language question. The debate presented above between *demoticist* and *purist* and their literary works is another example of experiences during the emergence of Turkish as the national language and the related debate in Turkish literature on the syllabic *vs.* prosody poetry meter. Regarding the correspondence between the experiences of the two nations, it might be concluded that a search for national literary canon in Turkish literature can be analyzed from Bhabha's perspective. Although, considering this thesis, a search for literary canon in Turkish literature would be beyond the scope of this study, the applicability of the notion of double narrative movement is still possible with respect to the historical period examined. In the next section, an attempt

is made to understand the relationship between the Turkish nationalism and the early republican literature by applying Homi Bhabha's theory.

4.4 The Analysis of the Republican Literature

Starting in the 20th century, the emerging Turkish nationalism had a strong effect in the shaping of the new Turkish literature. As discussed in chapter 2, the newly established Turkish Republic and its notion of 'nation' had a shared ideology with early nationalist movements. This common background also showed its impact in the development of the new Turkish literature. The construction of the literature has been experienced in a circular way: While the Turkish Republic, together with its institutions supported the emergence and movement of this literature as an ideological apparatus, republican literature sought for the consolidation of republican thinking, in which nationalism has been an integral dimension.

In understanding the construction of a new literature, the emphasis on the Kemalist principle, 'populism' and its essential component, the notion of 'people,' play important roles. From the perspective of 'populist' understanding, the 'people' was the signifier of the 'nation' and consequently the national culture should be the product of 'folklore'. The emphasis given to 'folklore' is a crucial point while reading Turkish literature's case from Bhabha's theoretical framework.

Regarding the points mentioned above, the applicability of Bhabha's notion of double narrative movement seems fruitful for Turkish modernization and the development of nationalism in relation to the literature. The functioning of

pedagogical and performative actions in a constructed double time, between the past and the present, initially connotes the 'people', providing a historical, political and cultural authority to the 'people'. As the narrative of pedagogical and performative action gives an identity to the 'people', it historically functions backwards so that the discursive authority given to the 'people' simultaneously authorizes the system itself. Regarding this functioning of pedagogical and performative actions, it could be concluded that the attempt to create a national literature by collecting, arranging, and rewriting folkloric tales, stories and legends served the creation of a homogenized people's culture in a double narrated time (Erdoğan, 1998: 117).

The issue of national language, which is repeatedly updated as a literary question, is the basic characteristic that indicates the functioning of constructed 'people'. The Turkish language question raised from the clash between the rejected Ottoman culture and the created Turkish identity in fact appears as a problem of renewing the past Turkish culture in the present, modernized time. Apparently, the formation of literature was affected by this necessary language question and reflected its natural consequences in many forms such as the emerging debate on syllabic meter *vs*. prosody poetry meter. Another form that surfaces is revival of the folk poetries, tales and stories but in a transformed style.

Moreover, as was suggested in Bhabha's theory, the formation of Turkish literature too, through a double time, resulted in the emergence of a discursive creation of the 'self' and the 'other'. It is the folkloric heritage of Turkish culture, which is saved as the 'self' in this new literature. The essential element is the pure Turkish language. Both in the new Turkish poetry and novel, the history of the Turks,

their culture and their language are praised, and this past is perceived as the reason for the glorious birth of the Turkish Republic. On the other hand, referencing each factor, which is non-Turk in Ottoman history creates the 'other'. While in poetry, prosody becomes the Ottoman artifact; in novel- writing the 'other' appears in the form of symbols signifying the 'East' or the Ottoman.

Actually, this whole process shows the functioning of pedagogical nationalism. Starting from the publication of *Genç Kalemler* journal, there was an attempt in literature to renew past literary works, in particular poetry, since they were written in the pure Turkish language and represented the ideology of emerging nationalism. The most appropriate example demonstrating the continuity of this attempt is the collected and published poetries of Karacaoğlan in the *Ülkü* journal. The pedagogical action that seeks historical evidence for the origins works in the same way in the case of Turkish literature. The prominent poets who had written in syllabic meter turned out to be the pioneers of the new Turkish literature movement. Similarly, folk tales such as those of *Keloğlan* and *Karagöz-Hacivat,* with their transformed forms, became the sources of a new writing style.

