

ISSUES IN TURKISH HISTORY



NIHAL ATSIZ

BERSERKER

BOOKS



Atsiz

ISSUES IN TURKISH HISTORY

Foreword

Some of the articles of this book, which was titled *Meseleler in Turkish History*, had been published in the first edition of "Turkish Country". With the corrections made and the addition of other articles, this work was created.

Issues in Turkish History is a new approach to some issues of our history and culture from a Turkic point of view.

It is a well-known fact that all sciences which fall outside the scope of the hard and fast sciences such as physics, chemistry and mathematics and which fall within the framework of social sciences are always considered from a certain point of view. In the social field, nations act from the point of view that is favourable to their own interests and the theory that will benefit them. To put the national interest behind and pretend to be impartial is in reality not to be impartial, but to take sides the opposing parties. Nations suffer very bitterly from such blunders of intellectuals.

For this reason, the theses in this book should be discussed in terms of national interest and should be included in textbooks.

For example, the thesis that "Turkey was founded with the Battle of Malazgirt in 1071", which is a widespread opinion even among historians, is wrong, rotten and harmful in terms of national ideals, has been stated with evidence in this book, but due to the difficulty of getting the facts accepted, "wrongness" has continued.

I hope that the theses in these articles, which are written more for tomorrow, will be discussed and accepted by the Turkic history scholars of tomorrow.

Hope is the last thing to be abandoned.

Maltepe (Istanbul) 4 October 1966

Atsiz

Our Perspective on Turkish History How Should It Be?

In the XVth century, we had certain view of history: Oghuz Khan's epic would be mentioned as the earliest **epochs** Turkish history, then very short Seljuk history would be told and the Ottomans would be mentioned. Thus, although the old historians considered the Ottomans to be more important and superior, they reviewed Turkish history as a whole.

However, this view of history was undermined before it took root. Especially after a historian like **Hodja Sadeddin** started his work directly with the Ottomans, for us Turkish history remained only as "Ottoman history". And the earlier Turks **began to** be referred to more or less like foreign nations.

The reaction that started with **Müşir Süleyman Pasha** in the XIXth century **began to** shake this **wrong** view. It was realised that our existence and beginnings were much than the Ottomans. Although chapters on the ancient Turks were included in school textbooks, Turkish history was not presented as a whole. Because the times of various ruling dynasties were treated as if **they** were separate states, and the Turks shown as a nation that had established many states in many places but **could** not sustain any of them for a long time.

However, this is not **at all the case**. Because Turkish history is a continuous whole. The problem to systematise it.

How should **we view** Turkish ? This is very issue. Because Turkish history cannot be treated like the history of the English, German or French nations. The reason for this is that Turkish history is **not** as as the history of those nations.

Today, we know certain nations in the world came into being. Because this happened before the eyes of history. However, when the history of the Turkish nation began, it had already been formed.

Moreover, the history of these nations takes place in almost the same narrow area, it is easy to put their histories in order. But is this possible for Turkish history? It seems difficult to fit the history of the Turks, whom we sometimes see in China, sometimes in Egypt, sometimes in Europe, into a single framework. For this reason, until now, Turks have been considered as a nation that founded forty states in forty places and no attempt has been made to organise Turkish history chronologically.

the past, the history was mixed with epics, Turks had a more structured view of history. Today, many unknown facts have come to light, it is no longer possible to be content with that old view. Therefore, we have to find a new historical system. Since we are nationalists and believe in the great Turkish unity, the system we will give to our history must be in accordance with our wishes, and this system must not only show us our past in the brightest way, but must also pave the way for the future.

* * *

For many nations, history the history of the homeland. For example, the French, it is not possible to follow any other method of history than the history of the homeland. Therefore, for the French, a nation is a group of people who live in that homeland and mix with each other.

It a being born out of a community of people. Because the French claim that they are neither Gol, nor Latins, nor Germans. they are a nation born from the mixing of all these in the same homeland, they are obliged to take the history of the homeland as a basis.

The history of the Arabs the history of a nation. Because, the borders of their homeland remained different, this nation lost its state for long centuries, but preserved its national existence.

the British, on the other hand, history the history of a state. This is because, although they remained culturally British when they left their homeland, the British, who had a name other than British, preserved their main existence in their mother states.

However, these provisions cannot be considered definitive. It also be said that the French a homeland-state principle, while the a state-patriot principle. What is certain

It is that for with different historical organisations, the historical system is also different.

As for us: "historical view", which we held until now, is **wrong**. Because, although it was more suitable for our national interests to accept the nation-state principle, , leaving aside the history of the nation, let alone the history of the state and homeland, only history of the clan and the regime as the basis. Considering each clan as state, we claimed that we had established as many states as there were clans until now. But we did not think that if we had established so many states, we could not keep any of them **alive**!

However, we have always Turkish state. Because in reality, **had not established** so many states, but we **had** changed so many dynasties. As in all nations with long historical lives, we too had a number of ruling dynasties. While other nations regarded them as ruling dynasties, we regarded as separate states. It is, of course, **wrong** to recognise the times of such ruling dynasties as separate states. Just as the dynasties in England France followed each other and there were no Capet Bourbon, Orlean, Napoleon in France; Saxony, FranconiaBav yeraHasburg in GermanyAnju, Tudor, Stuard states in England and these were only dynasties; similarly, there were no Kun, Gok Turk, Uighur, Seljuk, Ottoman states in Turkey, but there were dynasties. The fact that sometimes there are two or legal Turkish clans in two or more dynasties and that they **clash** with each other cannot break this rule. Just as the German state was considered state even though many clans, which ruled at the same time in Germany until yesterday, sometimes **clashed** with each other, and some of them even **united** with the French and marched against the other Germans, we must be a state in the same way.

If all nations valued their history in the same way as we do, then it would be necessary to accept that in England, for example, there were two states **at the time of the Wars of the Roses**. Nor would it be necessary to accept that there were several states in France at a time when the counties were strengthening and the influence of the king was losing its power. Especially in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Germany would have become insurmountable, and perhaps it would have been necessary to deny the existence of what was called Germany.

The belief in **dynasticism played** a major role in writing history such a contradictory way. The fact that the dynasty was regarded as sacred entity **led** to the idea that the state would disappear with its fall. However, this kind of

In these cases, what changed so simple that it can be compared with the changes of our time. For example, **the fall of the Gok Turk dynasty and the establishment of the Nine Oghuz dynasty in Eastern Turkel is considered as the birth of a new state.** In reality, the dynasty has changed in the same state. The difference between these two periods, whose people, borders, territory, , language and traditions are the same, is only in the difference of the dynasty at the head. Therefore how can look at the Gök Turks and the Nine Oghuz as two separate states? We should think that the Nine Oghuz period is nothing but the development of the Gök Turk period. And, after all, if dynastic changes in our country do not occur under the same conditions as dynastic changes in other nations, the reasons for this should be sought in the spiritual differences of the nations.

In this case, it **not** acting with dynasticism to consider dynasties as separate states?

Let us take an example from today's history: According to the **wrong** notion of history prevailing in our country, the Ottoman state **collapsed** and was replaced by the Republic of Turkey. This **idea** is also **wrong**. Because there was no Ottoman state for it **have collapsed**. There was only the Ottoman dynasty. That is what was destroyed. In other words, **the regime has changed in the state.** That is all...

Then, it should not be forgotten show the collapsed dynasties as states, may be inferred that Turks do not have power in political life and that they cannot keep their states alive for a long time. Since the psyche of nations **does not change** over the centuries or changes very little, this may lead to the thought that we will not be able to sustain the Republic of Turkey for a long time either. Of course, we cannot be the one to gain from this.

There are wars and conflicts in the life of . However, this does not mean that a state is divided into two. If this were the case, could also mean that our nation lived a very dispersed life and could not **unite** and establish a state according to the old Turkish form of government which was not centralised.

Howeversome conflicts and separations lasted for a long time. For example, the period of the beğl ks in Anatolia. Can consider all of these beğl ks as a state? This a great **mistake**. Because what really happened that the western Turks were left **without a head**. Only between 1806 and 1871, Germany **was also left without a head**, but no one **considered** Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Vurtemberg, etc. as separate states. The history of Germany is still **considered and read** as the history of Germany. However, still regard each dynasty as a separate state, and we speak of the history of Turkey, we understand only the Ottoman dynasty and the republican era.

* * *

How, then, should we correct this **wrong** view?

Turkish history can only be organised by evaluating it in a manner similar to the way other nations deal with their own history, taking into account the changes required according to our own conditions.

When we walk on this path, we will first **divide** Turkish history into two parts:

- 1 - Turkish history in the homeland,
- 2 - Turkish history in foreign languages.

Turkic history in the homeland takes place only in Eastern Turkel from the earliest times until the XI century. This Eastern Turkel also the eastern parts of today's Mongolianstan and Muscovy Europe.

In the XIth century, a second homeland was **established** in the west: Turkiye. This homeland consisted of Anatolia, Erran, Azerbaijan, Iraq and Northern Syria.

The history of Eastern Turkel and Turkiye the history of Turks as a whole without interruption. And also with the occasional merging of these two homelands...

The Turkish history in foreign lands is the history of the states established by dominant Turkish dynasties on the basis of foreign nations. These states were **not** continuous; they started with a Turkish dynasty and a Turkish army under that ruling over other nations, and continued with these Turks losing their language and nationality among foreign majorities. It is impossible to consider these states as Turkish states throughout their entire lives. For example, although the present Egyptian state was founded by a Turkish dynasty based on Turkish soldiers, today Egypt has become a completely Arab state. Therefore the Turkish states established in , India, Iran Eastern Europe and can be included in Turkish history as long as the dynasty and army **retain** their Turkish character. the dynasty and army lose their Turkish character, it is impossible to see them in Turkish history.

Accordingly, we can draw the schemes of East Turkel and Turkiye histories as follows:

Eastern Turkel:

Age of Sakas VII BC - III century BC.

Age of the Kuns II BC - AD 216 Age
of the S yenps 216-394
Age of the Apars 394-552
The era of the Sky Turks ... 552 - 745
Nine Oghuzes-On Uighurs era 745 - 840 Uighurs era
840-940
Qarakhanid era 940 -1123
Qarakhitai era 1123-1207
Secular age 1207-1218
Age of the Chengzils 1281 -1370
Age of the Aksak Tem rls 1370-1501
Age of the Uzbeks 1501 - 1920

Turkey:

Seljuk era 1040-1249
The era of the Ilkhanids 1249-
1336 The era of the great admirals
1336-1515 The era of the
Ottomans ... 1515-1922
Republican era After 1923

* * *

After a small group of historians, consisting of serious scholars, discusses this scheme, finds and corrects its and errors, Turkish should be revisited on these principles. Unless this is done, it will continue to be impossible to get Turkish children to digest our history in schools, and we cannot avoid showing disrespect to our past as a nation.

(Çınaraltı, 1st issue, 9 August 1941)

Issues of Turkish History

All civilised nations have made a final and definite decision about their own history. In other words, they know where their histories **begin**, which ages they are **divided** into, who is attributed to their histories, and have unchanging convictions about the spelling of the names of the people who fill their histories. As for us, as in all other matters, we are in a pathetic confusion about **the understanding of our history**. We do not have common idea about where our history began. The periods into which our history is divided vary according to everyone's whim. Personalities who are considered national heroes by some are considered national enemies by others: **Chengiz Khan**, etc... There is no uniformity among us in writing the names of historical heroes and personalities. The historical system, which started to be confused after the Constitutional **Monarchy**, completely deteriorated after the Republic and its present pathetic form with the first efforts of the Historical Society.

However, in the past, **our understanding of history** was quite smooth and stable: Our ancient history used to start with the legendary **Oghuz Khan** and end with **the Seljuks** and **Chengiz**. Even though he was sometimes cursed because he was not a Muslim, he and especially his children were often spoken of with respect.

The history of Turkiye, after brief introduction about the Anatolian Seljuks, continued immediately with the Ottomans, and the other Anatolian **beğ** ks, especially the larger ones, referred to as the legitimate governments of a part of Turkiye, and **their beğs** were honoured with respect. The idea of the illegitimacy of the Anatolian **beğ** ks started after Fath.

is no doubt that this date was **not** official. But it **was** accepted by the general public. In other words, there was a law in **our understanding of history**. law is, after all, better than lawlessness, the date accepted with scarce information available at that time

system more accurate than the unconscious confusion among our advanced knowledge today.

Some of the problems of Turkish history today, which are immediately necessary and not very difficult to solve, are as follows:

a) The Question of the Beginning of Turkish History:

In today's history books, Turkish history is generally started from the Huns, i.e. the Huns of Central Asia. However, there are also historians who do not recognise this beginning. Some of them say that Turkish history should start from the Gok Turks in the VI century, while others believe that it should start from the times before the Huns, from the Sakalar era. Even recently, **Prof. Zeki Velidi Togan**, a distinguished historical scholar, claims that the tribe named Shu or Chu, who lived in Turkestan before the Sakas and whose existence was determined between 1200-800 BC, were the first Turks. There some scholars', theories and assertions that Sumerians before the Shu or Chu were also Turks, or that there were Turks among them. The finalisation of all these opposing opinions can only be possible with the decision of a scientific historical congress after serious and long discussions. Perhaps today's knowledge history is not enough resolve some issues. However, in any case, things will be tied to a principle and the terrible event of anyone drawing a separate beginning for the Turkish history be prevented. If this is not done, contradictory and will arise in the Turkic world, and perhaps the intellectuals of the nation will be divided into two or three teams hostile to each other by the growing and degenerating debates among them. Since a nation is the product and result of a common history together with many other elements, the collective life of people who do not have a common sense of history in a nation will cause spiritual discomfort and the seeds of mischief be sown for the distant future.

b) Turkish History's Cadre Issue:

The disagreement about the beginning of Turkish history means disagreement about the composition of Turkish history as well, and the question of who should be included in Turkish history in the later ages remains before us with all its complexity. For instance, is it correct to accept the period of the Karakhtayids' rule in Turkas a period of Turkish history? Or this a period of foreign rule the Qarakhitays were Mongols? Or does the Ghaznavid state belong to the Turkish history, or is it a period of foreign rule in places where foreign people lived?

Should be excluded from the national cadre because they are judges? Which of them should be considered as colonial or only dynastic history? These are serious issues of Turkish history and have not yet been resolved and concluded with certainty.

One of the most important issues to be considered when discussing the cast of Turkish history is the determination of whether Çeng z and Tem r are the heroes of national history or the enemies of our race. Because our historians do not have a common opinion about these two personalities. Some consider these two individuals as Turks and include the events they created and the states they founded in the Turkish history. Some historians, on the other hand, argue completely the opposite. According to them, Çeng z and Tem r are not Turks; they are Mongols or Tatars. Both are our racial enemies. One of our historians considers Çeng z as foreigner and Tem r as Turk. This great difference of opinion and difference of view among historians of the same nation a national anarchy that cannot be equalled in any nation. Because the issue is whether certain individuals are good or bad, great or small, but whether they can be directly attributed to national history. If these disagreements belonged to the beginning of Turkish history, to the ages mixed with mythology, they could be tolerated to some extent. However, this confusion of on individuals who lived in the XIIIth and XIVth centuries shows that national consciousness had not yet been properly awakened. There is doubt that one of these conflicting opinions is right and the others are wrong. The inability to find the truth on the biggest main issues in the recent past not the lack of historical documents, but the lack or absence of historical and national consciousness.

c) The Issue of the Ages of Turkish History:

It is now understood that the division of history into periods such as the early ages and the Middle Ages is not very accurate. This is because these divisions were made according to the whole humanity, but according to some continents or some nations. Just as the stone age and the mining age did not start at the same time for all tribes, times such as the Middle Ages and the New Age (if they are used to show the stages of development in intellectual life) cannot show the same period for all nations. It not scientific to divide ancient Turkish history into sections such Turkish history in the early ages and Turkish history in the Middle Ages. Of course, it would not be right to blindly follow a classification made by Western Europe in its own way.

Attempts to classify our history according to the nationalist view have so far been made only by **Dr Rıza Nur** and **Prof. Zeki Velidi Togan**. As Rıza Nur divided Turkish history into main periods as "Old Turkish History" (=Type and Law Period =Millî Period), "New Turkish History" (=Muslimisation Period = Religious Period) and "Fresh Turkish History" (=Rebirth and Awakening = Second Millî , Zeki Vel d Togan divided Turkish history into three periods. divides it into three main periods: an era of progress and rise until the middle of the XVI century, an era of decline and collapse until the end of the B rst C han War, and a third era after the B rst C han War. However, this division has not been taken into account by anyone.

d) Spelling of Names:

The fact that a number of proper names in Turkish history do not have a certain morality one of our national shame. Is the name of the XIIIth century hero **Chengiz, Chingiz, Cengiz**, then **Temir, Temür** or **Timur**? Just like theses should the word "**tigin**" or "**tegin**", which is the title of a prince, be written as **Buğra** or **Boğra**? These philosophical indecisions lead to many mistakes. The best example of how a mistake has taken root is seen the name of **Bumun** or **Bumin**, the first khan of the Gok Turks. Since the difference between "I" and " " was not clear when it was written with the old spelling, the name of this kagan was written as **Bumin** after the new spelling, and this incorrect form has become entrenched in historical books, p yes, and surnames.

* * *

It can be seen that our understanding and handling of history confused. Neither individuals nor private organisations can get out of this confusion. official organisation is necessary prevent this confusion. Such official organisation should convene a convention to decide on the issues of Turkish history, and in the convention, the issues should be evaluated and discussed from an academic point of view, and the mutual statements should be printed and presented to the public. Only such a convention, where national and scientific ideas will , can find a solution to the problems of Turkish history.

(Yen Sabah, 29 November 1948)

Issues of Turkish History

Just like Turkish history in general, there are **unresolved** issues in Turkish history as well, and without resolving these issues, neither history be taught in schools in the national interest, nor can a national consciousness be created among the Turks of Turkey.

Today, not **only** the general Turkish history, but also the beginning of the history **is** not clear. Even more tragically, today, there is confusion among us as to the beginning of Turkey, which **was founded in a** historical epoch. If a nation does not know the beginning of its own history because of a lack of historical knowledge, this cannot be considered a significant deficiency. However, very well known epochs of history

If there is a **difference** of opinion about the time of the **foundation of developed** state, this only a manifestation of confusion of opinion. To disagree on the year of **the founding** of a state is to be like grandchildren who disagree about who their grandfather was.

The important issues of Turkish history are the following:

a) The Question of the Beginning of the History of Turkey:

The history of Turkey new compared to France, and Germany. Being old or new does not mean a great deal. Even so, for some reason,

People and nations a spiritual **desire** for states to be old. However, this state of mind should not lead to changing history. At one time, it claimed that the H t t s were Turks with the idea of taking our existence in Anatolia back to 2,000 years before Christ. However, **it is idle** to think that in order to own the title deed of a country, one must necessarily be its first inhabitant. In such a case, almost all of the nations existing today would have to be considered foreigners in the lands they inhabit, and the situation of the Amerindians would be particularly **difficult**.

Then, even if the H t t s were Turks, the new Turkic state established on the same lands a thousand years after their disappearance cannot be considered a continuation of the old one.

Today, it is accepted by all serious historians that the history of Turkey began with the Seljuks. It was the late **Dr Rıza Nur** who put this forward for the first time. This is the scientific and historical fact. However, when it is necessary to state a precise , there is no unanimity in this regard.

According to the opinion of many, our history **begins with** the Battle of Malazgirt in 1071. However, it cannot be said that there is a certain certainty in this idea. Because the Battle of Malazgirt was first battle between an **established** state, the Seljuks, and their neighbours, the Persians.

and after this battle, a new state **was not established**, but the gates of Asia Minor were **opened** to an already existing state.

In 1940, in a pamphlet I published under the title of **Nine Hundredth Anniversary**, the year of the **establishment** of our state was marked as the year of Tugrul Beg's revolution in Khorasan.

had taken the year 1040 and stated that this state had **completed** its 900th anniversary in 1940, but since no commemoration ceremony was held by official organisations, this small **brochure** was written to fulfil this duty.

My defence at the time was this:

This state **was founded** in 1040 in Khorasan under the suzerainty of Seljuk Tugrul **Beg** and then grew and added Anatolia to its territory along with many other lands. However, strange twist of history, this state lost the territories on which it was founded and held on to the places it conquered after its **establishment**.

This strange historical **departure** does not exist in the history of other states. Germany, France and England did not dispose of the lands they were first established in later. I think this is what puzzles our historians.

historians, who want to start the history of Turkey from Malazgirt, claim that there were separate sultans in Anatolia after this date and therefore this means a new and separate state. The existence of separate sultans in Anatolia does not mean that this country was a completely separate and independent state. It is enough to recall that the ancient Turkish state system was not centralised to show that the Anatolian **sultanate** cannot be **regarded** as separate state. The Gök Turks also had two, sometimes even four **kings**. The **kagans** were independent in their own right. But this did **not** mean two or four separate states. Similarly, there were four sultans in the Seljuk state, but three of them **lived** under the great sultan in Khorasan.

In that case, which date **shall** accept as the beginning of **Turkiye**, 1040 or 1071?

In my opinion, the first one the right one. However, it does not make any sense for me to hold this opinion, or even for the majority to favour me. Unless a single opinion prevails among us, as I have said before, the seeds of mischief be sown for distant future. Only a historical congress prevent this disagreement and confusion of opinions. Once a definite conclusion is reached, all historical books now written according to that starting year. It very important to determine the date of the beginning of a state. A state with an uncertain beginning year cannot be considered a civilised organisation.

b) The Issue of Hegemonies in the History of Turkey:

This is the issue of the division of the history of Turkey into main ages. The late **Rıza Nur Beğ**, who stated in a speech at the Ottoman Meb'ûsan Assembly that the history of Turkey did not only consist of the Ottomans but also began with the Seljuks, and who put forward this idea for the first time, in 12-volume **Turkish History** published after the War of Independence, divides the history of Turkey into three main sections, namely the Seljuks, the Seljuks and the Ottomans, and this classification of his has been accepted by many.

Another historian states that there were Dan Shmendl, Seljuk, Karamanli and Ottoman hegemonies in Turkey respectively. According to this view, Turks in Anatolia have no connection to the great Seljuk state in Khorasan.

I, on the other hand, argue that only the Seljuks, Ilkhanids, the Emirates and the Ottomans can be mentioned in this regard. According to the Anatolian viewpoint, which considers the Ilkhanids as foreign and even hostile, this is sure to be subject to objections. However, which these various ideas is correct and scientific can only be understood in a historical congress.

Since the scholars who will speak here will work hard defend their ideas, perhaps new historical documents and facts will be revealed.