On the other side, performative nationalism runs through the processes of transformation. The contribution of both the state institutions, and the Kemalist elite, the cultural works collected by a pedagogical motive were transformed in order to construct the contemporary signs of the society. Literature and narrating activity itself, perhaps, are the most proper area for the running of performative action. It takes the past narrations and collects them, and later they are transformed into another form and context, which is the symbol for the verification of the system's discourse.

It creates new signs to refer the past, and in essence those signs are the distinguishing element between the 'self' and the 'other'. While pedagogical nationalism addresses the past, performative nationalism originates from the notion of present. Therefore, the alteration of the past is necessary for the realization of performative authority.

Performative nationalism in the creation of Turkish literature demonstrates itself both in implicit and sometimes in explicit ways. Necmi Erdoğan, in his article "Popüler Anlatılar ve Kemalist Pedagoji", presents some significant examples of the processes of transformation. He exemplifies the notification sent by the General Secretary of the RPP to the recognized writers in 1937. According to this notification the traditional folk tales of the Turkish people should be revised with respect to the new principles of the republic while protecting their original form. Such an effort was basically aimed at the realization of two important projects: the protection of past cultural works which are already known and accepted by society, and the transformation of those well-known tales and figures in conformity with the republican ideals/values, so that by using them as such the people who are the subjects of the republican project can more easily understand and accept the objectives of the republic. Needless to say modernization, secularism, and national solidarity were the primary values that were attempted to be projected in the tales. In the notification sent to authors by the RPP, the project covered the books as follows: *Aşık Garip, Köroğlu, Yedi Alimler, Tahir ile Zühre, Arzu ile Kamber, Leyla ile Mecnun, Nasreddin Hoca, Şahmaran,* and *Kerem ile Aslı* (Erdoğan, 1998, 199)[9].

---

[9] The notification initiated a debate among the intellectuals of the period. For this debate see Güloğul, F. R. 1937 *Halk Kitaplarına Dair*, Istanbul: Bozkurt Matbaası.

Another example that Erdoğan presents is the transformation in the traditional folk tale characters of *Karagöz* and *Hacivat*. In 1941 a book entitled *Karagöz* was published by the RPP's printing office. The book contains seven new scripts of the traditional *Karagöz* and *Hacivat*. Erdoğan states that the newly written scripts of *Karagöz* "transform the conventional couple to figures that articulate and popularize the republican ideology in a didactic fashion. […] *Karagöz* becomes an unadulterated but virtuous prototype of the Turkish people and speaks the words that Kemalist discourse wants to hear from the 'people'" (Erdoğan, 1998: 122).

A similar process also runs in the development of the new Turkish poetry. The abolishment of the Divan literary works represents another example of performative nationalism. The praised syllabic poetry meter –as the 'self'- as opposed to the prosody –the 'other'- becomes the only national meter. The works of the traditional poets such as Karacaoğlan, who had written in syllabic meter, were revised and the old Turkish words were replaced by the new ones (Ülkü journal, 1939: 13(79) and subsequent four issues includes the rewritten poetries of Karacaoğlan). More importantly, the syllabic meter that symbolizes the 'folk' tradition now becomes the poetry form to give the examples of 'national' poetry. One should remember that the period's poetry is not only the signifier of the nationalism discourse, but it also reproduces the modernization principle of the Kemalist project. The poetry that emerged in the performative process is perceived as a political means to spread the Kemalist ideology among the people.

Another instance of the reflection of pedagogical/performative action in Turkish literature are the characters of *Prospero* and *Caliban*. Allan Carey-Webb, in

his comparative study on early European literature and contemporary African writings, focuses on the relationship between Prospero and Caliban in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. In the book, while Prospero represents the Western intellectual (the 'self'), Caliban appears as the eastern servant (the 'other') who is in need of being educated by his master. Carey-Webb approaches this literary work as the obvious representation of self/other construction in the process of national identity (1998:60-64).