Civilised nations the ruling dynasties in their history certainty. What they do not know, in most cases, the dates of **accession** and death of the first rulers of the first dynasty. We, on the other hand, not even know which dynasties held supreme authority in Türkiye.

c) The Issue of the Number of Ottoman Sultans:

We do not even have a common opinion about how many Ottoman sultans came until now. According to the conventional wisdom, the Ottoman Empire started with Osman Gaz and ended with VI.

Mehmed le b ten Ottoman pad shahs 6 Mehmed, 5 Murad, 4 Mustafa, 3 Osman, 3 Ahmed, 3 Sel m, 2 Bayazıd, 2 Süleyman, 2 Mahmud, 2 Abdülham d, 1 Orhan, 1 İbrah m1 Abdülmec d1 Abdülâz z were 36 . However, I wonder if this is correct. Suleyman, Mûsâ and Mustafa Çelebs, the sons of Yıldırım Bayazıd, and Sultan Cem, the son of Fatah, **were** not among the Ottoman sultans? Since Ottoman history until now has been **written** with the intention of establishing the legitimacy of the sultans who seized the sultanate, could it not be **that** some historical facts have been deliberately concealed? In our opinion the Ottoman sultans **were** not limited to 36 classical figures.

The famous poet **Ahmadî**, who lived in the fourteenth century and wrote the first Ottoman history according to our present knowledge, recognises **Suleyman Çelebi** as the Ottoman sultan after Yıldırım Bayez d. **Şükrullah**, who lived during the reigns of Murad II and and wrote the general history *Behçetü't-Tevâr h*, also accepts that Suleyman Çelebi ruled after Yıldırım. Şükrullah writes that after Süleyman Çeleb, **Çelebi Sultan Mehmed** in Anatolia and **Mûsâ Çelebi** in Rumel **ascended** to the throne at the same time.

A little later than **Şükrullah**, historian **Âşıkpaşaoğlu** also has some to the fact that Süleyman Çeleb 'n was considered an Ottoman sultan.

The reason why **Süleyman Çelebi** and **Mûsâ Çelebi** were not considered as sultans by later Ottoman historians is that the others were killed after internal fights and the generation of **Çelebi Sultan Mehmed** took over the reign, and they wanted to legitimise a reign that was not considered legitimate at the time. Most of the historians of the last period, including **İsmail Hami Danişmend**, who published a work *Chronology of Ottoman History*, do not count Süleyman and Mûsâ Çelebs among the sultans claim that the reason for this is that they were not able to possess the entire Ottoman . However, the late **Ali Seydi Beğ**, one of the members of the old Historical Council, accepted **Çelebi Süleyman** as the fifth Ottoman sultan after Yıldırım Bayazıd and **Mûsâ Çelebi** as the sixth sultan after him in his Ottoman history published in 1329. Since the capital of the state at that time was Ed rne, it is correct to a certain extent to consider prince who dominated the capital as the legitimate ruler. The fact that **Mustafa Çelebi**, one of Yıldırım Beyazıd's sons, was **proclaimed** sovereign in Rumel and **Sultan Cem**, the son of Fatimid, was proclaimed sovereign in Anatolia and ruled for months, even years.

they had been **sovereigns** for a long time in a large part of the country, it would **not** be right to dismiss them from the rulers' list at once. Whether or not a prince, who has made many princes and viziers acknowledge their suzerainty, minted coins, had an army and ruled for a long time in large part of the country, can be considered a sovereign or not can only be decided in official convention.

But this is **not** the end of the matter. In recent years, it **has** been claimed that another pad shah ruled between Osman Gaz and Orhan Gaz. The late **Hüseyin Hüsameddin Efendi**, the historian of Amasya, in a study in his *Tarih Encümen Mecmuası*, states that after Osman Gaz, his son **Ali Erden** Beğ succeeded to the Ottoman throne, and after four years of reign, he was deposed by his brother Orhan Gaz, who was assisted by other Anatolian admirers.

The Prophet's allegation is worthy of serious discussion. Since a similar case is recorded in the Byzantine sources, Hüseyin Hüsameddin Efendi's claim is worthy of serious discussion.

d) The Issue of the Spelling of Terms and Proper Names in Ottoman History:

This issue, which is also present in general Turkish history, manifests itself perhaps more strongly in Ottoman history. The issue of "d-t" in proper names continues to be subject to arbitrary spelling whether in school books or academic works. Should the endings of the historical names Ahmed, Mehmed, Mahmud be written with "d" or "t"? There is no common opinion on this issue. The anarchy of spelling, which increased rather than decreased after the adoption of the new alphabet, has also spread to historical names. I am in favour of writing the names of historical personalities in their original forms, i.e. Ahmed, Mahmud. Those living today free to write their names in any spelling they wish. Others are obliged to respect this right of theirs.

The spelling of historical terms is also a separate issue. Which spelling should be used for the title of the prime **ministers** the Ottoman period? Some people think it should be written as "sadr-ı âzam" with the original spelling. I, on the other hand, consider it correct to write this word, which has become **Turkishised** and **popularised**, as "grand vizier" in the common **usage**. Similarly, should the title of the person who is Religious Affairs be written as "sheikhül slâm according to the old reading" or as "şeh slâmin the common usage? Only academic congress put an end to this situation, which is written according to various principles and is a sign of spiritual weakness.

(Yen Sabah, 4 December 1948)

Establishment of our State

The Turkish race, of which we are proud to be a member, has been portrayed as a community that has established many states until now, and this result has been accepted by everyone as a fact. "establishing many states" seems to be virtue at first glance, it is understood that this is not the case upon careful consideration. Because when the claim of "establishing many states" is accepted, as a natural consequence of this, it is also assumed that these states are very short-lived institutions, which means that Turks lack the ability to establish continuous states, they are an unstable nation.

But is this the truth? the Turks really a nation that founded many, but un-lived states? this idea also be the idea of Turkish nationalists?

Turkism must be based on a world view, and it must have ideas that consider everything from dress to the calendar, from surnames to the family's teleology from its own point of view.

These considerations will create national personality and will give us value in proportion to the value of national personality. I will now explain my ideas about our state and call on the Turks to think about the matter:

In our thirty centuries of history, we have established two states. The first one is the state in Turkestan, the **original homeland**, which started from the darkness of history and lasted until the last age and was lost; the second one **is the state in Asia Minor, our state**, which was established in the XI century and has lasted until today. States established outside the homeland are excluded from this calculation.

The claim of "many states" arises from the misconception instilled in us by Eastern historians who regarded ruling dynasties as states. Turks have been **recognised** as nation that made history but could not write it. in the Orkun inscriptions where they mention themselves: "After the blue sky above and the black earth below were created, human beings were created between them, and my ancestors Bumun Kagan and Istem Kagan ruled over the human beings.

They used a short expression and it is noteworthy that they counted only Turks as human beings.

After they became Muslims, they completely adopted ideas of the Arab and Persian historians and made mistakes such as considering each dynasty as a separate state and the conflicts between dynasties as national wars.

The Turkicist view rejects this idea. Our idea idea that sees the facts of history from our own point of view. We are obliged to put forward our own view without the need to overestimate or history and to be free from the feeling of inferiority of accepting the opinions of others about us; we not to recognise ourselves the eyes of others.

will give you an example: In some geography books, there are maps such as "known parts of the world in such and such a century" and in these maps, our homeland is shown among the unknown parts. If in any century, in any century, any nation does not know the places where our ancestors lived, but considers them unknown to itself, and we accept this as such, this be an objective opinion or a mere opinion?

In the old school textbooks, our national history used to start with the "İst klâl- Osmânîin 699 AH. It does not start like that now, but it goes back to the Battle of Malazgirt in 1071, and the likes of Karamanids and Aydınoğulları that populated Anatolia are counted as separate states. This notion still the result of the desire to place dynasties above the nation.

Our state was established follows: In the Xth century, the Qarakhanids dynasty in the homeland, namely in Turkistan. Outside the homeland and bordering the Qarakhanids was the Ghaznavid state, founded by Turks. Between these two Turkic states, the Muslim majority of our ancestors, the Turkmens, the Oghuz and the Korluks, had established their sovereignty.

They entered the territories given to them by the Ghaznavids after they became a tool for their ambitions. However, due to their military strength and power, they did not fail frighten the state they were subject to. Although the Ghaznavids captured and imprisoned their leader Arslan Yabgu order to break the power of the Turkmens, the loss of their leader, far from breaking their power, on the contrary, increased their resentment, and after a series of battles with, they finally won the Battle of Dandânekan in 1040 and established an independent state in Khorasan.

was established. This state established in Khorasan this new organisation, which historians call the **Seljuk State** our state, namely **Turkey**.

Founded in Khorasan, this state later **conquered** Azerbaijan, Iraq, Syria and Anatolia, and the last gates of Anatolia were **opened** with the Battle of Malazgirt in 1071. The Seljuks were by several sovereigns, as in all times before and after Islam. The **vastness** of the state and the concept of Turkish sovereignty this. There were four sultans in Seljuk Turkey, but three of them recognised the great sultan in Khorasan as **the head**. The sultan of "Rûm", Anatolia, was one of these subordinate rulers. As in all our ancient history, the subordinate sultans **fought** with their foreign neighbours and sometimes even with each other without **consulting** the great sultan, but this did not disturb the unity of the state, as we **see** in European nations.

Unlike all other states in 's history, state, unlike all other states, **is** the only **example** of a state that has lost the lands on which it was founded and has remained on the lands it acquired later. Germany, Great Britain and France still on the lands they were founded on, and this is what is normal. If France lost Gaul and **settled** in North with half of its population, or if England was expelled from the southern part of the island of Britain and took refuge in Scotland, could this situation be considered natural? Just like him, the lands where we were founded are still full of Turks and the graves of those who founded this state are still full of Turks.

There can be no more natural outcome than that we cannot forget the lands adorned with the colour of the earth and remain attached to it.

A family, society or state, whatever it may be, will be solid if a community is established **with** virtue. If it is founded on vileness, it will collapse quickly. **Our state is a community founded with virtue.** Its history with greatness and renunciation. When the state was founded, there were three candidates for the presidency. However, was **not** the eldest **Mûsâ Yabgu** or the most heroic **Çağrı Bey**, but the youngest **Tuğrul Beğ**. In this, we also see the traces of a sense of compassion overflowing from their humanitarian hearts in peace, as well as their iron limbs with steel swords on the battlefields. Because Tuğrul **Beg** had no children. His uncle and brother tried to relieve his great suffering by becoming the head of state. Here is **the first president of our state great Sultan Gazi Tuğrul Beg**.

After the Seljuk dynasty, the Chengiz dynasty **was** at the head of this state, and the Ilkhanids, the western branch of the great Chengiz empire, dominated.

Although their centre was Azerbaijan, they carried out Turkiye.

Until now, the children of Cheng z have been referred to as **Mongols** or **Tatars** in our histories, making them look like a foreign state and dynasty. If we accept this unrealistic notion, we must also accept that the **Turks** lived under foreign rule for a long time, which would destroy our pride that we are a nation that has never lost its independence until now. Cheng z Khan, whose descent from the ancient **Gök Turks** is accepted by **contemporary** historians, was a Turk in terms of culture and ideals. What makes him look alien is that he belonged to a minority among the **Turks**, who had already become Muslim nation in the XIIIth century, and that he **was** labelled as **Mongol** by the Arabs and Persians as a member of a family that was dominant the **Mongols**.

The greatest service of our second dynasty, the **Ilkhanids**, was the definite **Turkification** of Anatolia and Azerbaijan. Because at the beginning of the XI. The **Turkmen** population in Anatolia, which was estimated to be one and a half million by conservative estimates, was **no** more than half a million, and this population **was** forced to wage relentless defensive wars against the Latin and Germanic Europeans for a century. The **Turkish** force that **Kılıç Arslan I** was able to muster against the crusader hordes barely fifty thousand **men**. only because the **Ilkhanids** brought new **Turkish** elements to Anatolia and expelled the foreigners from Anatolia and Azerbaijan to a great extent that the **Anatolian Turks**, who were so few, were not subjected to the catastrophe of "eradication" that had befallen the dominant **Turks** in **IndiaChina** and **Egypt** in history. It is the product of **irrationality** and a little bit of hatredus that **Europeans**, who consider this an atrocity, give the title of "great" to **Alexander of Macedon**, who caused great offences in **Turkand** killed the inhabitants of some cities that surrendered. Although **Europeans** were able to defeat all **Asian**, they cannot forget the **Turks'** centuries-long struggle and defence of honour against the entire western world. Therefore, what they see as normal in themselves and others, they claim as defects in us.

definite **Turkification** of Azerbaijan by the **Ilkhanids** was also a major factor in the **Persian** war.

leads them to their fears: In their opinion, the "**Mongols**" took Azerbaijan and forced the people to **speak** "**Turkish**" by inserting pins into their **Persian** language. A nation is forced to speak a foreign language because a needle was inserted into its tongue.

The absurdity of reconciling the fact that he started to speak by learning in totality with reality is obvious.

In the era of Ilkhanids this state was administered from Tabriz and Meraga. Just as Izn k, Konya, Kayseri, Bursa, Ed rnelstanbul, Ankara served as capitals, the cities of once served the same function. This a sign of mobility, energy and youth. If our nation is the only nation with people the civilised nations of the XIX century, this its ability live and youth rather than its backwardness. Diseases as malaria, which destroyed the H t t s and other nations before us in Anatolia, could not and will not destroy the Turks. The nomads in the highlands and mountains immediately occupy the place of those who die of malaria in the villages and towns and take place in history and time like the new forces that replace the soldiers who die in the war.

Osman Ghazi and his son **Orhan Ghazi**, who were considered as rulers by historical perception during the hundred-year-long Ilkhanid dynasty, were nothing but glorious tip-admirers.

Again, the same misunderstanding of history resulted in Temir being regarded as a foreigner, Tatar and enemy. Tem r, or **Aksak Tem r**, as the Turkestanis call him, is a ruler who wanted to realise an imaginative Turkic state like the **Bek Kuns**, **Gok Turks** and **Cheng z**. It is wrong and sinful to consider him as , i.e. Turkic Turks', national enemy. nationalist view of history is obliged to regard the **Battle of Ankara** as a fraternal quarrel. In the Battle of Ankara, the number of Turkmens in the army of Aksak Tem r was perhaps more those in the army of Yıldırım. Were so many people traitors? Is it possible for so many traitors to come together? They considered this fight as a fight for dynasty and authority. Aksak Tem r Bek commit a crime in terms of general Turkishness? I leave this discussion aside, because we accept that every human being has flaws. Were there no flaws in Fât h, Yavuz, Kanunî, even Alp Arslan, whom we can consider as the greatest individuals our history? Were there not some flaws in Mete, Kür Şad, Tonyukuk, Kül Teg n, whom we would consider the greatest individuals? Of course, Aksak Tem r also made some mistakes in terms of great Turkishness. But he was a person who could see the . the Slav threat and proposed to Yıldırım to jointly destroy the Russian-Leh-L tvan horde. Unfortunately, Yıldırım, the greatest knight who crushed the European knight armies, refused.

I wonder what would have happened if he had not refused and those two magnificent armies had united? As Turkist poet said:

If all Turks were one, they would be different...

Only the great Turkish poet Abdülhak Hâmîd had a different view of Aksak Temür, and was vindicated. There are five works that Hâmîd has gathered under the title "Kambur": İlhan Tarhan, Tayîrî, Ruhlar, Arzîler. In the third of these works the first two of which are set in the world, the third and fourth the otherworldly realm, and the last in the world, the spirit of Aksak Temür also speaks. Kambur, the protagonist of the works, Hâmîd himself. The poet makes him say all his ideas, philosophy and . He personally describes that Kambur is himself.

Probably due to the sixth sense and intuition of great men, Hâmîd grasped and appreciated his ideal. In the Tayîrî Geçidi, Hâmîd says the following to Temür's soul:

I am a'rac m⁽¹⁾ on my way but don't think I failed,
My aim was to unite the Turks and the Turks. I
destroyed the fetuses to create human beings:
Surely their âh ü sighs will not be heard ... I
painted the dâr- fenâyî, mettafak for pleasure,
You call that colour blood, I call it dawn; He
who sheds and destroys the blood of time
for the sake of Tathîr, will be Mâ'fû.

Destroying foetuses to create human beings is indeed done to produce a great work. And the fact that what appears to others as the colour of blood is dawn is due to the fact that every human phenomenon appears differently to opposite groups.

the only one. To use blood to wash the clothes of the age and to take this blood from the angels is a idea worthy Hâmîd.

Aksak Temür used blood for "tathîr of zamânî". However, cannot consider his shedding of Hnt, Persian, Armenian, F colour blood this cleansing as atrocity. No nation falls into the mistake of blaming itself before history.

It is also **wrong** to accuse 'Temîr' of leaving Anatolia after defeating and destroying it. Çeleb Sultan Mehmed and his son Murad II were both rulers subject to Temîr and his son Shahrukh in . In this way, the idea of a Turkish unity had been realised. The sovereignty of the Ottoman dynasty in the whole of Turkey **began** only during the reign of Fât h and continued until the Republic.

As a Turkist Let us think: Do not the Seljuk, Ilkhanid, Tem r Ottoman dynasties and the Republican era all together a single state? Wouldn't seeing them as separate states be tearing ourselves apart? When Tem r and Yıldırım were the commanders of two enemy armies, would it be obligatory to consider the Karamanids and the Osmanids, or the Ottomans and the Karamanids as separate states and national enemies? When looking at our history, we do not have the right to take the side of this or that dynasty and consider ourselves as its nation. Just as we do not have the right to do so, do **not** have the right to consider the lands where our state was founded as foreign countries today. If Turkey conquered Rumel and lost Anatolia - God forbid - would the Anatolian lands also be foreign to us? National situation is **not** only the situation of moment or time. Because the nation is also only one at the time living People **It's not.** Yesterday lived with the ones tomorrow **they will live** da Turkish m llet n Thank you It does. Yesterday's n the right to cannot sacrifice it. It our right and duty to think of and love places full of graves of those who founded this state and gave us the opportunity to live here today. Fratricidal strife everywhere. When Napoleon invaded Germany, the states forming the German Empire fought together with Napoleon. However, the Germans did not recognise Prussia and Bavaria as separate states and nations, nor did they regard the Bavarians as a . **they don't,** to their children tar h while reading y ne single **They** mentioned Germany, but this **Brother** from their fight some bretler to remove have laboured.

Naz Germany, Czechoslovakia st lâ ed p world When Hitler was attacked by the press, the following justification was **put** forward against him: "German They forget that their emperor lived in Prague." It is seen that other nations rely on the old right of unity even for their political ambitions.

Our first Pad Shahs **lived** and **died** in Khorasan, and as a result the region **was** marked by eternal Turkishness. In short, it is another may

Our state, which was established at the end of the Dandânekan Battle of Dandânekan on 23 May 1040, is a state that has been uninterrupted until today.

As for the meaning of 3 May: It is important as the beginning of an awakening in our history. Since the Tanzimat, which was an act of entry into Western civilisation, but which caused the formation of a sense of inferiority due to misunderstanding and misapplication, we have gone too far in denying ourselves. We even came across people who said that civilisations could enter countries without going through any customs, that it was essential to take Western civilisation and its prostitution along with its technique, art and knowledge. What was done so that the children of pure Anatolia could grow up as communists in the Village Institutes. Most of those who did this have been exposed today. More and more damning documents will be revealed about them. Like waking up as a communist in the morning horrible

It was prevented by the noble and conscious action of a few thousand unknown nationalist youth on 3 May 1944. The nation realised the water plot against it. Indeed, 3 May is the source of many sufferings. But out of those sufferings, consciousness and happiness are born. 3 May, which was celebrated quietly in small groups in the early days, today is the holiday of a growing and growing conscious mass beautiful to think of the majesty and the joy of the parade the youth front of the mausoleums of our great sultans in Gök Turkic dress one day in the future.

Our state, which is founded on the foundations of virtue, never be shaken and overthrown by a few black days. Just as a few mistakes in the verse or rhyme in the most beautiful poems do not prevent the beauty of that poem, a few traps cannot prevent this state from its greatness in the past and in the future. This state and homeland will grow. Because there are those who are ready to die for it.

Text of the conference given in Ankara on 4 May 1952).

1A'rec: Topal

The war that led to the establishment of our state

May has a great place in Turkish history: The historical and epic movements that led to the establishment of Turkey took place in this month, and **the Battle of Dendânekan**, the crucial point of these epics, took place on 23 May.

There is no indication in the school books as to when our state was founded. Some people consider 26 August 1071, the date the Battle of Malazgirt, as the beginning of our state. This idea is completely **wrong**. Because the Battle of Malazgirt was **nothing** but the defeat of another strong state by an already **established** strong state. The Battle of Dendânekan, on the other hand, was the battle that enabled the Turks under the Seljuk dynasty to defeat the Ghaznavid Empire and tear the Khorasan country away from themorganise independently here and to start conquestsin other words, to establish Turkiye and to bring us to the present day.

all the turning points in our national life, both good and bad, and being aware of the dates that all will **rejoice** and **grieve together** is one of the first conditions of being a nation with a strong spiritual structure.

Turkish youth who memorise , CaesarArslan Yürekli R şarDel PetroNapoleonhow this state was **founded** with heroic deeds and what an epic hero named Çağrı **Beğ** did, It is not only sad but also shameful not to know the names of the immortals suchKutalmışİbrahim İbrahim İnal, Yakutu, Resul Teg n, Buka, Anasıoğlu, Hasan Artuk, **Afş** and others, who were the Turkish chiefs of the terrible battles fought hand-to-hand with the Eastern Roman Empire. These are things that should be learnt **not** in high school and secondary school, but in primary school. Let us learn and remember them. Let us always keep them in our minds and keep them in our hearts, **not** only when our hope fails.

* * *

The energetic and daring Oghuzs under the Seljuk dynasty and a number of eastern Turks who had joined them after floundering between the Khazar, Qarakhanid and Ghaznavid states, and even suffering great resentments, began to move around the idea of "Khorasan".

Khorasan, a large and rich province of the Ghaznavid Empire was a means of survival for the Seljuks. The pasture for their herds of cattle, sheep and horses was in Khorasan, and the rich cities that would tax them were also there. Several battles fought for this place with different dates did not resolve any issue and it was left to a decisive battle.

Sultan Masud, the son of the great Sultan Mahmud of Ghaznavi, was a great commander, a unique hero, but an indecisive, cruel and drunken head of state. He had lost the trust of his commanders due to frequent and unnecessary changes of decisions in major cases, and some of these commanders joined the Seljuks, resenting the sultan whom they had insulted during their drunkenness, which made the sultan suspicious of all his commanders. In Khorasan, propaganda was made in favour of the Seljuks, religious scholars the Seljuk princes to replace their drunken sultans, and the merchant and artisan class also the Seljuks who charged less taxes.

The spy network between the two sides was growing, and the movements and preparations of both sides were known to each other.

Sultan Masud made great preparations to deal with this matter and organised an army unprecedented until then. This well-armed army consisted of 100,000 and 50 elephants. This army consisted of Hindis, Afghani, Iranian, Arab and Kurdish besides Turks.

The Seljuks numbered less than 20,000 men. However, it was a very dense and armed army consisting of extremely agile horsemen. The large number of the Ghaznavids also caused a shortage of food and water.

On 17 March 1040, the Ghaznavid army moved from Nishapur towards Serhas. The Seljuks who had gathered in Serhas also stirred. Leaving nothing to eat in the places where the Ghaznavid army was passing by, they filled the wells and started to retreat.

On 13 May, the Ghaznavids entered Serhas. However, during the starvation march, most of the animals died and most of the cavalry was left without horses,

The horses that would not die had become exhausted, and worse, the army had deteriorated to such an extent that it was unable to use weapons due to starvation.

Serhas was in ruins. The people had fled with the Seljuks, and the Seljuks had taken everything useful and burnt what they could not. Although the Ghaznavid commanders suggested returning to Herat in order to find food, the sultan did not favour this idea. Saying that the Seljuks were also hungry, he said that an offensive was necessary to end the war once and for all, and that Merv was the target.

that he's going to have it stamped out.

On 16 May 1040, the Ghaznavid army marched to Merv, the new headquarters of the Seljuks. The army was suffering greatly from thirst and disease begun.

On 18 May, wells were dug to cure the thirst, and the surrounding reeds were set on fire to provide shelter for the Seljuks. But most of the wells turned out to be brackish.

On 21 May the first battle was fought with 1500 Seljuks under the command of Börü Tegin. They made a lightning attack with a rain of arrows. When the heavy cavalry of the Ghaznavids attacked them, they retreated, but managed to carry off some of the weights.

This first battle revealed the demoralisation and lack of religion in the Ghaznavid army. The Turkish speciality soldiers in the Ghaznavid army appealed to their commander, the famous chiefbuğ Beğdoğdu, and told him that they were tired of riding camels, that if there was a battle next day, they would take the horses of Tajik (=Iranian and Afghani) and Arab soldiers and that this was the only way they would enter the battle.

Meanwhile, the Seljuks in Merv were discussing what to do in the face of the offensive of the great Ghaznavid army, but they could not come to a decision. In the end, they left the decision to Tugrul Beg. Tugrul Beg was in favour of a great migration and marching through Iran via Dhan due to the arrival of an unprecedentedly large Ghaznavid army. Iranians were cowards said that he could not stand us. He was afraid that the Seljuk community would disintegrate if the war ended in failure.

Callag Beg objected to this proposal.

"If we going to escape from here and take, we should have done it at the beginning and should not have grabbed the belt of such great pad shah and called him to war"

He enumerated the evidence for the inevitability of accepting the war. He conby saying that they would win the war if they fought manfully with bare horses. This idea was accepted.

They separated women, children, sick and old people. sent them and their weights, with 2-3 thousand cavalry with skinny and scrawny horses, far away the deserts. They counted the soldiers fit for battle and realised that they were 16.000 men. Although this army was small in number, its spiritual strength was very superior and its weapons were very good. Çağrı Beğ was the commander-in-chief of the army and Börü Teg n from the Qarakhanid dynasty was the vanguard commander.

This decision of the Seljuks was reported to Sultan Masud by Ghaznavid spies among them. Sultan Masoud, who read the letters brought by a cavalryman that night, talked to his men about this report. It was decided to march to Merv in haste.

On Thursday, 22 May 1040, the Ghaznavids began to advance in battle formation and were soon attacked by Turkmen bands on their nimble horses from separate locations. Among the Seljuk troops there also slaves who had passed Ghaznavidsthe Seljuks. Their summons to their former comrades quite effective, and some of them joined the Seljuks, while , at least, remained spectators of the battle. The reason why the palace slaves were so offended was Sultan Masud. Because he had disregarded Beğdoğdu, whom he had despised as being weak and blind, and had appointed Er Teg n as the head of the Turkish slaves. Er Teg n did not fulfil his promise.

In the battle that lasted from morning until noon, the Ghaznavid army repelled the Seljuks thanks to the sacrifice of its officers and the heroism of Sultan Masud, who overthrew every opponent, but again lost some of its weight to them.

After the Seljuks withdrew, the Ghaznavid army marched for a few kilometres more to a place where there was water and there was nothing left for the sect. Overwhelmed by thirst, the soldiers attacked the water without listening to the officers and commanders. If the Seljuks had made an attack at this time, this army would have dispersed. But the Seljuks, who had decided to fight a decisive battle on the plain of Dendânekan where they had set up their headquarters, did not make this attack. The Ghaznavid army quenched its thirst towards midnight and went into formation.

On the morning of Friday 23 May (= 9 Ramadan 431), the Ghaznavids started to march again. There were 12 fighters left in this army. The Seljuks immediately went the offensive.

They would shout and attack with lightning speed, **shoot arrows**, , and then come back again. The Ghaznavids fought with these agile troops and reached in front of Dendānekan castle in the **early** morning. The fortress had **not** to the Seljuks. Some soldiers of the Ghaznavids, who were overwhelmed thirst, came in front of the castle despite the orders of their officers and handed their flasks to inside. The Sultan gave the order to attack without waiting for them to join the army. The Seljuks were waiting quietly in neat rows.

When they realised that **the** great war would start, the Turkish slaves in the Ghaznavid army got rid of camels. They wanted to take the horses of Iranians and Afghans whom they considered inferior. **Since** they did not want to give them, a fight broke out. Seljuks did not miss this opportunity. They attacked violently. **Many** of the Turkish soldiers who were offended by some unseemly behaviour of Sultan Masoud went over to the Seljuk side.

When the two armies came face to face, the Arab and Kurdish units of the Ghaznavid army, which were the raiding units of the Ghaznavid army and the least valuable part of the army in military terms, dispersed and fled. The most populous element of the army was the Hindus. But the Hindus, who had been defeated by the Seljuks several times before, were frustrated. They too could not hold out for long and broke down. **Although** the commanders and officers tried to prevent the defeat by fighting with extraordinary zeal and courage, they failed. The centre of the Ghaznavid army held out until the end. Here the sultan, his **brother** and son were present, and Sultan Masud doing justice to his weapons by knocking down a Seljuk with every blow. The Seljuks **began to hesitate to** approach him.

But this did not change the outcome. Even so, the Sultan **not** accept being **defeated**. At last one of his commanders woke him up: He reminded him that if he did not withdraw, he **would** go to the Seljuk headquarters as a prisoner. There was no solution. He gave the order to withdraw. He himself **started** to flee on an elephant. He had 100 people **left** with him.

Turkmen horsemen were chasing him fiercely. When the Sultan saw them approaching, he mounted a horse and attacked them. He cut one of them in two with a sword. He killed the second one with a mace. Thus, he was saved from falling into their .

The Seljuks **had** won a complete victory. Sultan Masud's treasure, weights **were taken** and most of the army **was** captured. At first **Callag** did not realise the **magnitude** of his victory. He did not allow his army to raid in every direction. He sent only some of his horsemen to chase the fleeing army. He kept his army pure in case Sultan Masoud gathered his troops and turned back.

He prepared his whole army by organising it in order. He kept his whole army on horseback and with weapons in hand for three days and nights, except in times of such as eating and drinking. This precaution was **not in vain**. Because after removing the dead and captives of the large Ghaznavid army, there were still 40-50 thousand **people scattered** in the desert, and their gathering in some mansions could create a great danger.

After Çağrı Beğ learnt that Sultan Masud **had fallen** to Merv rûz in a state of exhaustion and that he had no forces left with him, **he ordered** his army, which **he** had kept on horseback for three days, to rest.

Khorasan was now theirs. A few days later, celebrated victory and declared their state. **Tugrul Beg**, the brother of Callag Beg, was appointed as the **head** of the state. The hero Çağrı Beğ remained as the **ruler** of Khorasan province until his death. , **Turkey was founded in May 1040**. This Turkey became one of the most states of the **Middle Ages**, taking over Iran, Iraq, Azerbaijan, Anatolia and Syria. It maintained its existence by **fighting** against the Crusaders, and a strange and **unprecedented** manifestation of history, it lost the lands it was **founded** on and held on to the lands it acquired later.

Throughout history, the Turks have always marched westwards, reaching as far as Germany and Morocco during the Ottoman period, but then they were forced to retreat and stayed in Anatolia.

Let us draw our glorious and epic-like **past** in our and hearts indelible . Let us remember it. Because it is the source of our strength. Let remember and hope.

The soldiers of the Battle of Dendânekan and the mercy of the Ghaznavid army, **including** the Turks!

We, who are accelerated by them, have the strength to accomplish our mission!...

(Orkun, 10 issues, 15 November
1962)

Turanism

Turanism is an issue that **has been** discussed in Turkey for more than 60 years. Although from time to time it has been considered as a system that includes the related nations of Turks, what **is** understood in today when "Turanism" is the ideal of uniting all Turks a single state, including their historical heritage, and like any other ideal, it is an ideal that looks at generations and imposes a blood and life tax.

It is a belief that is demanding and adds excitement to the hearts.

the reunification and rise of the Turkish nation, which is to almost the whole world due to its history, **wars** and conquests, frightens many nations, because some states will disappear or **shrink** as a result of this **rise**, and even because the interests of large trade partnerships around the world will be undermined, the ideal of Turanism is met with great opposition, and this propaganda also effective in Turkey.

The opposition in Turkey to the ideal of Turanism **arises** either from the assumption that it is an adventure that would put Turkey at great risk, or from ignorance **that** Turks outside **Turkey** are Turks at least as much as we are (in a way more than we are), or from the confusion of ethnic groups and cultures that have been piling up within our present borders for 4,000 years and the acceptance of the emergence of a "people" whose language now Turkish.

I do not pay attention to the opposition of those who fear that Turanism will overthrow Russia because they are Muscovite henchmen.

First, let us consider whether Turanism is an adventure:

The idea that Turanism was an adventure was **derived** from the failure of Enver Pasha's actions on the Caucasian front in the First World War, which ended in failure and great losses. Just as spring does not come with a cheque, judging **the** wrongness **of** an idea with a failure cannot be considered a work of sound logic. Enver Pasha was a brave soldier, but an incompetent one.

It is now well known that Pasha was a commander. Furthermore, it is also **wrong** to consider Enver Pasha as a pure Turanian. The Unionists were both Turanists and Islamic unityists. They wanted to take both the Caucasus and Egypt. Moreover, the untimely Caucasian offensive **was** motivated by the idea of Turanism, but rather to relieve the burden on our ally, Germany.

it comes to adventurism, it is necessary to think carefully and seriously about this word. Just as not all adventurism is a mistake, not all desire is prudent **behaviour**. The history of mankind is full of adventures in the fields of politics, military and science. Christopher Columbus' desire to reach India by travelling westwards was an adventure. So was crossing **the Atlantic** on a raft. If we look at our own recent history, Mustafa Kemal Pasha's landing in Samsun was also an adventure. The fact that many people disagreed with him **was not** because they were **not** patriotic, but because they could not see the prospect of success. However, **he** knew how to calculate well, he brilliantly completed **an** undertaking that others opposed as an adventure that would sink Turkey.

In our earlier history, Babur's plunge into Hindustan with 10,000 men and Yavuz's crossing the desert into Egypt with 30,000 men were not adventures?

Yes, Napoleon and Hitler's Moscow campaigns were also adventures, but does the value of the others diminish because they ended in failure?

is not an adventure for the Jews to establish the state of Israel in what is now the Arab homeland?

Those who want to live without any danger please do so. Life and the universe are full of dangers. Danger exists for individuals, nations and lands. A terrible earthquake **bury** Anatolia under water in a few hours. **The** suffocating gases of a comet passing close to the Earth **destroy** several nations at once. A **meteorite** large enough to dislodge the Earth from its orbit **hit** the globe and bring about the apocalypse of the world. A few nations **unite** and launch 500 hydrogen bombs on Turkey one night and then send their soldiers in special suits into our country.

Are we **going** to sit lethargically and spend our only building factories, watching football matches and shouting, organising and competitions, and analysing the works of some **vulgar** people in universities because we have all these needs? A nation **cannot live** on these things. A nation **not** a herd of animals. The nation aims for a national goal. Only when it sees that goal, it ceases to be a herd.

He becomes humanised, gets rid of selfishness and becomes **altruistic**.

The most blessed goal for us is Turanism. What can be more blessed dedicating oneself to an ideal, saying that we will **unite** as we used to unite? It our right and duty to unite all Turks. To take back by force what was taken away from us by force to fulfil justice. Turanism an idea of greatness. The idea of greatness a noble idea.

To understand **Turanism** as the unification of all Turks only in the field of culture is **empty** and **wrong**. It is a social law that cultural **unity** is born only at the end of unity. Is it possible to unite Turks under the domination of nations hostile to Turks in culture? By what force, by what method can you unite Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Uzbeks, Turkmen, Tatars and Bashkirs, whose alphabets were **separated** in the Soviet **Union** and whose native dialects were turned into literary languages, with us in a single culture? If you have that much power, it that you already the power to march your armies and save those countries. After that, you can convene a congress for cultural **unity**, otherwise you will never be able to establish cultural **unity**.

Today, the cultural **unity** among the Turks exists only the form of unity of heart, the consciousness of being one nation and a little language unity. But **at** this rate, their languages will separate after 50 years. What will happen then? Will we **accept** this fait accompli with resignation, saying that they have become another nation? Or will **we** risk everything, **war**, in to save the old homeland and the **severed** parts of our ancestry? Of course we **will**. that we look out for the time and make the calculations well...

If dealing **with** Turks outside **the** legal borders is an adventure, why did Turkish planes attack Cyprus? Why would Cyprus have been invaded if the navy had not prevented it? Why are we so interested in the Turks Western Thrace and the Turks of Kirkuk? Yesterday it was "Hatay". Today it is "Cyprus", tomorrow "Western Thrace and Kirkuk". The day after tomorrow "Azerbaijan" and beyond... This is what it is. No one should stick **their** head in the sand.

Another form of opposition to Turanism is the result of ignorance of Turks outside Turkey. Just recently, it was told that a knowledgeable person asked one of the young people at a meeting, "Are the Huns also Turks?". What be called an ignorant person who does not know that the Huns were Turks and even partly the ancestors of the Oghuzs? It turns out that he **thought** that national history begins with the victory of Malazgirt. Let's say a good night's sleep and pass on...

In addition, with the non-national consciousness of not being of Turkish descent, Anatolia is a glass, the people in it are a cocktail, and the Turks are the last to join this cocktail.

There is a delirium of counting the number of fans of a team of mental patients barett r.

Those who start our history with Malazgirt or the capture of the city of Iznik should ask What did those who made Iznik the capital or won the battle of Malazgirt say before? Where did they say? The Eleventh Century is a century under the spotlight of history. It immediately reveals where and what these men were. Thus it revealed that so-called Turkic states were Turkish dynasties chasing each other, that they were in fact single state that was divided into two or three in times of conquest, and that this extended as far back as Tanrıkut.

In order to denigrate such a nation-accelerating, morality and virtue-based ideal as Turanism, one must either the blood in one's veins is foreign, be a communist, a traitor to the homeland, or be so ignorant and foolish as to start national history from Malazgirt.

30 Nisan 1973

(Ötüken, issue: 114, June 1973)

Çağrı Beğ

This heroic Oghuz beğ, who played a great role in the foundation of the State, was the eldest son of **Mikail Yabgu** and the grandson of **Selçuk Sübaşı**. Mikail Yabgu died before his father Selçuk Beğ, but he left two sons, **Çağrı Beğ** and **Tugrul Beğ**.

At the beginning of the XIth century, the Oghuzs, who were under the **Khazar Khaganate**, were in disorganised state due to the disintegration of this Khaganate. There was the powerful **Qarakhanid Khanate** to their east and the more powerful **Ghaznavid Empire** to their south.

Although most of the Oghuzes were subject to the Ghaznavids, Çağrı and Tugrul were subject to **Yagan Tegin Mehmed Buğra Khan**, the governor of Talas under the Qarakhanids. Yagan Tegin had given city of Selç along the Talas River to Çağrı and Tugrul Beğ as a dividend. After Yaghan Tegin, they were subject to **Ali Tegin**, the governor of Samarkand and Bukhara of the Qarakhanids.

But they were not at peace. The Qarakhanid - Ghaznavid rivalry and wars on the one hand, and the lack of unity among themselves on the other, prevented them from looking to their future with confidence. They were also a state of economic straits. Çağrı Beğ sought a way out of this disorganisation and unrest. He decided to cross to Anatolia with the warriors under his command and clash with the Greeks. This war was to be fought with national and religious ideal and at the same time feed the Oghuz who were falling into financial hardship.

This war was going to be a daring act. Because order to reach the Bzans border from Maverāunneh r, it was necessary to pass through Khorasan and Iraqi Persia, the lands of the Ghaznavid Empire.

Çağrı Beğ made this bold and fearless march in 1015. Leaving his younger brother Tugrul Beğ in difficult deserts, he entered Khorasan between Khwarzem and Bukhara. From the southern region of Lake Van to Anatolia

attacked. At that time, there a small Armenian kingdom called **Vasपुरagan** in this region, which was a part of B zans.

In 1015-1016, Cagil **Beg** made terrible attacks on this kingdom. He defeated the armies of King Senehar m . The Armenian king was so tired of these raids that he left his kingdom to B zans and asked for another place to be given to in Anatolia. asked. In return for Vasपुरagan, he was granted the region of Vas.

When the Ghaznavids saw this fearless behaviour of Callagh, they invaded Kharzem in 1017 in order to block his return route. Unaware of this, the fearless Oghuz **beğ** headed north in 1018 and entered the territory of **Shaddadoğulları Beğligi**, which dominated the cities of Ganja and Nakhchivan. After having chewed up the lands of this Kurdish kingdom, he penetrated into the Georgian kingdom, which was subject to the Persian Empire, and plundered the whole region.

In 1021, he crashed into **the Armenian kingdom of Anı** and then returned to his homeland **despite** all the measures taken by the Ghaznavids to block way.

This raid, which lasted six years, is **unique** in all history. Because it is a miracle **that** a commander travelled so much in enemy countries he did not **know** and returned to his homeland with great satisfaction even though the rest was cut off.

Sultan Mahmud of Ghaznavāl was frightened by this movement of the Oghuz of Çağrı **Beğ** and marched to Bukhara and captured **Arslan** Yabgu, the great head of the Oghuz.

After these events, Çağrı **Beğ'** approached the Qarakhanids and was in the service of Al Teg n, the ruler of the western branch of the Qarakhanids. However, when Al Teg n, for some reason we do not know, killed Inanç Yabgu, the son of Çağrı **Beğ's** uncle, they fell out. At a time when preparations for **war** were being made, a son **was born** to Çağrı **Beğ** and his name was **Alp Arslan**.

Having won the battle in 1029, Çağrı and Tugrul were by the blows of Al Teg n and his son Shahmel k a little later. lost most of their property, hid the rest in the deserts and started military preparations to avoid such a defeat again.

Since the Ghaznavids thought that these preparations were against them, they also started to **prepare** to crush the Oghuzes and in 1035 they led an army under the command of the experienced commander **Beğ-doğdu** against Çağrı **Beğ** and the other Oghuzes. On 2 July 1035, this army **was ambushed** by Çağrı **Beğ**, who commanded the central column of the Oghuz. Çağrı **Beğ's** arm killed the horses of the Ghaznavids by raining arrows and broke them. But the Seljuks did not defeat them.

attributed their victories to coincidence and sent envoys to Ghaznavids to ask for **peace**. After the envoys arrived, an agreement was made.

In this treaty, the governorship of Deh stan given to Çağrı Beğ. However, in the menşur sent, the fact that the Oghuz chiefs were called d hkan" instead of "emîr" caused distrust among the Oghuzes because this Persian word meant "village lord". Because this Persian word "village lord".

War and fighting started again. In 1036, Çağrı Beğ made a raid near Merv. In 1037, Ghaznavids marched a large force to Merv in order to suppress Çağrı Beğ, but he retreated to the desert. Ghaznavids chased him. However, Çağrı Beğ suddenly met and destroyed the Ghaznavid troops chasing him in a valley without water.

In early May 1037, Çağrı Beğ and Tugrul Beğ had **khutbahs** read in their names in Merv and Serhas respectively. But they were **not** completely independent. Because both of them **had** read the name of **Ghaznavid Sultan Masud** before their own names in the khutbah.

In the meantime, the two sides seemed to **come to an agreement** and the daughters of some of the elders of the Ghaznavid State were nominated for the Oghuz likes.

Among them, Callag Beg had the daughter of Abulhasan Abdulcel I. As the Seljuks evacuated Merv and Serhas and started preparations for the wedding, the **situation** changed when the governor of Uzkend, Börü Teg n of the Qarakhanids **provoked** the Seljuks again and sent money and weapons. Çağrı Beğ, together with his brother Tugrul Beğ, defeated a few Ghaznavid forces.

In April 1038, when the Ghaznavids marched on the Seljuks with an elite army of 30,000 , the Oghuzes **discussed** among themselves what to do. Çağrı Beğ proposed a very daring plan such as a raid on N Shabur, but Tugrul Beğ considered it dangerous and preferred a normal war.

In June 1038, the **battle** started at Talhab in the jurisdiction of Serhas. After a very fierce and furtive **battle**, the Ghaznavid army was destroyed. He was taken from Serhas and Merv. **At a meeting held in Ulucami in Merv, Çağrı Beğ, who was no longer willing to establish a beğlik under the protection of the Ghaznavid sultan, became independent.**

He proposed that a state should be established and one of them should be elected as the president of all of them and recognised as "sultan". This proposal was accepted and Tugrul Beg was elected president. Çağrı Beğ was never a rival to his younger brother.

stemed. Since Tugrul Beg was infertile, the pad kingship would have gone to Callag Beg anyway.

will pass .

In July 1038, Cagil Beg invaded Herat.

In October, a 50,000-strong Ghaznavid army marched against the Seljuks.

This army entered Balkh in November. But Ghaznavid Sultan Masoud, He marched on Qarakhanid Börü Tegin, who was their ally before the Seljuks. Because he had heard a rumour that he would be declared the pad shah of Khorasan by the Seljuks. He was advancing regardless of the cold, snow, loss of people and animals. Çağrı Beğ also wanted to take advantage of this situation and started to march in a way to fall behind his army. When Sultan Masud learned about this, he left Börü Tegin and returned (12 January 1039). He retreated to Balkh.