Interestingly, Shakespeare's famous characters genuinely affected a Turkish critic, Nurullah Ataç. The Caliban character appears in his writing in order to refer to the notions such as traditional, eastern, and illiterate (Ataç, 1988: 22-23). For him, it is Prospero who has the features of a modern man. On the other hand, Caliban refers simply to the backwardness and to the chains of illiteracy as the essential result of backwardness. The projection of these two figures in the writing of Ataç can be read from the two perspectives. First, it is true that for Ataç, the relationship between the characters symbolizes the position of the 'intellectual' as opposed to the 'people'. Second, Ataç, implicitly points out another factor: as one of leading and committed figures of the early republican period, stands as a good example of the split between the pedagogical, and performative actions. It should also be noted that although he appears as a committed republican and pro-West figure, it is possible to recognize, in Ataç his splitness (duality) by seeing how a part of his mind/heart was still in the past, i.e. in Ottoman literary tradition, while arguing for the development of syllabic meter. Therefore, Ataç appears as a good example to see the effect of double narrative movement.

The analysis of republican literature, considering the basic motives of nationalism and modernization as the shaping elements, is possible from the theoretical framework that Bhabha presents us. The works of both poetry and the novel provide enough information to observe the effects of pedagogical and performative actions.

Chapter V: Conclusion

The modernization era is marked by the universal existence of the nation-state, the political, social, and cultural expression of that 'worlds' as our world. Both the Enlightenment ideals and the understanding of 'Western civilization' construct the notion of 'national peoples' and justify the creation of their cultures. In this thesis I tried to explore the rising discourse of nationalism and the notion of modernization in the establishment of the Turkish Republic with specific reference to the emergence of the republican literature. In this respect, within the theoretical framework of the thesis I examined the legitimating of the nation-state apparatus by exploring the making of national identities in literary texts written in the crucial periods of the national formation. In the case of the Turkish nationalism, we have seen that the literature appeared as the most important to nationhood and took part in the construction of a national narration.

The notion of 'revolutionary' literature and the other genres of poetry and novel, explored in the third chapter, have demonstrated how the literary works can function in the legitimating of the republican ideology. On the one side, the emerging Turkish literature presented the precise examples of the Turkish nationalism as the subject of the Kemalist project, and on the other side it became the object of the process of republican modernization. In other words, the narrating activity functioned both as an active participator to strengthen the nationalist discourse and as the passive recipient of the attempted modernization. In that sense, the formation of the republican literature occurred in a 'double-time' functioning.

Accordingly the content of 'revolutionary' literature represented this notion of 'double-time' construction. In the fourth chapter, following Homi Bhabha's theoretical framework on the examination of the post-colonial nationalism and its narration, I tried to explore the notion of 'double-time' existing in the republican literature. The tension between the 'past' and the 'present' was the basic constitutive element in the emergence of period's literature. The Turkish nationalism that constructed itself on a brand-new cultural identity rejected the historical heritage of the Ottoman Empire as implementing a new identity that addressed to the 'present'. In this sense, the tension between the 'past' and the 'present' created the conflict between the 'self' and the 'other'. The republican ideology employed the literature, as the other elements of the cultural sphere, for overcoming the duality stemming from the contradiction hidden in the nationalist discourse.

In particular, Bhabha's conceptions of pedagogical and performative action/nationalism helped me in analyzing the republican literature. It is true that these two concepts are the subjects of a highly theoretical and deep debate, they can be thought as somehow embedded processes, rather than totally separated ones. However, I tend to draw a demarcation line and kept the epistemological differences between the pedagogical and performative nationalism for analytical examination purposes. In this respect, when we look at the emergence of a 'revolutionary' literature, it appears that the political agenda brought into by the state, which influenced both the form and the content of literature, functioned as the factor behind the pedagogical and performative actions. This is to say that, the Turkish nationalist discourse that build itself in a 'double time' based upon the conflict between the 'self'

and the 'other'. The literature that narrates the nation's history, consequently, became a part of the discourse. It is possible to see the reflections of both pedagogical and performative nationalisms in the literary debates of the period. The rewritten poetries of folk bards, the collection of Turkish proverbs and phrases, and even the new characters appearing in Turkish novel exemplifies the functioning of these two actions in literature.

This thesis has tried to demonstrate that Turkish modernization and foundation of the national identity can be read from a post-colonial theoretical perspective, or such framework might offer some insights and clues in order to better capture some dimensions of Turkish Republic and especially its nationalism, though the historical experience of the state/country do not match with the case of a colonized one. Similar to the dynamics of the post-colonial nationalism, Turkish nationalist discourse has created own distinction of the 'self' and the 'other' from within its history. Different from the post-colonial nationalism, in the Turkish case the formed 'other' was not addressing the West, but rather the recent Ottoman past, which was interestingly accused of having alien elements to what was 'Turkish'. (As a contradiction point in itself, Turkish nationalism has never been opposed to the Western culture, although having being battled in the War of Independence against the imperialist powers of the Western world has constituted one of the greatest themes of Turkish state ideology. It is clear that the for republican elite, the Western culture always represented a level to be reached.) Nevertheless, the construction of the 'self' and the 'other' in the nationalist discourse of the Turkish Republic has functioned similar to the post-colonial discourse in the formation of national identity.

Therefore, this thesis could provide a different perspective to the understanding of Turkish nationalism, while bearing in mind the basic differences between the colonial world and the Turkish case.

In thinking about the issue of modernization and the emergence of the nationalist discourse, the Turkish case helps to recognize that the reflection of this process on the cultural sphere is independent from nations. That is to say, it is international and reiterative. Ironically, nationalism draws on the circulation of forms, institutions, and relationships in a global economic and cultural system. The presented case of the Greek literature is just a limited comparative ground for demonstrating the common points between the experiences of nations, rather nation building processes. Therefore, rather than focusing on the uniqueness arguments of the nation building processes, a more general (in terms of the dynamics) look at the functioning of the nationalist discourse might assist us for understanding the common contradictions and conflicts that take part in the emergence of nations or, with a more correct wording, the making of nationalisms. In this respect, this thesis hopes to be a proper and fruitful example.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdülcebbar. 1934. "Ulusal Edebiyat," *Yeni Adam* 1(50): 6-7.

Abdullah, F. 1940. "Namık Kemal ve Hece Vezni," *Ülkü* 16(94): 319-325.

Ağaoğlu, A. 1925. "Milliyetçilik Cereyanın Esasları," in M. Kaplan *et al* (eds). 1993. *Atatürk Devri Fikir Hayatı* Vol: 1 Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 115-122.

Ahmad, F. 1993. *The Making of Modern Turkey*, New York: Routledge

Akçura, Y. 1994. "Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset" *Türkiye Günlüğü* 31

Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (2nd ed) London: Verso.

Ataç, N. 1988. *Prospero ile Caliban*, İstanbul: Can Yayınları.

Atalay, B. 1941. "Türkçe Davası," *Çınaraltı* 1(10): 6-9

Arai, M. 1994. *Jön Türk Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliği*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Aykurt, İ. U. 1928. "Yeni Türk Harfleri Münasebetiyle," in M. Kaplan *et al* (eds). 1993. *Atatürk Devri Fikir Hayatı* Vol: 2, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 50-58.

Berkes, N. 1950. "Ziya Gökalp: His Contribution to Turkish Nationalism," *The Middle East Journal* 8(4): 375-390.

-----. 1978. *Türkiye'de Cağdaşlaşma*, İstanbul: Doğu-Batı Yayınları.

Bhabha, H. 1994. *The Location of Culture*, London: Routledge.

Carey-Webb, A. 1998. *Making Subjects: Literature and the Emergence of National Identity*, New York: Garland Publishing.

Çeçen, A. 1990. *Atatürk'ün Kültür Kurumu: Halkevleri,* Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları.

Chatterjee, P. 1986. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A derivative Discourse*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Clark, R. C. 1973. " Osmanlı Edebiyatı Türk Edebiyat mıdır?" in M. Kalpaklı (ed.) 1999. *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler,* İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 159-163.