Callag Beg came to N Shabur in February and was welcomed by Tugrul Beg. He stayed here for 40 days. The elders of the city visited him one by one and welcomed . He was sitting on a decorated seat placed next to Tugrul Beg's throne. But he was not able to treat the people of N Shabur as well as Tugrul Beg.

Chukun Sultan Masud had reported that with the propaganda of his supporters, the emirs and sheikhs of N Shabur had spoken against the Seljuks to the people and openly cursed them in mosques. Since the wars between the Seljuks paralysed the trade of N Shabur, which was the market of Iran-Turkistan-China, the merchants, who complained about this, gave material aid to the Ghaznavid armies the Oghuzes. Therefore, Callag and his subordinates appealed to Tugrul Beg and for permission to sack city, which was still in trade goods, since the Seljuk-Ghaznavid wars had not been concluded. When Tugrul Beg did not agree, they did not hide their discontent. When no result came out of the long discussions, Tugrul Beg drew his knife and said to Çağrı Beg: "If you refuse in the looting, I will kill myself!" and took the knife to his heart. Callag caught the knife and promised give up the plunder and prevented the attack. Tugrul Beg ordered him to be given 500,000 dirhems and many gifts.

In March, Callag Beg left N Shabur and headed for Serhas.

Since Çağrı Beğ knew that Ghaznavid Sultan Masud was going to launch a decisive attack, he acted cautiously and burnt and destroyed the places he would pass through in order to make his movements more difficult.

On 6 April 1039, Sultan Masud and Callag Beg fought on the plain of Alabad. Callag Beg was forced to retreat in the face of superior forces.

On 15 May 1039, Sultan Masud departed from Balkh with an **unprecedented** army of 100,000 men. This army was very strong. But it was difficult to feed and the movement was heavy.

When Callag **Beğ** learnt about this march, he was in Serhas. He informed his brother and all his relatives. all united their forces. Their army consisted of only about 20.000 horsemen. Some of them were armoured and armed to perfection, and most of them were light cavalry, fast and fiercely armed.

They destroyed the open towns in Khorasan to starve the Ghaznavid army. They burnt crops. They cut down trees.

The Oghuz elders held a **war** council in Serhas and **discussed** question of whether **or** not **to** fight with the great army of Ghaznavid Masud. Various ideas were put forward. The last one, Çağrı **Beğ**'s idea of fighting with extreme violence by keeping the weights at a distance was accepted.

In June 1039, a series of battles **broke out** between the advancing heavy Ghaznavid army and the Seljuks. In these battles, the spirit of the Oghuz-Turkmen army formed by Çağrı **Beğ**. The Seljuks used the tactic of attrition by not engaging in a decisive battle.

By the end of June, both sides were **exhausted**. A messenger sent by Ghaznavids led **to** peace and both sides **agreed** to peace with the idea of being better prepared for the war.

However, as soon as **peace** was concluded, preparations on both sides **began**. In November 1039, Ghaznavid Sultan Masud moved swiftly with his excellent army of more **than** 100,000 men. Oghuz gathered in Bâverd and united. The Seljuks were strategically raided and narrowly escaped annihilation. Unable to capture them, Sultan Masoud halted the march due to lack of food and returned to N shabur (January 1040).

The Ghaznavids' decisive march on the Seljuks began on 3 May 1040. The Ghaznavid army was marching in great water shortage.

On 21 May 1040 the first battle took place. The Seljuks had 16,000 elite troops **under** the leadership of Cagil **Beğ**.

On Friday 23 May 1040, a great battle was fought on the plain of Dendânekan and ended in a victory for the Seljuks.

Çağrı Beğ came to the headquarters of Sultan Masud and sat on his throne.
What did he distribute to the soldiers in goods and sustenance?

After Çağrı Beğ learnt that Sultan Masud **had fallen** to Merv rûz in a state of exhaustion and that there were no forces left with him, **he** ordered his army, which had been waiting on horseback for three days, to rest.

Callag Beg **remained** ruler of Khorasan, the eastern region of **the** empire, and **maintained** this position his death.

He died in 1060 **at** the age of 70. He was
buried in Merv.

Alp Arslan, one of his sons named Yakutu, Kavurt, Süleyman, became the governor of Khorasan in his place.

(Orkun, 9th issue, October
1962)

The Tale of 16 States and False Flags

Recently, news in the press and a calendar printed by the Turkish Radio and Television Corporation (TRT) claimed that the Turks had established 16 great states until now, and that this is why the Turkish presidential forsign has 16 stars.

Like everything else, our history has not yet taken its definite shape. From where does Turkish history start and which course it follow, who are Turks? These not yet clear. As we have mentioned before, there is no consensus among historians as to whether some great personalities were Turks or not. While the situation is in this centre, the assertion that 16 great Turkish states have been established until now and that Turkiye is the successor of these states a very dubious assertion.

Until now, it is not clear who made the decision on the establishment of 16 great Turkic states. A serious congress should have been convened for this issue, which is the subject of historical scholarship. Such a convention has not been convened. Moreover, it is not sufficient to convene only a convention historical scholars for such a large and influential idea. When talking about a historical heritage, it a natural necessity to involve people who are the carriers of national culture and ideals.

Until now, I had no information about the 16 stars on the Presidential uniform representing 16 great Turkish states. As a person who is interested in such issues, I wonder who else about this symbol after I did not know about it? Or was this also a national secret and only now was it deemed appropriate to reveal it?

I learned about the legend of 16 Turkish states from an article written by Mr Tek n Erer on 6 January 1969 in his column titled "The 16 Avenues of Turkishness". Among the 16 states listed in this article, there are some non-Turkish states such as the Samanids, Akkoyunlular, Karakoyunlular, Safavids, Egyptian Kölemenler,

The absence of any mention of great and magnificent Turkish states such as the Baburids, and especially the absence of any mention of the Cengiz state, the greatest empire of the Khan's history, renders the subject crippled at the very beginning.

Furthermore, the concept of 16 states is strongly contrary to our national ideal, our idea of greatness, our vow of permanence, as well as historical facts.

16 great states... Of course, when the Karamanids and others such as smaller ones are counted, this figure will swell, and there will be at least 50 states. Establishing 50 states may seem a success at first glance. However, when we turn to the opposite side of the coin, the situation changes completely. They ask the man: "Why did you establish fifty states but could not keep any of them alive? Why are you left with only a medium-sized Turkish Republic?" Of course, forced historical scholars will not be able to answer this question. Because the historical reality is not like that at all. 16 or

50 states were not established. In reality, only two states were established in the motherland, and three or five more were added outside the motherland. That's all!... Since it is the state in our homeland that concerns us, the subject remains the history of one or two states. These two states consist of the state established in Turkestan and its extensions in Eastern Europe and the state in the region of Preasia, where the state called Türkiye today was established, and the latter has continued the principle of "One Turkish State" in history by being subordinated to the former several times. The idea of "One State" continued until recent times, albeit symbolically, for example, "Atalik Gaz Yakub Khan", who expelled the Chinese from Eastern Turkistan during the reign of Sultan Aziz, recognised the Turkish state as his vassal.

He said that our history, like everything else, has not yet taken its final shape. For this reason, our children are not taught national history in schools. The delusion that the Sumerians or Hittites were Turks is still repeated in history lessons, and the child who learns this without believing it has no love for national history.

Turkish history is a whole. The objects called "state" are separate ruling dynasties. As such, the tale of 16 Turkish states collapses by itself and the unity in Turkish history shines before us with dynasties that are the continuation of each other.

No one thinks about the destructive effects of the division of Turkish history into parts under the name of "States" on the national psyche. Until recently national

It is not taken into account that anyone who does not believe in continuity will also despair of today's national continuity. However, those who have a little logic and understanding can comprehend that Turkish history is an uninterrupted whole. Eat Turkish Cumhuriyet from the sky zembille has not been restored. It is the continuation of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Empire a continuation of the Ilkhanid Empire. was born; means k his is its continuation. Ilkhanid The state the continuation of the Seljuk State in Anatolia. The Seljuk State in Anatolia and the Kharzemshah State in Western Turkistan and Iran are the continuation the Great Seljuk State. The Great Seljuk State is the continuation of Karakhanids, Karakhanids are the continuation of Uighurs, Uighurs are the continuation of Gok Turks, Gok Turks are the continuation of Apars, Apars are the continuation of S yenps,

S yenps are the continuation of the Kuns.

These continuations are the cast of an uninterrupted, uninterrupted history. In other words, we the nation of separate states that were destroyed and re-established, but state that continues as a whole.

The fact that several dynasties sometimes existed at the same time and established sovereignty in different regions of Turkel and even clashed with each other does not indicate that this rule was broken. This situation is nothing more than a consequence of Turkish legal theory of sovereignty and the concept of a decentralised state. Because, at least in theoretical form, one of these dynasties had the right of sovereignty over the others.

Nevertheless, sometimes in Turkish history, there were times when the legal unity was shattered. These are the times of conquest seen in the history of every nation. The existence of two separate governments in Istanbul and Ankara in the last periods of our history is an example of this.

This is the historical truth. From primary schools to universities, history must be taught shown in this way. Turks must have in their minds the consciousness of a unity of history and a single state. However, in order for this consciousness to be established, this consciousness first be present in the Ministry of National Education and its Board of Education and Training.

In recent weeks, a calendar published by TRT has attracted attention in terms of repeating the same tale of 16 states and, moreover, attributing 16 fabricated flags to 16 states. Since TRT is generally recognised as a left-leaning institution, it would be surprising for it to broadcast such a "Turanist" calendar. However, the information given about each of the 16 states and the words attributed to Turkish greats are false or fabricated. For example, the Great

the Kun Empire been shown as 204 before the caliphate. It would be 220. Its founder was not Mete, but Mete's father Tuman Yabgu. It was made to look like Mete's words: "If you ask me for a saddle, will give it to you; my horse will give it to you if you ask, but I will not give it to anyone asks for an inch of land from my homeland". Mete accepted the request of the Tung-hu, his eastern neighbours, for valuable horse and one of Metes wives due to the weakness of the state at that time, but defeated the Tung-hu by refusing their land request. Against the likes who said that a barren piece of land is of no value after the horse and woman are given: "The horse and woman belonged to me, gave them, but the land to the nation!"

a big difference between these two forms. It cannot be changed arbitrarily.

The sayings attributed to Turkish elders under the leaves of the calendar have also been subject to arbitrary draftsmanship. The phrase B lge Kagan, which has been frequently seen recently: "Turkish nation! T re and return to yourself" is also fabricated. This saying is only "Turkish Nation! Think!" and was written by "Yuluğ Teg n" although it was spoken by the mouth of B lge Kagan.

Especially the aphorism attributed Istem Khan (or "Istem Bagatur Yabgu", one of the oldest kings Gok Turks: "A nation whose men are brave and whose women are strong will be sovereign" is a complete fabrication. Historical information about Istem Khan is so scarce that it is difficult to find this saying of his among this scarce information. impossible.

It is neither possible nor necessary to enumerate these mistakes one by one. But it would be appropriate to talk a little about flags.

16 flags of the 16 imaginary Turkish states are also completely imaginary, fabricated and fictitious. of all, ancient Turks had more tughs than flags. The flag was born in later centuries with the development of the tuğ. Again, as it is known, the ancient Turks did a single national flag, but a variety of flags. Most of the flags of the Ottoman Turks known. It is known that every military unit, every pirate, every commander had a different flag. The idea of a single national flag developed gradually and our present flag took its final form during the reign of Sultan Abdülmec d.

The inclusion of a strange creature shape, which is not clear whether it is a dragon, salamander, lizard or d nosaur, on the Hun flag among the fabricated flags not knowing anything about Turkish history. The dragon is the symbol of the Chinese. Turks used wolf, falcon and sheep.

It is also worth wondering from which imagination the yellow flags of the Western Huns (meaning last age of the Central Asian Huns) and the black flags of the Khwarazmshahs in this calendar were born and invented.

It is also a great mistake to show Ötüken as a city on the map. As it is known, Ötüken is the name of a forested region, not city.

This is what they call raising an eyebrow while making an eyebrow. If TRT had consulted with Turkish History professors while producing a beautiful calendar at such great expense, have produced a work to be kept in libraries instead of a work full of mistakes and would have done a great national service. Since he did not do this, this calendar will not be anything more than a ridiculous fad, and worse, many people will very wrong ideas about their national history, thinking that the information and flags given here are correct.

O Ministry of National Education! If the word "national" at the beginning of your name is true, and if there is no other meaning of this word that we do not understand, then first you should "turn your back on yourself" and prepare a national history textbook for schools, and find and seat a few distinguished members who understand Turkish history in the Education Department. Teach Turkish history to Turkish children instead of Greek, Roman and Byzantine histories, and ensure that a national historical consciousness is imprinted in the brains of tomorrow's generations by printing the only history book in accordance with the Turkish ideal instead of today's competitive (!) books that are printed on paper and leave no pleasure in reading.

Otherwise, Turkey cannot develop by opening high schools in every town or city. The power of development is first born in the heart. The strength in the heart is provided by commitment to national ideal. In order to be committed to national ideal, love of homeland and history live in the hearts. Generations who know the list of national football teams by heart but are not aware of national heroes become unconscious vagabonds who take down the Turkish flag and hang a piece of red cloth in its place, as seen today.

If the minds and hearts of the Turkish nation are filled with religious (!), national (!) and social (!) sophistry, it will cease to be a Turkish nation and become a "Türk ye M illet" or an "Anatolian M illet", as has been repeated so often recently and will be no different from a South American nation that has no connection with the past, no sacredness, no culture and morality, even if it has technology.

(Ötüken, Issue: 65; May 1969)

Battle of Malazgirt

The Battle of Malazgirt, one of the most glorious victories of Turkish history for this reason, two misconceptions seem to have been **settled** and accepted among our intellectuals. This

key misconception is this:

- 1 - Malazgirt victory opened Anatolia to us completely.
- 2 - With the victory of Malazgirt, a new Turkish state started in Anatolia.

These two ideas are also worthy of scrutiny. After they have been analysed, it becomes obvious

It is surprising that an idea **that** has been accepted as "truth" by an enlightened group of people for so long should be **false**. There are many **false** ideas in history **that** have been accepted as true by the public or intellectuals. For example, the assumption that the Seljuks' Alaaddin Keykubad was a "great ruler" and Turgut Bey was a "great patriot" is **one error**, as is the assumption that Jesus is both God and the son of God, which has been adopted by millions of enlightened Christians.

Now, after this brief introduction, let's review the information about Malazgirt:

The Malazgirt victory is a great war of annihilation in military terms and very important in two respects. It was **won** both against numerically superior enemy forces and Turkish troops in the enemy army **were** instrumental in the victory by crossing over to our side. In other words, the Battle of Malazgirt was a great victory of Turkish **war** tactics, Turkish heroism and Turkish national consciousness. Since all three of these are objects worthy of pride, the Battle of Malazgirt is one of the golden leaves of our history.

However, this did not mean that the Greek resistance in Anatolia was completely broken and this country was **opened** to us. This victory was neither the first nor the last of the great **battles** won against the Greeks in Anatolia.

The Battle of Pasin, which was won in 1048, was completely similar to Malazgirt in terms of the destruction of the enemy army and the captivity of its commander, and the battles of **Kayseri in 1072, Paphlagonia in 1073 and Antioch in 1074**, which were won after Malazgirt, were also complete victories, and the commanders-in-chief of the Greek armies were captured in all of them. Even so, the backbone of Byzantines could not be broken, and Byzantines did not give up determination and thought to conquer the whole of Anatolia again.

as claimed, the 1071 Malazgirt victory had been and opened Anatolia to us would the Byzantine Empire have fought more major battles in the following years?

It would be incompatible with historical realities to think that the Eastern Roman Empire, which already very large territories, was and densely populated, would give up such an and vast country as Anatolia with a single defeat. It should also not be forgotten that whole of Western Anatolia could only be appropriated to Turkishness in the age of the Seljuks. Therefore, the statements about the opening of Anatolia with Malazgirt and the breaking of the Byzantine counter-command are not based on any foundation.

In the meantime, Byzantines not only defended but also attacked from time to time and never failed to make attempts to take Anatolia from the Turks whenever they had the opportunity.

Emperor Manuel Komnenos in 1161, made contact with Armenian, Syrian and Latin principalities in Anatolia and Turkish Dan Shmendil Principality. After defeating **Kılıç Arslan II** and taking a lot territory, in 1176 he fought the famous Battle of **Merya Kefalon** or **Düzbel** with the aim of completely destroying the Seljuk state. The Battle of Merya Kefalon Hungarian, Serbian and British troops also was the last attempt of Byzantines to Anatolia from the Turks and, of course Byzantines was also defeated morally.

It can be seen that 105 years elapsed between the Battle of Malazgirt in 1071 and the Battle of Kefalon in 1176 and it was only after this war that Anatolia, except for the western part, became definitively Turkish. The conclusion drawn from this is as follows:

If the Battle of Malazgirt had been legally decisive battle, Byzantines could not have fought the battles of Caesarea in 1072, Paphlagonia in 1073 and Antioch in 1074, could not have taken territory from Kılıç Arslan II in 1161, and

In 1176, he could not make the great military move to out the Turks, which had come to naught at Kefalon in M rya.

However the greatness of the Battle of Malazg rt will never be minimised. As I said above, it will remain one of the unique pages of national history as a monument of sacrifice and national consciousness. However, if we are to be faithful to the real principle of history, we cannot say that Malazg rt **was the battle** that opened Anatolia to us. If we use it in the sense of the great **war** that led to the Anatolian conquests, it would be more accurate bring the date a little earlier and accept the 1048 Battle of Pas n as the beginning.

If the Battle of Malazg rt had been lost by the Turks, **there would have been no** definite result against us. Because the state, the foundations of which were laid in Khorasan by Çağrı Beğ and Tugrul Beğ, was so strong and powerful that the Turks would never have given up their ambition to take Anatolia with the loss of Malazg rt, and the Turks under those great chiefs, each whom was a god of **war**, would not have given up their great ideal with a defeat.

I now come the second misconception: According to many intellectuals and even , a new state was **established** in Anatolia with the Battle of Malazg rt in 1071. Or this date is the starting point of history of Anatolian Turks.

This also completely **wrong** and false. Because:

a) The victory of Malazg rt was won by the Seljuk state, which was founded in 1040 in Khorasan and Iran, Iraq and Azerbaijan in a short time.

b) There is no independent state **established** with the victory of Malazg rt.

c) The state called Anatolian Seljuks was **founded** in 1077.

d) These Anatolian Seljuks were also not independent, but were subordinate to the Great Seljuk State in Khorasan according to the **medieval** Turkish state system.

d) The Anatolian Seljuk State **became** independent only in 1157, after **the collapse of** the great state, all other eastern parts of country **remained** in the hands of the Khwarazmshahs.

* * *

While these unquestionable facts of history are obvious, directing it in another with forced interpretations will not provide any benefit. Although history is **not** science, it is **not** a fairy tale that can be taken in any direction. History is first fact. Then it is a means of education.

The acceptance of Malazgirt as the beginning of a new state arises from a lack of understanding of the peculiarities of Turkish history and desire to consider Turkish history in the same framework as French history.

The history of France's homeland has more or less always taken place in the same lands. But just because the history of France and even of England and Germany is like this, it is not necessary that the history of Turkey should be like this. There is no such obligation. The uniqueness of the history of Turkey lies in the fact that this state lost Khorasan, on which it was founded, later on and took hold in Anatolia, which it acquired after its foundation.

This is the truth of history. Nothing can come out of rejecting this. Not accepting it to break our history and our national unity in history. There is no need to explain that this is harmful.

What, then, should be our judgement about Malazgirt in accordance with historical facts? The judgement is as follows:

The Battle of Malazgirt is one of the most beautiful examples of battlefield battles and the most glorious of the victories won against the Byzantines. It is one of the highest examples of Turkish heroism in terms of the number of soldiers participating in the battle, Turkish soldiery in terms of management, and Turkish national consciousness in terms of the fact that the Christians in the Greek army switched to the side of Alp Arslan. In terms of the value given to the war by the Islamic and worlds, it is the settlement of great prestige case in our favour.

(Türk Yurdu, 6= 276th issue, August 1959)

900th Anniversary of Malazgirt Victory

On 29 August 1971, the 900th anniversary of this great and glorious victory will be celebrated. The "Seljuk History and Civilisation Institute", established in 1966 at the Faculty of Language, History and Geography in Ankara, has begun preparations to erect an Alp Arslan monument in Malazgirt in order to play its part in this anniversary. The anniversary is a year and a half away. Even though a year and a half is too little time to prepare a beautiful and well-thought-out monument, it is still possible to do something.

With the help of Prof. Em n B lg ç, the President of the Institute, a lot of money was raised and the initiative was publicised.

Malazgirt victory one of the greatest victories of Turkish history. It is the second major after the Battle of Pas nler in 1048, in the almost a century-long struggle between the Turks and Greeks in Anatolia. One of the reasons that increased the importance of this battle and magnified Malazgirt was that it was won 40,000 men against 100,000; the second was that the Turks in the Byzantine army switched to the side of Alp Arslan with a great national consciousness; and the third was that it took the form of a struggle for prestige and honour between the Turkish-Islamic world and the West-Hrystian world.

26 August 1071 is a national day, and celebrating its 900th anniversary is a national duty. For this reason, its celebration should not be left solely on the shoulders of the Seljuk of History and Civilisation; the Turkish Historical Society, the Ministry of National Education, the General Staff, in short, all governmental institutions, in short, the "state" should take up this task.

Victory is a need for nations like breathing, and celebrating them with a ceremony is a life-giving reason going into the lungs.

As we approach the 900th anniversary of Malazgirt, we cannot help recall memories of anniversary of conquest of Istanbul. Just so that our Greek friends (!) would not be offended, the 500th anniversary **was** disgraced and the spirit of Fatah and the hearts of the Turkish nation were hurt.

Malazgirt is also a victory against the same Greeks and more important than the conquest of Istanbul in terms of historical significance. Indeed, the conquest of Istanbul closed an era of history and opened a new one, but fortunately this was won against a corrupt state that was already on the verge of collapse. At the time of the Malazgirt victory, the Byzantine **Empire** was at superior point of power and its army was superior to the Turks in terms of numbers. Celebrating victory **won** under these conditions would be a great respect for both past and those who served the nation, as well as a unique opportunity for the upbringing of the youth.

Today, the youth is **left** helpless against the influence of destructive and treacherous currents. Schools cannot do anything called national indoctrination. While history is the best tool inculcating national culture, the history course has ceased to be independent course and has been lost in the group of courses gathered under the name of social group.

The Ministry of National Education is busy with literature, **not** action, but it is partly excused it does not have much authority.