Donado, G. B. 1688. "Türk Edebiyatı'dan," in M. Kalpaklı (ed.) 1999. *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler,* İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 18.

Erdoğan, N. 1998. "Popüler Anlatılar ve Kemalist Pedagoji," *Birikim l* January 195(105): 117-125.

Etem, S. 1933. "İnkılapçı Sanat Gerici Sanat," *Varlık* 1(4): 50.

Fanon, F. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*, New York: Grove Press, Inc.

Finn, R. P. 1984. *Türk Romanı: İlk Dönem 1872-1900*, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*, New York: Cornell University Press.

Gibb, E. J. Wilkinson. 1999. "Osmanlı Şiirinin Hususiyeti ve Sahası," in M. Kalpaklı (ed.) 1999. *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler,* İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 54- 63.

Güloğul, F. R. 1937. *Halk Kitaplarına Dair*, İstanbul: Bozkurt Matbaası.

Gökalp, Z. 1976. *Türkçülüğün Esasları,* İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

Heyd, U. 1950. *Foundations Of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp*, Luzac Co. & The Harvill Press Ltd.

-----. 1954. *Language Reform in Modern Turkey*, Jerusalem.

Jusdanis, G. 1991. *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kadıoğlu, A. 1996. "The Paradox of Turkish Nationalism and the Construction of the Official Identity," in S, Kedourie (ed). *Turkey: Identity, Democracy, Politics*, Frank Cass London; Portland, 178-179.

Karaosmanoğlu, Y. K. 1925. "Hars ve Mefküre Edebiyatı," in M. Kaplan *et al* (eds). 1993. *Atatürk Devri Fikir Hayatı* Vol: 2, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 125-129.

----- 1990. *Yaban*, (28th ed) Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

----- 1999 *Sodom ve Gomore*, (7th ed.) İletişim Yayınları.

Karpat, K. 1960. "Social Themes in Contemporary Turkish Literature," *Middle East Journal* 14(1): 29-44.

Kazım, N. 1933. "Halit Fahri'ye Diyeceklerim," *Varlık* 1(5): 68.

Kemal, N. 1988. *Renan Müdafaanamesi*, İstanbul: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Keyman, F. 1995. "On the relation Between Global Modernity and Nationalism: The Crisis of Hegemony and the Rise of Islamic Identity in Turkey," *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 13: 93-120.

Kohn, H. 1929. *A History of the Nationalism in the East*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

-----. 1962. *The Age of Nationalism: The First Era of Global History*, New York: Harpers & Brothers, Publishers.

-----. 1967. *Prelude to Nation-States: The French and German Experiences, 1789-1815*, Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.

Kolcu, H. 1993. *Türk Edebiyatında Hece-Aruz Tartışmaları* Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Köprülü, F. 1938. "Alfabe İnkılabı," in M. Kaplan *et al* (eds). 1993. *Atatürk Devri Fikir Hayatı* Vol: 2, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 96-98.

Lewis, B. 1968. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, (2nd ed.) London: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, G. 1991. in Robin Ostle (ed). *Modern Literature in the Near and Middle East 1850-197*0, New York: Routledge.

Lybyer, A. H. 1913. "The Government of the Ottoman Empire in Time of Suleiman the Magnificent," in W. Hale (ed.) 1994. *Turkish Military & Politics*, London: Routlage, 90-194.

Mardin, Ş. 1992. *Türk Modernleşmesi,* (2nd ed) İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

-----. 1973. "Center-Periphery Relations: A Key to Turkish Politics?" *Daedalus, Journal of the Academy of Arts and Sciences* 102(1): 169-191.

Meriç, C. 1983. "Batılılaşma," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol: 1, Pp: 234-244.

Millas, H. 2000. *Türk Romanı ve "Öteki": Ulusal Kimlikte Yunan İmajı,* İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Moran,B. 1998. "*Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış*, Vol: 1 (7th ed) İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Naci, F. 1999. *Yüz Yılın 100 Romanı,* İstanbul: Adam Yayınları.

Necip, A. 1933. "Edebiyatımızın Bugünkü Gidişatı," *Varlık* 1(5): 65 .

Oktay, A. 1993. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyatı*: *1923-1950*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Orhon, S.O. 1944. "Hece mi? Aruz mu?," *Çınaraltı* 5(123): 8.

Ortaç, Y. Z. 1941."Türk Edebiyatı Nasıl ve Niçin Bir Buhran İçinde," *Çınaraltı* 1(1): 13.

Ortaylı, İ. 1982. "Osmalı İmparatorluğu'nun Değişimi İçinde Divan Şiiri," in M. Kalpaklı (ed.) 1999. *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler,* İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 218-219.

-----. 2000. *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı* (5th ed.) İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Ozansoy, H. F. 1933. 1933. "Kazım Nami Bey, Biraz İnsaf!," *Varlık* 1(6): 92.

-----. 1934. "Edebiyatımız: Nasıldı? Nasıldır? Nasıl Olmalıdır?" *Uyanış* 12(297): 178-183.

-----. 1935. "Ortaokul ve Liselerimizde Türkçe ve Edebiyat Programlarımız Nasıl Olmalıdır?" *Uyanış* 14(347): 146-147.

-----. 1936. "Aruzun Kifayetsizliği," *Uyanış* 15(377): 210.

Özkırımlı, A., 1983. "Anahatlarıyla Edebiyat," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol: 3, 580-606.

Özön, M. N. 1934. *Metinlerle Muassır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası.

Renan, E., 1990. "What is a Nation?" in Bhabha, H., ed. "*Nation and Narration*," London: Routledge.

Rustow, D. A. 1973. "The Modernization of Turkey in Historical and Comparative Perspective," in K. Karpat (ed). *Social Change and Politics in Turkey: A Structural-Historical Perspective*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 93-123.

Şehabettin, C. 1933. "Nazmımız ve Vezin Meselesi," *Anayurt* 1(2): 5.

Tachau, F. 1964. "The Language and Politics: Turkish Language Reform," *The Review of Politics* 26(2): 191-204.

Tanpınar, A. H. 1992. *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, (4th ed.) İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Tekelioğlu, O. 1996. "The Rise of a Spontaneous Synthesis: The Historical Background of Turkish Music," *Middle Eastern Studies* 32(1): 196-215.

Tevfik, R. 1944. "Netice: Şüphesiz Milli Vezinimiz Hece, Yani Parmak Hesabıdır," *Çınaraltı* 5(129): 8-10.

Tezcan, L. 1998. "Modern Devlet ve Yönatım Teknolojisi," *Birikim* (107): 48-56.

Timur, T. 1991. *Osmanlı- Türk Romanında Tarih, Toplum ve Kimlik*, İstanbul: Afa Yayınları.

Tunç, M. Ş. 1924. "Milliyet Mefküresi Nedir?" in M. Kaplan *et al* (eds). 1993. *Atatürk Devri Fikir Hayatı* Vol: 1, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 102-109.

Uşaklıgil, H. Z. 1934. "Halit Ziya Beyin Fikirleri," *Varlık* 2(32): 121.

Yeğen, M. 1995. "Türk Devlet Söylemi ve Cumhuriyet Kurumları," *Mürekkep* (5): 37-46.

Yöntem A. C.1927. "Edebiyat Tedrisatının Yeni Vechesi Çocukları Kozmopolit Yapar mı?" in M. Kaplan *et al* (eds). 1993. *Atatürk Devri Fikir Hayatı* Vol: 2, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 135-139.

-----. 1941a. "Yazı Dili Münakaşaları- 1," *Çınaraltı* 1(14): 8-10.

-----. 1941b. "Yazı Dili Münakaşaları- 2," *Çınaraltı* 1(15): 10-11.

-----. 1941c. "Yazı Dili Münakaşaları- 3," *Çınaraltı* 1(16): 14-16.

Ziya, S. 1998. *Salon Köşelerinde*, İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları.

Zürcher, E. 1993. *Turkey: A Modern History*, London: I. B. Tauris & Co Ltd.