Traitors such as Nâzım Hikmet are portrayed national poets and heroes, local and foreign communists are introduced into the minds of the **youth** as exemplary people, and this **infamy** called "progress".

Being owing to the shyness shown towards foreigners whether they **will** be offended by our national ceremonies is taken into as if it were a matter of great importance.

Accepting the **fact** that eternal friendship of nations against each other is contrary to the laws of the world, it is necessary to prepare a big programme to celebrate the 900th anniversary of the Malazgirt victory and to take advantage of this historical opportunity.

The Greeks are our enemies who **seek** to destroy the old Byzantines and, in order to do so, to destroy Turkey. It is necessary to know this **fact** first, and after knowing this, to implement the victory programme without **paying** any attention to the clamour they or others may raise.

The government would certainly not refrain from spending five to ten million lire on this great day. Among the measures that come to mind are the use of the best materials to ensure that the monument of Alp Arslan to be erected in Malazgirt is large and imposing in a manner befitting his honour, taking serious measures to prevent the introduction of heresies such as cubism into the monument and statue, printing and translating the history of the age of Alp Arslan, one of the greatest Turkish rulers, into major foreign languages and giving more space to entire Seljuk history in school books.

Today have professors who know Seljuk history well. In alphabetical order, Faruk Sumer, İbrahim Kafesoğlu, Mehmet Altay Köymen and Osman Turan are among them. Of course Zek Velid Togan, Professor of General Turkish History, can also join them.

Despite some unpleasant discussions between them, these professors should take the initiative to unite and write a History of the Age of Alp Arslan, and the Ministry of National Education should make every effort to facilitate this. I am sure that our professors have the maturity to forget personal resentments in the face of this national duty.

It is also important to open a competition for a film about the battle of Malazgirt, but to select jury from serious people, from known perverts.

Film that will be written by the best scriptwriters under the supervision of best directors and controlled by history professors can only be made within this period. The Turkish army is capable of providing great assistance in this regard.

In short: In for the 900th anniversary of Malazgirt to be celebrated seriously and not to resemble the anniversary of the conquest of Istanbul, it is necessary to make good use of the short period of time, such as the next two and a half years.

**(Ötüken, 63rd issue: March
1969)**

900th Anniversary of Malazgird and National Culture

Remembrance of the **past** reserved for human beings. Animals cannot think about the **past**. They are only concerned about the moment they are in. "The past." no matter how imperfect it may be, it will teach lessons today and tomorrow, it will

This book, which cannot be forgotten, is one of the sources of power for people and nations. Therefore, making a nation forget its past is the first condition for its destruction.

Today, are seeing the most tragic **example** of nation that wants to be destroyed by forgetting **the past**: **resorted** to this method in order to eliminate at least 40 million Turks in the Soviet countries. First, **they** turned the former nations, tribes and clans into so-called separate nationalities, eliminated the common literary language by separating their alphabets, and then, with a shamelessness **unprecedented** in history, **they began** to cut off their connection with the "**past**" by fabricating fabricated histories.

The same charade is being carried out in Iran. In a state of 25 million people consisting of Turks, Persians, Kurds, Arabs, Kurds, Arabs, Kurds, Armenians and , everything is being done to make the Turks, who are the largest and most energetic element with a population of 12 million, forget their Turkishness, and it is foolishly claimed that these Turks were forced to speak Turkish during the Cheng z style when they were actually Persian.

Both Moscos and Persians are excusable in their behaviour because they are foreigners and because they are afraid of Turks due to their past experiences. However, if do not take into account the past, no reason or excuse be given to excuse our offence.

In pre-Islamic times, Turks were aware of their national past. The Kuns at the time of M lât, even **though** a century had passed, were not able to reunite with Mete the God

they remembered. In 730s, the Gok Turks also showed in the monuments that they had not forgotten Bumun **Kagan** and Istem **Kagan** of 180 years ago. Furthermore, they were keeping the past alive with epics that circulated by word of mouth, and also engaged in national romanticism. National romanticism was a source of great power. It is same today.

It was first man heism and then Islam that made the Turks forget their national identity. "Alp Külüg B lge Böğü **Kagan**" (759-780), the third khan of the Turks called Dokuz Öğüz-On Uyghur and briefly Uyghur, who became the head of Turkel in 745 after the Gök Turks, accepted man he zm as the official religion in 763.

Thousands of manuscripts from the Uighurs, who lived a bright civilised life, were found in excavations in Eastern Turkestan and brought to European museums, many of them were published by valuable scholars, but not a single historical work was found among them. Almost all of the artefacts belong man he zm and buddhism. In other , the religion acquired from foreigners has taken the foreground, banished the national one and cut off the Turks' connection with the past. The national maz lived only among nomadic Turks and in the form of epic.

Islam, which was accepted in the tenth century, dealt blow to the national past. This time the blow was more severe than the first one, and the tragedy of forgetting the past infected the common people.

Although Anatolian Turks remembered the Battle of Bed r in the Seventeenth Century between three to four hundred people, the enmity of Al-Mu'awiya, which was an issue of the Arabs, and the killing of Hussein in Karbala with insistence and devotion, they Malazg rd in the Eleventh Century, They forgot about Kutalmış, Süleymanşah and Kılıç Arslan, who died in the Turks' own wars and each of them was a national hero; they only had a shapeless "Sultan Alâedd n" in their minds, and they got out of the situation by attributing everything from the past to him.

For instance, they clung to Islam with fanaticism and denied the era that preceded Islam. , why were Kılıç Arslan the First, Mesud and Kılıç Arslan the Second, who defended the homeland against the Crusaders with the battle of Malazg rt won against the Christians, forgotten?

During my 17-year tenure at the Süleyman ye Library between 1952 and 1969, I did not come across any works remembered national past among the tens of thousands of books I reviewed, but I did see many works written under the title of "Eshâb-ı Bedr", which record the Arabs of the Battle of Bedr by name and tag. Of course, none of them were identified in time, and all of them were written long after the battle.

Almost all of these names, which were written after a while, were fabricated and fictitious. However, the Turks looked at them as the truth, yet did not remember their own **past**, did not take themselves into account, and accepted the honours of the Arabs with all their falsehoods. Although Hâld b n Vel d, Târik b n Z yâd were praised great commanders, Çağrı Beğ, Afş n Beğ, Oruç Re s, who would not even use them commanders, were **forgotten**.

Kemalpaşaoğlu Ahmed Şemsedd n, a great Turkish scholar, wrote an article on Persian as the most superior language after Arabic.

Somehow the Turks had **not** forgotten the age of the Ottomans. That was also because they were in power.

On 26th August 1971, the 900th anniversary of the Malazg rt victory will be celebrated. This is a very appropriate **behaviour**. However, as in every national endeavour, it **is** too late. The thing to be done now is to lay the foundation of the monument to be erected the battle of Malazg rt and Alp Arslan.

Commemorating the anniversaries of great victories and great black days is a must in order to revitalise nations and strengthen their beliefs. In 1926, Hungarians held a big ceremony on the 400th anniversary of the Mohaç defeat. We disgraced anniversary of conquest of Istanbul in 1953. In order not to offend our Greek friends, everything was done to make the ceremony look dull. It a characteristic us to think only of others and not to take ourselves into account. I wonder this is national mental illness.

Malazg rt's 900th anniversary to make a move in the development of the country It was also an important opportunity. With the approval of the General Staff, geologists, meteorology, State Waterworks and all relevant departments, to build a city called "Alparslanon the edge of the plainthe battle of Malazg rt was fought, and to build the factories to be proposed by the Planning Organisation, It was an opportunity to establish 24 sample villages around the city of Alparslan in order to build a hara with a production farm and to revive the 24 Oghuz tribes, to settle selected families from the Oghuz tribes **scattered** in villages in Anatolia, to direct them to scientific agriculture, and to establish a sample section called lot region. It was not considered. Because the governments of the party zan were in the habit of thinking first of the votes they would win and then of the benefits they would provide to their supporters, national consciousness **was** paralysed.

According to the radio news, everything to be done Malazg rt would start on 26 August . However, on that day, we learnt that everything

It should have been completed and only the inauguration ceremony should be held.

The Ministry National Education and the newly established Ministry of Culture will have a lot of work to do in order to develop and re-disseminate culture, and it seems that the only issue will trouble the new government will be the education reform.

Land reform can finalised in five to ten years. Red tape in the administration be solved with a few laws and strict implementation. Building aeroplanes and tanks in is a matter of patience and hard work. Budget deficit can be prevented drastic savings.

But it is not so easy when it comes education. reform is knowledge and national education. It is possible to fill the knowledge deficiencies teachers through courses, but national education cannot be given through courses. If a teacher has diseases such as Marx, Lenin and Mao in his/her head, that teacher lost. Without burying our heads in the sand it is necessary to say that today, the Russophobia and Maoism going on as long as they can, and thousands of teachers are afflicted with an incurable mental illness. How Turkish children be taught national with teachers who are enemies of nation and homeland, who are waiting for and longing for the and the Chinese? The teachers who are brought before Martial Law Courts are a very small part of these patients. The others were left in their places because they were inconspicuous or hidden. Won't they start spreading their sorrows again tomorrow when favourable conditions are available?

This means that there is no other way but to sacrifice thousands of teachers for educational reform. It is difficult. But it must be done. The same that forced 7,000 officers to retire from the army and 1500 war veterans to retire from military service must not hesitate to sacrifice a few thousand teachers in order not to sacrifice the future of a nation. Otherwise, one must despair of the future of the Turkish nation.

* * *

The establishment of the Ministry of Culture was the result of a proper decision. However, we were disappointed when the Minister of Culture mentioned theatre and ballet as soon as he took office, as if there were no other important issues. When Turkish culture is mentioned, the last thing that comes to mind is theatre and the last thing that comes to mind is ballet.

What culture? 't it the common values and beliefs among the members of a nation? Therefore, when Turkish culture is mentioned, the first subject to be considered is "", then "ethics", "history", "", "maritime", "decorative arts" and "folklore".

We would have expected the Ministry of Culture **not** to first take tourism to the village, but to eliminate the reasons undermining the foundation our nation with a law called "Law on the Protection of Turkish Culture".

It is easy to set up a theatre. Nowadays, since everyone is an artiste, it is **not** difficult to find stage artists. But where are the theatre works that **will** instil national consciousness, taste and culture **in** the Turkish nation and its popular strata? Kültür Bakanı, Türk köylüsüne Hamlet yahut Faust'u, yerl p yes d ye de solakların devr k cümlel eserler n seyrett recekse h ç zahmet etmes n.

When I say to protect and develop Turkish, which is **the** main element of Turkish culture, mean, of course, sound language knowledge to be taught in schools, selections from Turkish works, which are known as the basic works since the eighth century, and Turkish dialects. In order for this homeland to be "Turkic", I mean that all geographical names and the names of all kinds of commercial, official, political, cultural and touristic **organisations** should be in Turkish, that a Language Academy should be established and that the still shamefully **undetermined** language should be finalised, that Turkish history should be edited in terms of national consciousness and interest, and that all Turkish architectural monuments in Turkey should be restored and saved from destruction.

Another important point is the construction of a "Road of the Immortals" in a suitable place in Turkey. The Way of the Dead is a historical road adorned with statues and monuments of the great figures **of** Turkish history and shaded **by** the most majestic trees. It is now a long and spectacular road that starts with **Alp Er Tunga** and ends with **Atatürk**, and to **which** the statues and monuments of the first class greats who **will** grow up in the can be added... Big heroes State Presidents, chief **centurions** information, The ceremonies for poets, artists and craftsmen will be held on the Way of the Dead, and the parades will take place here. All Turkish children will walk this road at least once, read a few lines written on the monument of each great person and feel the pride of being a Turk here.

will taste it.

A nation is not nourished only by Keban Dam, Ayşe Bakery and Hilton Hotel. It **degenerates** if it cannot hope for greater futures by taking speed from the greatness of the past.

the Law on the Protection of Turkish Culture will also protect morality, which is an important part of culture, writings, , films, advertisements and associations that are destructive of Turkish morality will be banned by this law, and thus national decadence will be prevented.

One of the greatest social laws "" . It is impossible for young generations to grow up as national heroes and idealists when they see "" and immoral" in newspapers, magazines, films, stage, radio, beaches and streets. Men dressed as women filling the streets are the result of imitating what they see. The remedy for this, as mentioned above, is the "Law on the Protection of Turkish Culture". Theatre and film, which are a great means of indoctrination and therefore should be considered as schools, should be taken under state control and the national, moral, patriotic If it is turned into propaganda, it will be the most effective measure for spiritual development.

On the 900th anniversary of Malazg rd, the contrast between the strength of spirit and character of those who won that war and the pathetic spiritual structure of today made us think of these.

, during the Democrat Party rule, due to the government's preoccupation with trivialities and disregard for warnings, Dr Cezm Türk said in a speech to Parliament, "We not worship the parliament, we worship the minutes."

And we think we're serving tomorrow's researchers. What else can we do?...

9 August 1971

(Ötügen, Issue: 92, August 1971)

National Holiday

Bayram a word derived from Turkish root. It rejoicing and having fun collectively. Accordingly, national holidays should also be days celebrated by the whole nation.

For some , there is no shared joy in our festivals. Festivals bring secret sadness to those who are sane and excesses to those who are not. Festivals **are not** for the good citizens, but for pickpockets who want to profit from the crowd and low class who molest women. Eid is a burden.

the police and postmen, the passing of the holiday is a holiday.

As in everything else, the "value" of a holiday is in its **scarcity**. Rome and Byzantium notable for the abundance of festivals in their **decadent** times. In , one of the restless countries of the twentieth century, holidays are also to be many.

The **proliferation** of holidays in Turkey in recent years is a matter worthy further consideration. Nations gain nothing by making every event a holiday. The hidden judgement in the ancestral saying "Every day is a holiday for the crazy" very appropriate. The **multiplicity** of holidays undermines its value. In order for a holiday to be a national holiday **and** a holiday of a caste, it **must** fall on days when no **can** say "no". Once upon a time, 23 July, the day the constitutional government was proclaimed, was a holiday. In fact, it continued to be celebrated as a holiday for a few years after the declaration of the Republic.

National holidays being a day to be **adopted** by the whole nation without objection

this reason, it be either a day of independence, or day of victory with a result, effects of which extend far beyond and change destiny. The day legal regime is announced cannot be a national holiday. There are citizens who do not like that regime, who do not accept it, or even who are hostile to it, and, in any case legal regimes are **not** eternal.

It get old and **change**, even after a long time. However, the national value of the day when independence or a great victory was won will never **change**.

In the years to come, victories in the field of science also be expected to be a holiday. For example, the day when a definitive cure for cancer, a major source of human suffering, is found will undoubtedly be a great holiday.

Some of our national holidays, other **than** our two well-established religious holidays, are to the schools and students. "1", "19" and "27" in May, **when** school holidays **are** approaching. May holidays reduce the opportunity for teachers to make a final check on students, and the rehearsals and preparations for 19 May, in particular, take several days.

It will be said that 19 May is a day of respect for Atatürk's memory and the beginning of the War of Independence. While looking at the beginning would **require** going back to earlier days, respect for Atatürk's memory also be done in a more respectful manner and in a different way. His victory in Sakarya on 13 September against vastly superior Greek forces (which was the longest battle in the history of the Turkish Republic up to that time) was, of course, more important for Turkish history than **his departure** for Samsun on 19 May. Moreover, the date of Atatürk's **departure** for Samsun was 17 May.

ht mal also has-⁽²⁾

The main issue we would like to touch upon here is which national holiday should be suitable for our history. This should be such a day that it should be a political

It should have nothing to do with beliefs and clans, and all Turks should accept it without objection, or at least not be wary of it.

In our ancient ancestors, the Gok Turks, the day when the kaghan put the red-hot iron on the anvil and beat it with a hammer was a national feast day dating back several centuries. represented the liberation by melting the iron, perhaps the exit from Ergenekon. It would be very appropriate to find out the exact date of this and make it a new holiday. This be a return to national history, a return to tradition.

23 May 1040 was the day of the great Dendânekan victory of the Seljuks and the foundation of the Seljuk state. Today's Turkey is the continuation of this Seljuk state. some historians accept only the Anatolian Seljuks as Turkey, I do not agree with this idea, because state does not always remain the same borders. Turkey has characteristic of having lost the lands where it was first established and being held in the countries it later acquired. 26 August 1071 Malazgirt victory glory and honour, but also national consciousness

It is a day that will be a national holiday in terms of national importance. 26 August was also the day the great offensive began.

30 August 1922 is the day when the **battle** of Commander-in-Chief=Greek Border was won. It the deed of **liberation** of Turkey.

13 September 1921 Sakarya victory is a war of "surface defence". It is an epic of heroism. It is also very great in terms of its results. This victory was **celebrated** not only in Turkey but also in the whole Turkish world.

The most important of these are **Ergenekon** and **Dendânekan** days. A committee to be set up by the state is expected to analyse the subject of national holidays.

After a thorough examination and decision, national holidays be finalised by making the necessary to the constitution and new national holidays should be prevented from frequently entering our social life.

It should be remembered that what becomes abundant **Will** become worthless.

13 May 1966

(Ötüken, 29th issue, May 1966) 2

In Prof. Jaescke's *Chronology of the Turkish Revolution* (Chapter I page 39 the date of Mustafa Kemals for Samsun is shown both as 17 May and 19 May according to Atatürk's speech. Atatürk have been **mistaken** in telling the date of his **departure** for Samsun after stormy events and years. It absolutely clear he sailed from Istanbul on 16 May. If the Bandırma ship was travelling at 14-15 mph, it **would** have reached Samsun 24-30 hours later.

it be. This history probably needs to be re-examined.

Big Days

Whatever the history of a nation, in some respects it is "a community of people who rejoice together and mourn together". To rejoice together, especially to weep together

It is what binds people to each other with the tightest ties. The common joy for the nation, which is made up of millions of people, is the anniversaries of great victories and great men. Common mourning is also a commemoration of great defeats, great defeats of the enemy.

The celebration of victory days alone is not enough for a nation. It is not enough a nation to celebrate only days of victory. In order to become fully conscious, a nation must also commemorate the days of great pain with mourning ceremonies. Whether it is victory or defeat, we call days that concern a nation as a whole great days. The word "great" here is used to show its great importance in the life of the nation. For this reason, birth anniversaries of great men that the nation can be proud of are celebrated as death anniversaries.

It is not right to doubt what a nation gains by remembering them. , a nation does not gain anything materially from them. But it gains something spiritual, the value of which cannot be measured by anything. This gain the nation's confidence in itself. A nation with great days in its past believes that these will also happen in the future. While commemorating the dark days of the past, they do not forget their enemies and act cautiously in order not to be subjected to the same raids and defeat in future. By celebrating the births or commemorating the deaths of great men, a nation pays its debt of respect to those who have served it, and engages in a moral behaviour. When a nation commemorates the dead with respect, it is a harbinger that it will raise great men in future. If the service of those who sacrifice the nation without seeking personal gain is great, they are heroes worthy of being in the memory of the nation. For this purpose, it is not necessary to hold a great position. Sometimes the service of a single soldier was greater than the service of many ranks. Such as **Mehmet Sergeant** and **Müstecip Corporal** in the Çanakkale Wars.

Among the great days in the history of a nation, the most glorious ones are the bloodiest. Just as individuals most rewarded when they are most exhausted, nations are most rewarded when they shed the most blood. Sometimes victories in history that seem to have been won at the cost of a lot of blood, yet they have not been rewarded. In order to see their great results, it is necessary to look carefully at the other side of history. It is certain that if that blood had not been shed, the result would have been very bitter for that nation. For example, if the Turkish race had not shed so much blood in the Gallipoli wars, which are thought to have been spent in vain, Russia would not have been overthrown, the war would not have been prolonged for four years, and since Russia would have been standing when we were defeated, the War of Independence would not have been fought and Turkey would have been erased from the map.

* * *

We are not as negligent in commemorating great days as before. But we more major shortcomings. What about the commemoration of the day when the Gok Turk Khans struck red-hot iron with hammers? Celebrating the day our state was founded in Khorasan in 1040? it a small thing that Tuğrul Beğ entered Bagdad and accepted the protection of the Islamic world? Why don't we make an anniversary that will move the world Malazgirt? Why don't we commemorate glorious crazies such as Çiçi Yabgu, Kür Şad, Çağrı Beğ, Oruç Reis? we forget the days when Kılıç Arslan and Sultan Mesud crushed the Crusaders? Isn' a pity that Serbian Sardan, Kosovo, Niğbolu, Varna, IstanbulHaçovaKarsifeSilistire, Plevne and many others are not commemorated? Can't cut a stone for first poet Çuçu, our first historian Bilge Tonyukuk?

It is disrespectful to the memory of the ancestors to honour the elders of others, or even to show the slightest interest in them, before bringing our own elders to light and showing them the respect they deserve. It must be prevented.

To liken today's ordinary leaders to the glorious of the past because of the degenerating historicism and party loyalty is the work of poor people who lack historical consciousness and .

(Ötügen, Issue: 116, August 1973)

About Genghis Khan and Aksak Temir Bek

Due to the fact that national consciousness and scientific historiography are still not properly developed, and religious prejudice still dominates the souls, mistakes such as disrespecting some of the greats of our history or considering this or that part of the Turkish lineage as enemies to each other are frequently made. The most common of these is the enmity against **Chengiz** and **Temir**. Among those who make this enmity, are who confuse Charlemagne and **Charlemagne** (=Charlemagne) with **Charlemagne** (=Charles-Quint), as well as those who pass themselves off as historians.

One of these, a newspaper article he wrote about the beauty of the Turkish race, referred to **Chengiz** and **Temir** as "creatures" out of religious fanaticism and claimed that they belonged to the yellow "Mongol" race, while the Turks were the representatives of the white race.

In addition to these outdated expressions of yellow race and white race, which no longer have any scientific value, it is understood that the author was unaware of the latest publications on the Chengiz and Mongols, and that he wrote these articles with the fragments of knowledge of forty years ago.

Here, without going into details, will summarise the scientific conclusions reached so far in order to answer the questions of young people:

1 - Turks and Mongols two brother nations. They are the most important two of the related nations called Altai group. Turkish and Mongolian were formerly one language, but became two separate languages only in the age of the Huns: **Von Gabain**, a scholar of Turkish, Mongolian and Chinese languages, asserted and proved this in his paper "Hun-Turkish Relations".⁽³⁾

2 - It was Chengiz Khan who introduced the word Mongol to history. It not clear what the Mongols (i.e. Mongolian-speaking tribes and clans) were called before him. Although it has been suggested that the troops named "Thirty Tatars" and "Nine Tatars" seen in the Orkun inscriptions of the VIII century were Mongols

However, this is nothing more than a hypothesis. Because only after it was proved that the old Gök Turk country, which is called Mongolstan today, was filled with Mongols starting from the Xth century, it became clear that the Thirty Tatars and Nine Tatars of the VIII century were Turks. Among the "budun" mentioned in the era of the Gok Turks, the only ones who were definitely known to be Mongols were the Kitay, and they were recorded as Mongols in later times.

3 - However, Cheng z's "Mongol" community not an ethnic but a **political** name, just like the term "Ottoman", and there are Turkish-speaking or Turkic tribes and clans among them.

4 - **Kâshgarlı Mahmud**, who wrote his work in the XI century, shows Tatars a Turkic tribe with separate dialects.

5 - **Marko Polo**, who travelled around the Great Ceng z Empire in the XIIIth century used the word "Tataras" an idiom for both Turks and Mongols.

6 - The Turks themselves considered "Tatar" as a part of the Turks and as Turks speaking Eastern Turkic. **Aşıkpaşaoğlu** records the Turks who came to Anatolia with Süleymanşah in his well-known history as "fifty thousand nomadic Turkmen and Tatar houses".

7 - In a historical calendar written and published by me in 843 AH during the reign of Murad II, one of the Ottoman sultans, non-Muslim Cheng zl kings such as **Chengiz, Ögedey, Mengü, Hülegü, Abaka-Keyhatu were mentioned with mercy**-(4)-Accordingly, until the middle of the XVth century, there was no such thing as enmity against Tatars, enmity against Cheng zl or enmity against non-Muslim Turks among the intellectuals in Turkey. This tolerance came the fact that the Eastern Turks or Tatars were not considered foreigners and the Cheng zl dynasty was considered a national dynasty. If there was a general tolerance, the same tolerance would have been shown towards the Byzantines, , Georgians and Westerners.

8 - Although Turks and Mongols are two **brother** nations from the same root, Cheng z Khan **was not** a Mongol, but a Turk. Apart from historical traditions, Cheng z's Turkishness also confirmed by the testimony of impartial contemporary Chinese. **Prof. Zeki Velidi Togan**, in his small work titled **Mongols**, Cheng z and Turkishness published in 1941 (18th p.) and in his large and valuable book titled **Introduction to General Turkish History** published in 1946 (66th p.), conveyed the information given by a Chinese envoy named **Çao-hong** who visited Cheng z Kaan in 1221. This emissary was a Chinese envoy from Cheng z's

Turks very clearly stated. As it is known, the **Shatos** are a great tribe of the ancient Gok Turks.

historical information about Cheng z's appearance (tall stature, auburn hair, white skin, **green** eyes) also corresponds that of the old Gök Turk khans. Just as "**Börçegin**", the family name of Çeng z, is the Mongolian pronunciation of "**Böri Tegin**", the word "**Çengiz**" is nothing but the Mongolian pronunciation of "**tengiz**", meaning "den z". Altaic linguists that words beginning with "t" in Turkish begin with "ç" in Mongolian.

The family of Cheng z was undoubtedly a branch of **the Echine Dynasty**, which had been ruling over a part of the Mongols (perhaps the Mongolised Turks) since time immemorial in accordance with the old Turkic tradition. continuation of Turkish traditions in this dynasty can be seen in the names of **Çagatay** and **Ögedey**, the sons of Çeng z. "**Çağa**" and "**Öge**", as it is known, are Turkish words.

9 - The fact that **Aksak Temir Bek** was a Barlas **beğ** and the Barlas were considered a Mongol tribe did **not** prevent this great ruler from being a Turk. Tem r's family was also a branch of the Çeng z family and had ruled over the Barlas **tribe**. The Russian organisation made by the Russians by opening Tem r's grave

The analyses revealed that he was also tall and white-skinned, which is completely in accordance with the Turkish description in the old Arabic and Persian literatures. Moreover, Tem r's mother tongue is Turkish.

10 - Neither Çeng z nor Tem r Bek was of Aryanite descent. The Turkic tribe was not Indo-European, as some impostors claim, but intermediate tribe between the and Aryans. As the skulls found in graves, ancient sculptures, ancient wall paintings and historical recommendations show, there are many examples of the praise of Turkish beauties with slanted eyes in Arabic and Persian poetry. **Zamakhshari**, who died in 1144 A.D., long before the emergence of Cheng z and the Mongols, wrote about a Turkish beauty.

Look at these poems he wrote:

"What a blessed day it was that I had become the owner of a beautiful and beautiful girl from the daughters of Yâfes. Although the eyes of that beautiful girl narrow, are wide in terms of colour. When she looks the blackness of eyes is visible, but when she laughs, all these blackness disappears."

.....
"A beautiful girl from the Turkish generation is leading me towards death on my own accord. The girl herself is a woman of lust, and her eyes are lethal. Isn't the killing power of the Turk already famous? Although this girl's brother's sword is as cutting and lethal, her eyes are more deadly than her brother's sword.

its sharp. Even if the **brother** redeems the captives he has taken, his captives are not redeemed. Some of the **brother's captives**

If he sheds the blood of people, he sheds the blood of everyone. The disbelievers cry out at the hand of their **brother**. And this makes the Muslims to weep. He laughs in front of me as I weep his grief, and when he laughs, his eyes, which become very narrow, burn my heart."

.....
"Tell Su'dā'y ^{a5} like this: We are not in need of you and we do want the narrow-eyed ones. Narrow eyes and eyeballs have **filled** our thoughts. When they look at us, only their eyes are seen. But if they laugh a that s yahness also becomes invisible. The face of the Turks, may God protect them from the evil eye, like the moon in the sky. "⁶

11 - The greatest proof that the Oghuz were also fully capacitated Turks at the time is the record of **Mas'udī**, who **died** before the establishment of the Seljuk state. Mas'udī said: "Oghuzes are slant-eyed. But there are others who are more slant-eyed than them." Among the Turks of today's Turkiye, who are generally the descendants of the Oghuzes, there are many examples of this type, either complete or slightly .

12 - Trying to turn **Aksak Temir's** clash with the Turks of Turkiye into a national cause is **nothing** but a national betrayal. There were many Turkmens from Eastern Anatolia in Aksak Tem r's army that fought against Yıldırım Bayazıd. In reality, this war was a multi-war like the Ottoman-Karaman, Ottoman-Akkoyunlu and Ottoman-Safavid battles. The fierceness shown in the Ottoman-Karaman and Ottoman-Safavid wars was to extent of suppressing Ottoman-Cagatai wars. These battles are the result of a destiny in the formation of Turkish history. Turkish history is full of many conflicts. Only in the Ottoman history too, slaughtering wars between princes constitute a large part.

13 - The statue of Kül Teg n, which was recently discovered at the site of Kül Teg n monument and claimed to belong to Kül Teg n, is a back Central Asian statue. In any case, it cannot be claimed that Kül Teg n or Gök Turks were "Mongolian".

14 - **Dih Hudây Abu'l-Ma'āliyi'r-Râzî**, one of the Iranian court poets of the Seljuks, mentions the Turkish slaves in the court of the Seljuk sultan as follows:

"All of them of Kyrgyz and Chin origin, all of them are rose-faced beauties from the seed of Yagma and Tatar. Among them Oghuz and Kipchak beauties with **silver** jaws, Kay and K meks like the moon and the moon. My God, these Turkish children are such beautiful things that the eyes of a person looking at them become like spring."

Ch n here means the Turks of the Far East and perhaps the Mongols. The depiction of the Tatars together with the Yagmas as rose-faced beauties the greatest proof of their unsubstantiated Turkishness.

15 - Today, the Turks who are called "**Tatars**" are the Kazakhs and Crimeans. The Kazanis are the descendants of the ancient Bulgarian Turks and the Crimeans are the descendants of the Kipchaks. In other words, it is impossible to think of the word "Tatar", which today has a legal and even geographical meaning, as a Mongolian tribe, or as something other than a Turk.

Under these circumstances, to see, show and think that Cheng z Khan and Tem r Bek, the two great figures of Turkish history, are non-Turkic and especially anti-Turkic nothing but distorting and changing history and historical facts. In particular, to use the word **Tatar** in the sense of Mongolian or non-Turkic nation is to know nothing.

Turks the right to critic, dislike and dislike some of the first class people of Turkish history. However, due to rivalries between dynasties, they cannot favour one of them and declare his opponent as an enemy. Geography is of no value in racial disputes.

Calling some of the Turks as national enemies is not only to change history, but also to undermine the Turkish unity of tomorrow. This undermining play into the hands of our historical enemies.

(Ötügen, 31-32. Issue, August 1966)

3 İlk nc Türk Kongres , 895-911pp.Istanbul 1943 Kenan Matbaası.

4 Historical Calendars for Ottoman History, 92-94. pp., Istanbul 1961, Küçükaydın Basımev .

5 Su'dâ is the name of Zamakhshari's Arab lover.

6 Şerefett n Yaltkaya, "Zemahşeri'n'n D vanında Türkçe Ş rler", Atsız Mecmua, 15th issue, 15 July 1932, 66-67. pp.

Battle of Varna

Murad II, one of the greatest of the Ottoman sultans, signed a peace treaty with the Hungarians on 12 July 1444.

accepted the second defeat and voluntarily withdrew from the sultanate, closing the chapter of the ongoing war with the Crusaders since 1437. , a few victories of **Jan Hunyad** could not destroy the Ottoman Turks, which had not been shaken even by the defeat in Ankara. However, seven years of struggle with Hungarian, Polish, German, Romanian and Croatian armies had **exhausted** both the state and Sultan Murad. He was a cautious, heroic, great man and a man of heart, who became the first chancellor of the Ottoman dynasty.

Murad II found the tranquillity his soul sought among the greenery and silence.

He retired to Man sa and left his throne to his 13 year old son, the future conqueror of Istanbul.

The accession of an inexperienced child to the Ottoman throne aroused hopes and aspirations among the pious Crusaders. Taking advantage of this opportunity, the dream of **expelling the Turks from Europe** settled in hearts. It had been ten days since the peace was signed. They were thinking how to break the promise they had sworn on the Bible. The Pope's deputy issued a fatwa: "**The oath given to those of other religions is not valid**". And preparations for war began immediately.

The core of the Crusader army composed Hungarian horsemen in elite and steel armour. Germans, Poles, Romanians and Croats also joined the army. Although the King of Hungary was present in the army, the commander-in-chief position was given to the famous Jan Hunyad and the army arrived at Orsuva and crossed the Danube on 20 September. However, this army, which had set out with great intentions and hopes, could not successfully execute its planned march and moved slowly. The Hungarian king's weights loaded on 250 wagons and other necessary belongings of the army delayed the march and time to the Turks. The Crusader army arrived at V d n on 26 September. The 110 kilometres between Orsuva and V d n were covered in five days.

In other words, only 22 kilometres could be walked in a day. In the meantime, the Turks **were running** to meet their enemies by **marching** from Anatolia with a **march** as fast as this.

The enemy attacked in front of Vidin for a few days but could not take the city. From there they came to Rahova. The Turks had **evacuated** the city. Crusaders the **empty** city.

On 6 October the Crusaders arrived in N **ğebolu** and were stopped by the Turkish garrison under the command of **Mehmed Beğ, son of Firuz Beğ**. The Crusaders could not take the city and suffered **futile** losses.

The Crusader army ravaged the places **they** passed through and came to Razgrad and from there to Yen Pazar, a fortified city. **It** took it in battle and put its inhabitants to the sword.

On 24 October, letters were sent to the cities of **Shumen**, Varna, Petr ç, Kavarna, informing them that they would be released **they** sur, they would be put to the sword. However, all the cities refused **surrender**.

On 26 October the Crusaders attacked Shumnu. The Turks fought back fiercely but **defeated**. When 50 men, who had held out until the last minute, realised that there was nothing left to do, they threw themselves from the bastions, preferring death to **captivity**.

The Crusaders stayed in **Shumnu** for **five** days **lost** time. On 4 November, they came to Prevad. They took and destroyed this place with difficulty.

On 6 November they captured the town of Petr ç, at considerable loss, and put the Turks inside to the sword. On 9 November they arrived in front of Varna. As dusk fell, the Crusaders were surprised to see the Turkish army massed behind them. At a distance of about 4 kilometres, the Turkish headquarters **had been established** and the fires of the Turkish army **had started** to burn.

How had this happened? By what means did Murad II, who abdicated and went to Man sa, **fall behind** the Crusaders at the head of his army?

It was learnt that the Crusaders had broken the treaty and were preparing to march, the Turkish statesmen sensed the danger and explained this to the child **sultan** in an manner and offered him to call his father to the throne and made him accept this offer. However, Sultan Murad rejected this offer, whereupon the **future** sultan of Constantinople, who is well known in history, **said**, "**If you are the sultan, head your army , if I am the sultan , head the army head .**"

"I command you!" forced Murad to **take** the sultanate again. Murad II, who could not find what **he** was waiting for in Man sa, where **he** had retired to rest with the sorrow arising from the defeat of his army and the death of his eldest son Alâedd n, gathered his army and marched rapidly. He was going to cross to Rumel from the hills of Gel bolu.

However, when he learnt that **the** Crusader fleet was waiting in front of Gel bolu, he turned eastwards with great speed of decision and headed towards the Bosphorus.

They marched on: This tight **march** from Balıkes r-Bursa-Gemlik was a completely **successful** operation. It was carried out very secretly, and the enemy fleet waiting in front of Gel bolu was deceived and **left** in its place. In vain, this fleet was waiting for the Turkish army in the Dardanelles.

The Turkish army crossed to Rumel with Italian ships from the front of Anadolu H sari. The 40.000-strong Turkish army crossed to Rumel giving this to the Italians, who demanded one duka gold per man, and marched rapidly to Ed rne.

Ed rne was reached in mid-October. Meanwhile, the enemy spending time in **vain** trying to surround N ğbolu. The Turkish army marched to N ğbolu by the Ed rne-F l be-Şipka- Tırnova road. By the time they reached N ğbolu, the enemy had withdrawn from there and travelled towards Şumnu. Turkish forces in N ğbolu also joined the army. They marched eastwards. The Crusaders not know that the Turkish army was among them, while Turks, who knew these lands well, were **approaching** the enemy like lightning, hiding themselves.

On 9 they reached the Crusaders. The two armies were to fight on opposite fronts. This was because the Crusaders **had** their back to Varna and their front towards the west and north, while the Turks **had** their front towards **the** south-east.

When the Hungarian king learnt that the Turkish army was four kilometres away, he ordered the horses to be saddled for the night. Their moral strength was excellent. The superiority of the Hungarians was that they were composed of armoured cavalry. Their commander-in-chief, Jan Hunyad, was a great soldier **who** had won several victories against the Turks. Both sides had cannon.

The Turkish army **had** crossed from Anatolia to Rumel with 40,000 men, where some forces had been added. they left some troops in Ed rne, **were no more than 50,000 men**. The Crusaders numbered 70,000. It's a **wrong** idea.

had they not lingered in front of some Turkish fortresses and suffered losses. They would have been in a superior position to the Turkish army.

On 10 November 1444 the battle began. The Turks drove the treaty, which the Crusaders had broken, to the headquarters. On the right wing of the Turkish army the Rumel S pahs under **Turhan Beğ** and the Anatolian S pahs under **Karaca Pasha** in the centre. On the left wing were the Raiders and the Azepe, who were foot soldiers. **Murad II**, the commander-in-chief, was in battle with the Kapıkulları, the Yen Yen çer and the Kapıkulları S pahs.

It was certain that one of the two sides **would** be destroyed in this battle fought with a reversed front. One of the reasons that made this outcome certain was the fierce determination of both sides, the mastery of their commanders and the heroism of their soldiers.

The Turks started the offensive. On the Turks' left flank, 10,000 Azepe and Akinci **approached** the enemy's right flank, surrounding it. After the Azepe showered the enemy with arrows, the Akinci charged towards the Crusaders. At the same time, the Anatolian **Beğlerbeğ** s Karaca Pasha attacked the enemy with the Anatolian S pahs. The enemy, waiting for the Azepe and Akincis to **approach**, launched a fierce counter-attack with their armoured cavalry and pushed the light Turkish forces backwards.

Karaca Pasha's forces defeated the Croats in front of them and started to advance. The Croats tried to stop this attack by bringing all their reserves **into** the battle, but they failed. The Croats were driven into the swamp and all of them were destroyed.

Jan Hunyad, seeing the bad condition of his **right** wing, attacked Karaca Pasha with Hungarian and **Bosnian** forces under his command. This flank attack was very fierce. Karaca Pasha **was** martyred in a very bloody **battle**. The Anatolian S pahs to the left of the Yen çer.

The Rumel S pahs on the Turkish **right** flank, together with the centre left, also attacked the enemy. The enemy attacked them with their armoured cavalry and pushed the Rumel S pahs back, but this wing, which had taken their reserves, attacked again, repelled the Crusaders and began to chase them.

Jan Hunyad, the enemy commander-in-chief, improving the situation on his **right** flank, **rushed** to the aid of the Hungarian king by taking one of his reserve regiments with him in order to improve the deteriorated left flank. Turhan Beğ's Rumel S pahs started to retreat. As the Anatolian S pahs retreated the left of the Yen çer, Rumel S pahs retreated to the **right** of Yen çer and formed a front.

Up to this point, **the** battle seemed to be in favour of the Crusaders. Although the Croats had been destroyed, the flanks and the centre of the Turkish army **had** been forced to retreat and the front had been pushed back to the front of the Yen çer and Kapıkulu S pahs, the reserves of the Sultan. On the other hand, there was this in favour of the Turks: all the forces of the Crusaders had been brought into **the battle**, the Kapıkulu soldiers of the Turks in reserve, not yet worn out. Furthermore, the worn out enemy forces facing the Turks' famous **goose wing** battalion.

The **enemy** thought that the Rumel, Anatolian S pahs, Azep and Raiders, who had retreated to the two sides of the Turkish line, **were** perhaps completely broken and finished. Without giving any thought to their existence, **he** attacked the Yen çer and Kapıkulu S pahs.

Ditches were **dug** and obstacles **built** in front of this . Jan Hunyad had told the Hungarian king to wait for orders from him, **he** wanted to bring the regiments with him **into battle** at the last moment of need. However, when the commanders of these regiments saw that **the battle was** going on in front of the Turkish headquarters, they forgot their military service and asked the king for permission to enter **the battle**.

They asked for it. The King **the** mistake of giving this permission. The last of the enemy's reserves were thrown out to attack the Yen çer.

When all the forces of the Crusaders entered **the battle**, Turks decided that the time had come to strike the final blow. The centre of the new front was pulled a little and the goose wing method **was** applied. **The enemy did not** realise that they had entered , as had happened at N ğbolu.

In the meantime, Jan Hunyad, who had just arrived at the king's headquarters after restoring his left flank, saw that last of his reserves **had** entered **the battle** contrary to his orders, and having nothing **else** to do, he led his army into a threefold and fierce attack.

The Crusaders were attacking towards Sultan Murad, while the Turks to capture the Hungarian king. There was a fierce struggle in front of the Turkish headquarters. In the meantime, **the Sekbanbaşı Yazıcı Doğan was** also martyred.

A Turkish soldier named **Rüstem** knocked down the Hungarian king's horse an axe. The king was killed. An old soldier named **Koca Hızır** cut off the king's head, stuck it on a spear and drove it into the broken treaty on the tip of the spear. Meanwhile, the Anatolian and Rumel

The S paks also closed the goose flank and encircled the enemy. As night fell, Jan Hunyad was able to escape northwards the Romanians.

The following morning, the small enemy troops that were holding on to the enemy headquarters were attacked and all of them were put to the sword, their commander, Cardinal Caesar nal. The king's valuables amounting to 250 wagons were seized. The four to five thousand survivors of Hunyad and his force, including David

Pasha chased him until the Danube.

* * *

The Battle of Varna one of the most beautiful examples of the wars of destruction. It was a battle that was managed well from start to finish. The Turkish army, which caught the enemy unawares by concealing its movements, has written a very glorious leaf in our history with this battle. Considering Jan Hunyad's mastery as a commander and the fact that the Hungarian horsemen were armoured, value of this victory can be better understood. The armoured cavalry of the XVth century was a formidable force, sweeping away all comers like today's tanks. Turks destroyed such force. Murad II and the Turkish army, who defeated and destroyed that terrible force, should be celebrated. Murad I and the Turkish army were worthy of celebration.

(Çınaraltı, 15th issue, 15 November
1941)

Abdülhamid Khan (= Gök Sultan)

Abdülhamid II was one of the historical figures who suffered the greatest injustice from the society. Carrying the heavy burden of the previous eras on his shoulders, being betrayed by the men he could trust the most and about to disintegrate

This great pad shah, who sustained an empire full of enemies for 33 years his intelligence and raw talent alone, was introduced as a murderer, a bloody , a red sultan, an ignorant and cowardly , and was recognised as such due to the influence of this propaganda against him.

How can it be possible that generations who start to be influenced by a certain propaganda as early as primary school and are raised with the same indoctrination as they grow older, adopt the lies of that propaganda as the truth?

Learn, my child, Ten July is the greatest of holidays, Es r m l
lett er broke and dismantled the z nc r on such a day.
If you knew the days that passed before him, my child, how
sad they were. He was the pad shah who would think
of every year of the nation;
The sultan at that time was not a human being, he was a
monster, he used to and shed blood, and the people were
very disgusted with him!

Such nonsense was written with who knows which broken pens and passed on to reading books, instilling enmity against Sultan Hamid in young minds.

Those who instilled this enmity were first the Unionists, i.e. the heroes of freedom (!, who fled the country after Sultan Abdülhamid dismantled the empire in 10 years, which he had maintained for 33 years. After the Unionists, there were Armenians Greeks Jews. That is to say, Armenians who raided the Ottoman Bank in order to ruin Turkey by involving foreigners, caused turmoil in Anatolia, and were dealt with by Sultan Abdülhamid without Europe saying a word; Greeks (or Greeks as they are called in our country) who were dealt with by Sultan Hamid in 1897 when they wanted to attack the Balkans, cause turmoil and break up Turkey with the involvement of foreigners; and

Attempts to establish a Jewish state in Palestine were prevented by Sultan Hamid

While Sultan Hamid was putting down the rampant behaviour of these minorities with all sorts of legal schemes, bullies united with them and deposed the pasha from his throne:

Turks, Jews, Greeks,
Armenians, we have seen this
day!

They made the squares ring by singing this unforgettable composition of stupidity and treason, and they thought that they were ruling an empire by not realising or understanding how the Jewish, Greek and Armenian citizens were waiting for a "rûz- rûşen" until the First World War and the armistice.

In order to understand Sultan Hamid, it is necessary to know the time when he ascended the throne. During the decadence of Sultan Abdulaziz's last days, Murad V. represented liberalism and Abdülhamid II represented conservatism. Liberals, looking at England and France, believed that everything would be fine with the parliament; conservatives that with a population of 30 million, everything would be fine.

In order to ensure the sovereignty of 10 million Turks in the empire, he saw the need for absolute power. The Freemasons had also made Sultan Murad a Mason. Behind Freemasonry, which did not show its true face to Sultan, were Judaism and European imperialism.

The Hitlerist Young deputies in the first Constitutional Assembly were strongly in favour of war with the Russians in order to break up Turkey as soon as possible. And indeed, the empire almost fell apart. If Sultan Hamid had continued the Constitutional Monarchy after seeing this, he would certainly have done the wrong thing. Sultan Hamid's greatest achievement and service to close the in order to put a barrier against the Arab and Albanian nationalism fuelled from outside, together with the non-Muslim parliamentarians. What would have happened if this parliament had not been dissolved? How would this state have been maintained with 10 million Turks, whose level of culture was lower than all of them, against 8 million Croats and 12 million Muslim foreigners? Since democracy is majority regime, what would have been the result if the Arabs, who outnumbered the Turks, had, for example, proposed that the official language should be Arabic and taken the Albanians with them?

How would this end if democratic demonstrations were organised to provoke the European states that were looking for an opportunity to intervene?

Hamid prevented all these threats by closing Majand would have prevented them even more if he had not been deposed.

But his service did not stop there. He armed the Ottoman army, which emerged defeated from the war of 1877-1878, with the most perfect weapons of that time, for example, Mauser rifles. He fortified the Bosphorus and Dardanelles Straits against possible attacks from the sea by the sea states and the Russians. And the attacks of the British and French on 18 March 1915 during the World War I were stopped by these

They trained excellent staff. They managed the 1914-1918 war and the War of Independence. The navy prepared by Sultan Aziz to fight the Russians and save Crimea had lost its value in the face of changes in naval technology. It was no longer possible to do business with 8-10 metres in length. He dismissed them and bought two battleships and cruisers. He paid two thirds the huge Ottoman debts. He opened many schools. He built many roads and bridges, as well as charities such as hospitals and fountains. He established an unprecedented intelligence network. spies even among foreign ambassadors. He was aware of every bird that flew in Europe, learnt the decisions against us in advance and took precautions. To take the power from the Ottoman Dynasty

One of the members of a secret organisation founded in Egypt for the purpose was one of Sultan Hamid's men. As well as preventing the Balkans from uniting by fuelling sectarian and nationalistic divisions, he prevented the British Germans and Russians from uniting against us by pitting them against each other.

In doing so, time had shown how justified he was in not trusting anyone from his viziers and pashas, and the viziers had taken refuge in foreign and consulates without even bothering.

he was a very honourable and pious man, he never shed blood. The rumour that he had Mehmet Pasha killed is false. In fact, he was suspicious of Mehmet Pasha and believed that he had Sultan Aziz killed. However, as a pious person, he had avoided bloodshed all his life, and had changed the death sentence of Mehmet Pasha and his friends to life imprisonment. he not have signed the verdict of damnation if he had wanted to? What force have prevented this? Was he so low-minded that he did not do this and then attempted to commit suicide in Istanbul?

The state defended itself the Muscovite imperialism threatening the country from the east and the European imperialism threatening from the west and its representative England.

Sultan Hamid was also obliged to deal with minorities and the unaware freedom fighters, and had to confront the colonialism coming from the south.

For Sultan Hamid, it was a matter and a duty to defend the Ottoman Empire against the enemies of our ancestry, Moscos and England, the enemies of our nation the enemies of our state, colonialism and minorities, and the enemies of our regime, the freemen. For this, he had to remain the head of state. The correctness of belief that the state would not survive if he withdrew was soon realised.

Now, in the face of such a great cause, what is the events such as the exile of İsmail Safa, which Peyam Safa had suggested? What did İsmail Safa want? Freedom, according to his son's claim, i.e. constitutionalism, free elections, i.e. a regiment of Arabs, Albanians, Armenians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Jews and Serbs a say in the fate of Turkey... Now us think with reason, understanding, conscience and national consciousness: Is such an outcome acceptable?

Sultan Hamid, exile what they've done monthly da that you've tied Accordingly, is it Sultan Hamid's fault that İsmail Safa died in Sivas, which is one of the most robust places in Anatolia and whose inhabitants are known for their pious and robust nature? Would İsmail Safa, who had tuberculosis, not have died if he had stayed in Istanbul? Because of his love for his father, it is natural that Peyam Safa would have some private thoughts. However, a writer who addresses thousands of people every day, Is it true that he tried to show a great padshah like Sultan Hamid as the most ignorant and bloody of the Ottoman sultans?

"Everyone in this world ignorant of many things. As long as he himself is not ."⁷ Sultan Hamid, who had proved with thousands of proofs that he was a qualified person, was never ignorant. He did not have a higher school or even a university degree. However, he had learnt many valuable things from life and the great and magnificent dynasty in which he grew up. He was a painter, calligrapher and muse. knew some eastern and western languages. valuable Yildiz Library he founded is today the foundation of the Library. He also founded the Bayazid Public Library. In other words, Sultan Hamid Turkish culture by establishing libraries, opening many schools and printing scientific works.

It a lie that he was a murderer and a lie that he was a red sultan. To adopt the red sultanate ascribed to him by Europeans and Armenians is a lie.

to serve?

Sultan Ham d is not a red Sultan, he is the "Sky Sultan". Neither Turkish history nor the Turkish nation gains anything by denying the virtues of Sultan Ham d by pointing out his minor flaws, which can be found in everyone. İsmail was rightly exiled by Sultan Ham d for congratulating the success of the British in the British-Boer War going to their Perhaps İsmail Safa did not know at that time kind of enemies of Turks and Muslims the British were. However, Sultan Ham d, who knew everything with his extensive means of information, could not allow the intellectuals of the country to come into contact with enemy embassies.

Now let us think about it: conception of freedom is it to England for attacking a handful of Boers with large armies for no reason at all, just to seize the diamond mines in their homeland?

What is the difference between congratulating England for defeating the Boers in those days and applauding today's Moscos their success against the F ns?

The late **Sultan Abdülhamid Khan** lived his whole life in to have an , to keep the state alive and to prepare for it. He was distracting Europe and Muscovite with his political genius, and on the other hand, he was trying to strengthen the Turkish nation with railways and schools.

order to compare Sultan Ham d with his enemies, the freedom fighters, it is enough to look at this point alone: The heroes of (!), destroying freedom and hanging hundreds of innocents, fled like thieves when the state they had led into war was defeated. When **Gök Sultan** was deposed from his throne, after having kept the state alive for 33 years by overcoming the most horrible political difficulties without making a single political move, he rejected the invitation of the Muscovite Tsar to Russia, and when he came to Istanbul on a German ship from Th, he rejected the invitation of the German Emperor and preferred to live like an exile and a prisoner in his homeland.

Turkey is a house with fires on its four borders, and Sultan Ham d is a defender who runs quickly to sprinkle water, pour sand and cover the fire with felt in order to prevent the fires from infecting the house. If he knocked down a child who got in his way during these rushes, blame was not his. Because the fires around the country were rising to the sky and Gök Sultan was trying hard to be engulfed by the flames.

And he didnt.

What do you say? he rest in heaven...

(January, 11th issue, 11 May 1956)

7 This beautiful word was given to Sultan Ham d'n's youngest son Mehmed ib
d Efend

a tt r. Âb d Efend was born in Istanbul on 17 September 1905 and died in Beirut
on 8 December 1973, was buried in the Sel m ye treasury in Damascus.

Ottoman Sultans

One of the of teaching literature, history and geography is to instil in young people a love of nation and country. This must be done without telling lies or the facts. For **there can be no patriotism founded on falsehood, and no virtue can arise from changing the facts.** When children read own and history, they think, make judgements, , get angry, like, ; but in the end, Turkish history with all its victories and defeats, good and black days, Turkish culture and love of Turkishness remain in their hearts. In fact, sometimes there is nothing left of all the books, books and minds that have been read, but a national love and belief remains in the hearts, which is essentially what is desired and expected.

The children of a nation must brought up with both national love and national hatred order to become good sons and daughters of that nation. Every nation historical enemies. If the children of a nation grow up forgiving those who have done evil to their descendants, if they do not harbour any sense of revenge against them, or if they do not recognise those who have served them and deny them, that nation will lose its right to live.

The fact that false allegations about the Ottoman sultans have found their way into school books one the evidences of this danger. An entry in Al Can p Yöntem's *Edeb yat* (Literature), which is taught in the ninth grade of high schools, is one of them.

In the 1937 edition of this book, there is the following line on page 185 of the chapter "Political Regulation":

"...At that time Abdülmec d had ascended the throne. This was an oblivious and helpless man like every Ottoman pad shah..."⁸

If Al Can p Yöntem had been one of the sycophants of the time, perhaps this statement would not have been so important. would have said, "Some unconscious fool has **uttered** some delirium!". However, this judgement changes when it comes from the pen of a patriotic, even somewhat Turkist literary teacher like Al Can p, an intellectual **who** had befriended Ömer Seyfedd n, who **had been involved** in the movements for the simplification of the language and who knew its history well.

So, all Ottoman sultans were ignorant and helpless! So, among these people **who led** the Turkish armies from victory to victory, who **at the forefront** of the defence of Turkishness and Islam against all of Europe, who filled every part of the country with works of science and art, there was not a single worthy person?

How heavy is this accusation hurled at this hearth of veterans and martyrs! What **kind of logic** it be to **try** to refute all of them at once, just because there are a few crazy people and a few unrestrained people in the Ottoman hearth? What is the difference between making such an accusation and refuting the whole book based on a **wrong** sentence in a book?

Having noted these with regret, I will move on to the judgement that should be made about the Ottoman sultans in terms of history:

I will leave **Ertuğrul Gazi**, who defeated the Greeks in the Sultan's **Tale**, besieged Karacahisar and took **Söğüd**. Since he was not officially regarded as a pad shah, Al Can p Yöntem's beams of insult **could not reach** him. Therefore, I **will start with Osman Gazi**.

Here, I will discuss the events in which the Ottoman sultans participated or had direct influence. This article is not a historical analysis.

n this book, perhaps I will have some shortcomings and mistakes. I **forgive** Al Can p Yöntem my shortcomings related to the great Ottoman sultans, and those who know history **should forgive** me my mistakes.

* * *

Osman Gazi: In 1248, while going to capture İnegöl with 70 men, he was ambushed by the Greeks but he did not break down. In this battle his son **Baykoca** was martyred. Then he raided and took Kocah sar (or Kulacah sar) with 3000 men. After a while, he fought and won the **Great Eğirce War** with the Greeks. In this, his **brother Sarubatu Savcı Beğ** was martyred. Then he captured İnegöl. Mudurnu-Göynük in 1291

He made an expedition and put the Greeks to the sword. He defeated the Greeks in the battle at **Kaldırık Derbendi** and took Bilecik and Yarhisar. In **1299**, he defeated the Greeks in **Yalova**. He took Yenisehir and Yunduhisar in 1301 and Köprühisar in 1302. In 1303, he attacked İzmit, although he could not take it. In **1306**, he defeated a superior Greek army in front of **Koyunhisari**. His brother **Gündüz Beğ** and Gündüz Beğ's son **Aydoğdu** were martyred in this war. He took Koçhisar in 1308 and Akhisar in 1313. He also defeated and drove away the tekfur of Geyve. Throughout his life, he gathered Anatolian fiefs to him with his justice and good behaviour. He took many from his enemies. But when he died, nothing was found. Is this why Osman Gazi is ?

Orhan Gazi: He took over the state in the last years of his father's life. He took the castles of Aydos, İzmit, Hereke, İzmit, Taraklı, Gemlik from the Greeks by fighting for ten years from 1327 to 1337, by using arrows and swords, and by throwing himself into the embrace of death, and took a strong step towards Turkish unity in Anatolia by adding Karasi, a Turkish province, to his country. In 1338, he sent his son, the heroic **Süleyman Pasha** to Rumel and conquered Gelibolu, Bolayır, Malkara, İpsala and Tekirdağ. Was it because he had done these things that Orhan Gazi negligent and helpless?

Gazi Murad Beğ: He took another step for Anatolian Turkish unity and added Ankara to his country. Then he took Çorlu, Lüleburgaz and Edirne in 1363, and later Niğde castle. In 1382, he added a part of Germiyan to the Ottoman Empire, and in 1389, after winning the glorious **Battle of Kosovo**, he was martyred. In addition to a strong organisation in the country, Murad I had also established a new organisation. Accordingly, he was unaware and helpless because of his behaviour.

d ?

Yıldırım Bayazıt: This great man of the Middle Ages played one of the most important roles in the victory of Kosovo. He established Turkish unity in by annexing almost all of the Turkish tribes in Anatolia to the Ottoman Empire. He besieged Istanbul. In 1396, he smashed the united European armies at **Niğbolu** and wrote a golden leaf in our history. It is well known how he showed heroism in the **Battle of Ankara** in 1402 and how he suffered because he could not endure captivity. I wonder if he was deemed to be unfaithful because he killed his sweet life instead of revelling with women and drinking wine in this world?

All of the sons of the heroic Yıldırım, each of them was more or less a padshah (**Süleyman, Mehmed, Musa, Mustafa, İsa** had one son each).

He was a hero. The hero **Süleyman Çelebi** loved and protected poets very much. **Musa Çelebi**, on the other hand, was a fierce **enemy** of the infidels and hero who constantly **fought** against them. As for **Mehmed Çelebi**, he was not only as **handsome** as an art star, but also a hero who was a swordsman and a **swordsman**. He fought 24 **battles** and **received** nearly forty wounds and **died** early because of these wounds.

II. Murad: He besieged Istanbul. After the battle with **Aksak Temir**, he partially re-established the Anatolian Turkish unity which had been **broken**. He took Thessaloniki in 1429. He won the battles of **Varna** in 1444 and **Second Kosovo** in 1448. **Shah**. Although his poems **were written** in the XVth century, they are more beautiful than most of the poems **written** in the XXth century. He loved music very much. He was far away from the thought of reigning. Was he oblivious and helpless because **he** left the sultanate to his son and retired?

Fatih: What should I write about Fatih? He has already **written** himself into history. **Not** only Al Can p, if the whole humanity is empty of Al Can p's and denies him, he still exists and is great. **At an age when** Al Can p Yöntem could not pass through Karacaahmet cemetery alone, he was destroying countries and states and adding their lands to the Turkish country. It is certain that one day we **will** cut down his statues. Statues to him are also few. If we Istanbul after him and called it "Fatihkent" still be too little. We must definitely erect great statue for him, which will be a unique work of Turkish art and Turkish genius. **Must** find whatever we need, gold, **silver**, granite, whatever we need, and erect great statue. Fatih, **like all his ancestors, grandfathers and great uncles**, was a **veteran** who was **wounded** in the Battle of Belgrade. He was a **shah**, a wise and lawful man. I wonder why he was careless and helpless? Is it because of the way he treated the daughter of a commander in **defeated** Byzantium? Of course, it would have been better if he had not done that, but he doing it **the age of twenty** and against an enemy. He was not attacking the daughters and sisters of his own commanders...

Bayazid II: **Bayazid II** and **Cem**, the sons of Fatimah, were **not** idle and helpless. They were both glorious and heroic. Although Bayazid II pales in comparison to Fatih and Yavuz, he **was** indeed, as a historian says, a conscious sovereign whose behaviour had no unnecessary or deficient points.

Yavuz: As for Yavuz, I don't know if there is a person **who is** as unworthy of the adjectives of foolishness and helplessness as he is. The heroic that knowledge-friendly lion is also foolish and helpless.

If so, what the other people? Yavuz, who won the battles of **Chaldiran** in 1514 and **Merci Dabik** in 1516 and saved the state from the threat of division with his decisive will, is perhaps the greatest figure in the history of Turkey, along with **Alp Arslan**. As Kemalpaşaoğlu says, both the sword and the pen cried for his death.

Suleiman the Magnificent: How can we call this **conqueror of Belgrade, Rhodes, Budin, Tabriz and Baghdad, the glorious hero of Mohaç**, the pad shah of **Barbaros, Turgud, Sinan and Bâki**, this glorious emperor who participated in 13 battles, a who indifferent and helpless? How we call a person ignorant and helpless because any action of a person has yielded bad results after a few centuries? There are some people who can be called geniuses who cannot see 25 years ahead. While other nations do not hesitate to change the facts in to give examples of greatness and heroism to their children, and even make their kings look like great people, our attempt to minimise our own heroes is heavy axe to patriotism. The more examples of heroes people see in their environment the more likely they are to grow up as heroes. There is no difference between erasing historical heroes and erasing a nation.

Selim II: He never fought in any war. He was a poet and a drunkard. This ruler, who was not liked his mother was Russian, had no great side. Although Yemen, Cyprus and Tunisia were taken during his reign, he did not show any . However, he showed that he was not careless by leaving the state administration in the hands of competent people.

Murad III: He did not interfere much in state affairs. He was very fond of women. However history does not record a situation that can be called careless and helpless.

Mehmed III: He was not complacent like his father and grandfather. He went to war and conquered **Eger** in 1597 and defeated the Germans in **the Battle of Haçova**. His flaw was that he involved his mother in state affairs.

I. Ahmed: He was a poet. He was very kind and merciful. He died at the age of 27. He changed the method of succession in the Sultanate and prevented princes' marriages.

It was a good move in humanitarian terms. However, this move was to the detriment of the state in terms of outcome. It was probably not auspicious that old instead of young rulers came to the head of the state.

I. Mustafa: Al Can p Yöntem's words are appropriate. But he was sick. sick person cannot be expected to do the things normal people want.

Genç Osman: Osman II was a hero of great creation like the Ottoman Sultans of old. He ascended the throne at the age of 14. At the age of 17, he led the expedition to Poland. He was the first to recognise the corruption of the new generations. He **closed** the taverns, **reduced** salaries and rations, and **started** to handle the state with a stern hand. If he had not been martyred at the age of 18 due to the mischief of the **corrupt devş** meler, he would certainly have brought the state to its most glorious level.

Murad IV: He was a small copy of Yavuz. He too had become a pad shah at the age of 14. At the age of 23, when he took over the state, he showed everyone what an iron man he was. He conquered **Revan** in 1636 and **Baghdad** in 1639. Like most of the Ottoman sultans, he was also a swordsman. He used to drink raki and tobacco. But he was a radd and a poet. His death at the age of 31 was a bitter loss for our state.

Ibrahim: He was a very patriotic, patriotic and silent person. A constant headache, which started a little after he became Sultan and which could not be cured, finally **broke** his nerves, made him in need **Cinci** Hodja and **left** him with no religious principles in **his** behaviour. If he had been any other prince at that time, he would probably have been made a pad shah and Sultan İbrah m would not have stayed on the throne for 9 years.

Mehmed the Hunter: The enthronement of Sultan İbrah m's son Mehmedat the age of 7 prevented the state from being ruled by a patient. Mehmed IV was **not** great sultan. The turbulent life of the Ottoman Empire at that time had made him weary of everything. But he was a very compassionate and philanthropic man. The fact that he **protected Müneccimbaşı**, the famous historian, was probably **not** the result of a mere act.

II. Suleiman II and Ahmed II: Since the periods of Suleiman II, who ascended the throne at the age of 58 and reigned for 3 years, and Ahmed II, who became the ruler at the age of 49 and stayed in this position for 4 years, coincided with the most complicated times of our state and both of them reigned for a very short time it is **not** easy to say a word in their favour or against them.

Mustafa II: After 10 years on the throne, Mustafa II became the Sultan at the age of 22. He had the virtues of his ancestors. He went on three expeditions and **won** two of them. He had good taste, intelligence and . he abdicated the throne due to a military rebellion and left the throne to **his brother** Ahmed III, he gave him very brotherly and wise advice and **put his brother** on the throne himself.

Ahmed III: He did not go on a campaign. However, his time was an **era** of literary and scientific development. The establishment of committees to translate a number of valuable books from Arabic and Persian into Turkish, the introduction of the printing press to Turkey, the development of

The text is the work Ahmed III. Not being a hero a shortcoming. But his virtues cannot be denied either.

Mahmud I: was one of those who raised the glory of the state with his right-mindedness. He gave more importance learning than heroism. He opened 4 libraries in Istanbul alone.

Osman III: when he was born and remained on the throne for 3 years. He was not brilliant personality. However, the measures he took to prevent debauchery and immorality that he was thoughtful, not careless.

Mustafa III: He was a vigilant sovereign who understood the merits of Frederick and tried to cooperate with him. He knew that Europe was technically superior to us and tried to introduce technology into the country. The grief he felt because of the great military defeats, which were seen for the first time in his time, caused his death.

I. Abdülhamid: He became a pad shah at the age of 50. A peace such as the Peace of Kaynarca, which the state had not seen until then, was unprecedented because it was signed in his time. Although the state prepared and went to war in to liberate Crimea and avenge Kaynarca, it could not achieve success when the enemy was defeated and when the Moscos put all the people to the sword in the Öz castle they captured, the 65-year-old Sultan died with a sigh when he received this news.

I. Abdülhamid had made military reforms and partially introduced European technology into the country. He was a patriotic emperor and a romantic lover with his great love for a girl named Ruḥşah. His life and actions, and especially his death, show that he was not .

III. Selim: III can never be called a blind man. He was a great and very merciful creation. The Peace of Iaşi was signed at a time of a disastrous peace, but he did not tire of working hard to save the state. He wanted to introduce innovation into the country gradually and he was right in this. A large and solid building such as the Selimiye Barracks alone proof of his sublime service. He was a musician. After the abdication of the sultanate, when some Albanian scoundrels attacked his room kill him, he played the ney. Against the swords, he defended himself heroically, like Ottoman Sultan.

III. Selim died before he succeeded. But Mahmud II will succeed. had learnt a lesson from him.

IV. Mustafa: He was sultan for about one year.

II. Mahmud: was one of the greatest of the Ottoman sultans. He was 23 years old. The fact that he defeated the insolent people like **Ali of Tepedelenli** and a nest of corruption like **the Janissary Corps** and laid the foundation today's Turkish army his greatness. It is an **injustice** against Mahmud II that he **faced** many disasters despite all endeavours and his good . He to adopt western civilisation in a conscious way, but not to lose anything from our national identity. Mahmud II **introduced** the newspaper to Turkey. With this, he had no other aim than to open the public's mind. In other words, he was **not** doing things with the idea of , but be useful for the country.

Sultan Abdülmecid: Abdülmecid was **not** idle and helpless either. Many schools were opened in his time. And, fortunately, Turkey, which had been fighting alone against several enemies for centuries, found European allies for the first time in his era and had the opportunity to throw one more shot at the historical enemy Muscovy. Throughout his life, he knew how to choose men and listen to the words of those he chose.

Sultan Aziz: In his time, the state was one of the great states of Europe. The first girls' school was opened in his time. **Darülfünun, Law and Civil Faculty** were founded in his time. Abdülâziz, who was a wrestler , encouraged and protected **wrestling**, our national sport. He was preparing a great **war** against Russia. For this purpose, he had **established** a large navy. wanted to liberate Crimea. He was a great sovereign. His biggest flaw was that he put the state into debt.

V. Murad: Murad V, whose boundaries were weak, stayed on the throne for a very short time. Nothing can be said about him.

Abdülhamid II: was **not** a bad ruler as it has been said and written, on the contrary, he was a great and genius monarch. **There** has not yet been an unbiased study on him, **prepared** by reviewing all documents. Since the 1908 Constitutional **Monarchy**, it has become fashionable to write and speak against him in the manner of "Hit him, hit him!", which has led to the belief that Abdul Hamid was an unprecedentedly evil, bloodshed-inducing sovereign, but this is completely false.

Those who write that Sultan Hamid was bad are his enemies, the Unionists. In other words, they are the ones who ruined the empire that Abdülhamid had kept afloat for 33 years and fled the country. Because Abdülhamid did **not** defend himself and time **justified** him, has become an oppressed person today.

II. Abdülhamid's foreign and financial policy was , while his educational and public works policy was excellent. He successfully prevented the great European states from uniting against Turkey by pitting them against each other, according to European politicians,

Thanks the men he obtained with money from ambassadors and journalists, he always learnt the decisions and opinions of the Western powers about us in time, and found ways to overturn and prevent these decisions. It can be said that Abdülhamid II held the European states in his hands and manipulated them as he wished.

This is also the case with his financial system. Sultan Azziz repaid two thirds the debts taken during his reign. The payment of the remaining one third was completed in the middle of the Republic. During the reign of Abdülhamid, the value of our currency was high. One hundred piastres of lira was worth 108 piastres. In 33 years, more or less, the price of nothing has not changed. Some months there were no monthly salaries and there was no such thing as hunger and misery in the country.

The number of schools opened during the reign of Abdülhamid and the academic publications is astonishingly high. The main sources such as Şakîl-i Osmani, Kaamûsü'l-lâm, Kaamûs- Türkî, Polish- Osmânî, which we still refer to first hand, were published at this time. Then, it is very noteworthy that as soon as he became a sultan, he commissioned the preparation of the first work on historical methodology called Hamdetü'l-Usûl.

The biggest fault of Abdülhamid is considered to be his closing the Majlis-Meb'ûsân. In fact, closing the Majlis-Meb'ûsân is one of Sultan Hamid's most far-sighted, nationalist and brilliant acts. "He closed the Majlis, he acted anti-democratically, he was a sultan!" nothing but short-sightedness and demagoguery. What would have happened if this parliament had not been closed? Would the Ottoman Empire reach the highest level of civilisation? On the other hand, the Turkish Empire would have collapsed at the end of the 19th century and become a great power.

It might be said, it would not have been possible to save Anatolia, which was at a more backward cultural level at that time. Because at that time, with a population of 30,000,000

There were 10,000,000 Turks, 12,000,000 non-Muslims and 8,000,000 non-Muslims in the empire. Even Turks only one third of the population. The Christian elements were culturally inferior to the Turks. They were protected by Russia and other European states. They had many intellectuals educated in Europe. The Arab population was not inferior to the Turks in terms of culture, and the idea of taking Arab nationalism and even halalism from the Turks had begun.

What kind of laws could be passed in a parliament that would work under these conditions? Wouldn't all opportunities be prepared to dismantle the empire, wouldn't laws be passed against Turkishness? Wouldn't all elements that have representatives in the parliament immediately start to commit the outrages that we see examples of later on? Wouldn't a parliament that has representatives of 1 million Armenians in it immediately start to commit outrages?

If there had been a parliament, I wonder if Sultan Ham d would have been able to perform his historical duties comfortably in front of the eyes of Europe when there was an Armenian situation? Making judgements without considering all these and other issues would, of course, lead one to **wrong** conclusions.

Abdülham d II did not stand **idle** after he closed the Parliament. He tried to educate the Turkish people in the schools he **opened**. All commanders of the World War I and the War of Independence were Abdulham d's trainees.

Rumours about Sultan Ham d being bloody ruler and "red sultan" are also false. He is a red sultan only for the Armenians who want to dismember this homeland. Abdülham d, who is a red sultan for the enemies of the homeland, only be a "**white sultan**" for us.

It is also understood that the rumours that he had the liberationist students of Medicine and Harb ye thrown into the sea were false. Sultan Ham d did not build a political roof. He even forgave those who built a water caste for him. The rumour that Abdülham d had **Mithat** Pasha killed not historically positive. The rumour that he was **shot** by the Sharif of Mecca while being kidnapped by the British should also be thoroughly examined.

The biggest punishment Sultan Ham d gave was exile. He used to give pensions to exiles. also showed his greatness by building Namik Kemal's grave.

When the Majlis opened in 1908 and he spoke to the deputies:

"While almost all of the non-Muslim parliamentarians in the last were **educated** in Europe, most of ours were illiterate. As such, our parliamentarians could not resist the abuse and undermining of the state by non-Muslims. For thirty years I **have tried** to enlighten the Muslim people by opening many schools. I don't know if it will be enough, may Allah bless you!"

This proof of his correct view. In order to understand the truth of this, one only to remember the arrogant actions and words of the non-Muslim elements in the Constitutional Assembly of 1908.

Through the propaganda of the Unionists and their henchmen, Sultan Abdülham d was virtually turned into an enemy of Turkishness. In fact, he **used** Turkishness as a weapon, **was** also interested in the Turks of Central Asia and trusted only **the Special Ertuğrul Regiment**, which was formed from the Karakeç l's in **Söğüt**, throughout his life.

One day, when he was making the janitors in the palace garden **do their work**, he was angry at the incompetence of one of them and shouted: "Donkey Turk!" to the palace officer, who was Albanian, and said: "I am a Turk too!" and called out to that officer

It caused him to faint from fear. If his national consciousness had not been strong, he would have been able to ignore the incident he had accidentally watched from the window.

Abdülhamid II also made some marvellous gestures. During World War I, when the enemy navy was forcing the Dardanelles and the situation in crisis, it was considered that the government should move to Anatolia and delegation was sent to Abdülhamid, who was living an ascetic life in the Beğlerbeğ Palace at the time, by his brother Mehmed V. This delegation was headed by Talât Beğ, who later became a pasha, and was to explain the situation and the necessity moving to Anatolia. After listening to the delegation in silence, Abdülhamid said the following:

"When our Prophet Fattok Istanbul, the last Byzantine Emperor did not think of fleeing the city, he died at the head of his army. Are we not as good as the Emperors of the Byzantine Empire that we are thinking of leaving this city? If the Ottoman Dynasty leaves Istanbul, it will never be able to return there again. my honourable brother: I cannot take a single step out of Istanbul!"

When Abdülhamid died, the magnificent ceremony that was organised for him was a tribute to his memory and to repair the injustices he had suffered. In this sad ceremony, his former enemies, **Talaat Pasha** and **Enver Pasha**, the two great figures of the Unionists who had deposed him, wept bitterly.

Sultan Hamid was, in a word, the most vigilant and conscious person. He ruled the Ottoman Empire from Yıldız Hill alone. He built schools, roads and He endeavoured to glorify him with scientific publications. He prepared strong staff officers. He drove the Armenians to silence. He prevented the Balkan nations from uniting against us by pitting them against each other. He played the European states like puppets. If a bird flew in Turkey and Europe, it would be news. He had established intelligence network that overshadowed the British intelligentsia. He protected valuable people. With money, he turned his enemies into servants. He was very honourable. He never involved women in state affairs. He didn't shed blood. He never played with anyone's bread. Thus, he kept the empire alive for 33 years, weak from within and surrounded by external threats. He established such an authority over the Islamic world that European states were afraid of this influence. Thanks to his power, the Christians of Istanbul and Rumel felt a sense of inferiority the Turks. Hundreds of them were converting to Islam every month, voluntarily. Had he not been deposed and had he ruled the state with the same authority for another ten years, the Balkan War not have broken out, Turkey would not have entered World War I and the empire would not have been lost.

In short, Abdülhamid II is the most marvellous representation of what is the opposite of poverty and destitution.

V. Mehmed: He was a very kind-hearted, good-natured, fatherly and patriotic ruler. However, when he came to the throne, he was diseased. Furthermore, **the Unionists** had dominated the country and led the state into war. Except for some interventions, this blessed man, **who did not** interfere in the affairs of the state, **saw** the Balkan disaster, but he **died** without seeing the great disaster.

VI Mehmed: was the most talented of the Ottoman sultans. Therefore, he **was** labelled as a traitor. But **was not** a traitor, was a patriot like all Ottoman sultans. When Mehmed travelled to Germany, he visited the firing lines on the western front, and when he was told to bow his head in the face of any unexpected threat, he replied: "The Turkish head does not bow in the face of the enemy!".

He was an intelligent and authoritative padshah. He hated the Unionists. But He admired **Talaat Pasha** very much.

"If Talaat Pasha had not been tainted with that clan, would have been able to save this state."

At the Armistice, when he convened the Sultanate Council and opened the session with short speech and then left the hall, Mehmed Abdülmecid, who was with him, was forced to take his arm and the Sultan, who had tears in his eyes, could not help saying: "I am crying like a woman!".

It is asked why he did not leave Istanbul and take over the national movement in Anatolia.

Sultan Mehmed VI could not do this; **he left Istanbul, the enemies would never give this city to the Turks again.** He could not send the princes to the head of the national movement. It was also possible for the British using this as an excuse to expel and occupy, which was under military occupation, legally and permanently. **He sat under pressure to save Istanbul and the dynasty and sent commanders he trusted to start operations in Anatolia.** After receiving Kâzım Karabekir Pasha and telling him that all his hopes were in the young pashas, he **asked** him who else he could recommend to be sent to Anatolia; when Kâzım Karabekir mentioned Mustafa Kemal Pasha's name, he **welcomed** this with satisfaction, and he had great confidence in Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who was already his aide, he summoned him to his presence, **talked to him** and asked him to go to Anatolia and establish an organisation

gave him 40.000 gold coins. Most of this money was obtained by selling the **race** horses **he had been** breeding. Vah dedd n was good horseman and a scholar of jurisprudence at the same time.

His later behaviour towards the National Movement was always due to the pressure of British. had told his eldest **Ulviye** Sultan during his expatriation years this was not of any legal value and that he could find no other way appease the British.

Mehmed VI, who endured calamity of expatriation with great fortitude, did not utter a word **Mustafa Kemal Pasha**, who had deposed nor he let him say it. "History settle this future!" said.

In his last days, after telling Ulv ye Sultan he **could** no longer return to his homeland:

"When you return, tell them that I am not a traitor!" said.

VI. Mehmed two mistakes: , he appointed **Damad Ferid** Pasha as grand vizier several times. This is difficult to understand. Because it is known that **he** hated Damad Ferd. It is possible that he **made** him grand vizier with the pressure of the British. This Damad Fer d Pasha **brought** the affairs of the state to a dead end due to his lack of intelligence and his prioritisation of personal grudges; he **prepared** the disaster of Sultan Vah dedd n.

His second **mistake** was to seek refuge with the British. It is certain that he did this he saw his life in danger. It natural for people whose lives are in danger to resort to every remedy. However, as the representative of a dynasty like the Osmanogulları, who had been in **contact** with death for hundreds of years and **were accustomed** to embrace it like a lover, Sultan Vah dedd n's fear of death **was unbecoming** of him. However, these issues have not yet been analysed with an objective view of history, a more definite judgement cannot be made today. Our conclusion is **as follows**: Whatever his faults, **Sultan Vahideddin is not** and cannot **a traitor**... Because he is **an Osmanoglu**.

The work Görüp tt kler m, published by the Turkish Historical Society, a republican scientific institution founded in the Republican era, and the memoirs of Sultan Vah dedd n's chief of staff **Ali Fuad Türkgeldi**, is the acquittal of Mehmed VI in the historical court.

Ş md , let me review the **Ottoman dynasty** from a historical point of view in an unbiased manner:

This dynasty takes **the** first place in world history for being the longest-lived of the ruling families that **have** ruled from one branch in the same country. Although the Japanese have been ruled by the same ruling dynasty for 2600 years.

Although they say that they were controlled, this is of no value. Because until the last century, the Japanese have **lived** on their islands without any contact with anyone. What would Japan have become if it had gone through the storms of history that other nations have gone through? This is a matter to be considered. Furthermore, the fact that they have been a dynasty for 2600 years cannot be considered as historical achievement. This miracle said by the Japanese themselves. It **not** acceptable in terms of history.

Among the nations that have **participated** in the general flow of the world, none has lasted as long as the Ottoman Dynasty. Although **the Capet Dynasty** of the French (987-1789) lasted 802 years, they did not come from a single branch like the Ottoman Dynasty. From 1380 onwards, **the Valois** branch took over. This means that the original Capets ruled for 393 years. The Valois **were** not a single branch either. **were Bourbon** and **Orlean** rulers from two different branches.

The longest-lived German **Habsburg dynasty** ruled for 35 years between 1273-1308, 302 years between 1438-1740 and 61 years between 1745-1806. Side intervals. All together, that's 398 years. The Netherlands **Orange**

Dynasty da intermittentas four reigned in the campaign. 91 years between 1559-1650 in the first one and 1672-1702 in the second one between 30year, in the third 1747-1795 between 48 years, and 161 years between 1814 and 1975 (until the present day) in the fourth

has been ruling for 330 years.

The longest-lived dynasty, even in Britain, a country renowned for its conservatism

The House of Anjou ruled for 329 years between 1154 and 1483.

Even in , the oldest state, if we leave the legendary dynasties and take the historical dynasties, we see the **Tang Dynasty** (618-907) as the longest lasting one. Its duration was 298 years. Although the **Han dynasty of the** Chinese ruled for 427 years, they divided into two branches, the Great Khan and the Little Khan.

One of the longest lasting of the Turkic dynasties in Yan Mongolian **Cengiz Family** 1206-1634 between 428 year, **The Artuk dynasty** in southern Anatolia ruled for 300 years between 1108-1408. and theyve done it.

In order to get a better idea of this, it is enough to look at following list of long-lasting dynasties various nations:

Ottoman dynasty from Turks 623 years (1299-1922) P
yast dynasty from Poles 528 years (842-1370) Oldenburg
dynasty from Danes 527 years (1448-1975) Abbasid dynasty
from Arabs 508 years (750-1258)
Parthian Parthian dynasty 475 years (249 BC - 226 ADNorwegian
Itl ng dynasty 456 years (863-1319) Turkic Kun dynasty 446
years (220 BC - 226) Turkic Ceng z dynasty 428 years (1206-
1634) (branch in
Sasanian dynasty of Iranians 425 years (226-651)
Hungarian Arpad dynasty 418 years (890-1308) German
Habsburg dynasty 398 years (1273-1308, 1438-1740)
1745-1806)
Capet Dynasty from the French 353 years (987-1380)
British House of Anjou 329 years (1154-1483)
From the Dutch the Orange Dynasty 330 years (1559-1650,
1672-1702,
1747-1795,
1814-1975)
Artuk Dynasty of Turks 300 years (1108-1408)
Romanof Dynasty of Russians 294 years (1623-1917)
Tang Dynasty of Chinese 289 years (618 - 907)
Portuguese House of Bragansa 270 years (1640-1910)
Bourbon dynasty in Spain 232 years (1700-1932)
Macedonian dynasty in B zans 189 years (867-1056)
Swedish Vasa dynasty 131 years (1523-1654)

This means that even the longest lasting dynasties of other nations cannot compete with the Ottoman Dynasty. This is undoubtedly a point in favour of the Ottoman Dynasty. Because they were in a quiet country on the shore.

not ruling as a sultan, he was ruling in country that was waging war against seventy k nations. They ruled over 12 nations with a handful of Turks.

I cannot say anything about the number of large, medium and small-sized men in the dynasties of other nations. But the Ottoman sultans, can make following list:

Osman Gaz , Orhan Gaz , Murad I, Yıldırım Bayazıd, Musa Çeleb , Mehmed Çeleb , Murad II, Fat h, Bayazıd II, Yavuz, Kanunî, Murad III, Ahmed I, Genç Osman, Murad IV, Mustafa II, Ahmed III, Mahmud I, Mahmud III, Sel m III, Mahmud II and Abdülham d II, 21 of them great personalities. Especially half of them very great and illustrious personalities.

Süleyman Çeleb , Mustafa Çeleb , Sultan Cem, Sel m II, Murad III, Mehmed IV, Mustafa III, Abdülham d I, Abdülmec d, Abdülâz z and Mehmed V. 11 of them medium-sized individuals. Their virtues outweigh their defects. When making judgements about them, it is necessary to take into consideration the conditions of the age they lived in.

Suleiman II, Ahmed II, Osman III and Mustafa IV were four of them. Since their reigns were very short, it is difficult to make a correct judgement about them.

Mustafa I, Ibrah m and Murad V3 of them are mentally illMustafa I and Murad V remained on the throne for a very short time. Sultan Ibrah m, who was a normal and very capable sultan at first, later fell ill, his nerves broke down and he remained on the throne there was no prince to replace him. Since all three of them were ill, we cannot make judgements about them like normal people.

Mehmed VI has not yet become history. The statements about his with the British true. if it were true, while **Mithat Pasha**, who called on the British to interfere in Turkish affairs, was considered a great patriot, it is a strange injustice to accuse Mehmed VI of treason. The verdict on him should have been after his relatives made a defence.

Accordingly, if teacher analogy is made, out of this class of 40 students, 32 passed the class and 4 failed. are 3 students who failed the class. They also failed because they were ill. 1 person's exam paper be revised. Then, it is the most natural result that he also passes the class. Such a class is a perfect class.

Gündüz Beğ, Savcı Beğ, Baykoca Beğ and **Aydoğdu Beğ**, side 4 of them are martyrs.

Ertuğrul, Osman I, Orhan, Süleyman Pasha, Yıldırım, Yakub Çelebi, Süleyman Çelebi, Mehmed Çelebi, Musa Çelebi, İsa Çelebi, Mustafa Çelebi Murad II Fatih Cem Bayazıd II Yavuz Kanunî Mehmed III, Osman Murad IV Mustafa 22 veterans.

I. Murad both a veteran and a martyr.

II. Starting from **Murad**, almost all of them were . Most of them were calligraphers, musicians or .

Now, it is unjust to say that for such a family they are all ignorant and helpless. Today, the republic is established in country. There can be no question of the Ottoman Dynasty coming back again. For this reason, we can openly say what we are proud of in history.

The Ottoman dynasty is the **largest** family in Turkish history. **has** made and withdrawn **the** honour its historical duty. Undoubtedly, they also had their faults. However, it would be ungrateful to our own history and past try to belittle and show the Ottoman sultans as a whole. Especially the inclusion such ideas in school books is a great threat to national education.

From now on, we have to learn how to deal **with** our history and we have to put this into practice. We determine where the history of our nation **began**, the year state was founded, and the days of great festivals.

Respect for the values of the past... This is condition of and morality... No matter how revolutionary we are, we are still bound to the past. Because: We are ancestors with roots in the past!

(Tanrıdağ, 10th and 11th issues, 10 and 17 July 1942)

8 This one Sentence, k tab "Eat Turkish Cumhuriyet
Maar f Vekâlet Neşriyatından" ser record from the edition
published in 1926.

When was the Turkish Land Army Established?

In 1963, the Commander of the Turkish Land Forces celebrated the 600th anniversary of the establishment of the Turkish Land Forces with a speech on the radio.

Accordingly, the Turkish land forces, or more literally, the Turkish army established in 1363.

With these statements and congratulations, it has once again become evident what kind of a state we are in in terms of self-knowledge and national consciousness.

Those who, celebrating the 600th anniversary of Turkish land forces, accept that it was founded in 1363 should be asked the following question: If our land army was founded in 1363, fought the great battles, great strategic moves and tactical engagements before that? Was it not the Turkish armies that made these moves and won the great field battles? For example, was the oft-repeated victory of **Malazgirt in 1071** won by the Turkish army, but by gangs? Or was this army formed by foreign soldiers paid by the Turkish state?

Was it not the Turkish army that won the **Battle of Dendânekan in 1040**, the **Battle of Pasinler in 1048**, and the great battles of **Kılıç Arslan I**, **Mesud I** and **Kılıç Arslan II** against the crusaders?

It is a mistake to assume that the Turkish army was founded in 1363, which would hurt national pride. The Turkish army founded in 1363 was not Turkish army, but a few guard companies composed of **Devş** rmeler. In the great military movements of the Ottoman Dynasty, their role was only a minor one, and the main battle was fought by the **Timarids**, the army that had existed since ancient times.

To talk about a new army organisation with **the army established** in 1363. If this is the case, it is also **wrong**. Because this army was abolished by the state in the XIXth century and a new one **was established**, and even after the Balkan War, the army was reorganised with teachers brought from Germany and a new organisation. **The** changes did not end here either. In terms of , organisation, , dress, even **marching** and **stepping**, does our army now resemble the army that fought the War of Independence?

This being the case, we should look at the army of the times before 1363 in the same way as we look at them as the ranks of the same army in **different** ages, and this is the truth.

A nation whose history is known through historical documents since 220 B.C.E. and which is known in history the first class of soldiers, **will live** for 16 centuries without an army, then will come to its senses only in 1363 and establish a land army, and this army be composed of foreigners, as if there were no Turks **left** on earth!

It is difficult to find words against this.

This incident the degree of lack of national culture in the country.

That national consciousness can be **sustained** by national culture is a fact as clear as the roundness of the earth. The source of national culture is some courses in schools. Turkish language and Turkish history are the most important of these subjects. If the Minister of National Education merges history, geography and homeland knowledge and replaces them with a stand-alone Turkish history course and makes it taught from the second grade of primary school until the end of the high school year, he **have** made a very appropriate move.

The **knowledge** of their own history in the intellectuals of other nations above all . It only be possible for our intellectuals to become like this through new adjustments in the curricula. In short, primary and secondary education will be organised according to national consciousness on the one hand and the requirements of the atomic age on the other.

If the Commander of the Turkish Land Forces had taken a good Turkish history course during his high school education; if he had known the victories of **Attila, Kül , Çağrı Beğ**, the march of **Cengiz Khan's** young commander **Jebe** in Eastern Europe and the unique armies of these commanders, he would not have said that the Turkish land forces were **established** in 1363.

So, when were the Turkish land forces established?

According to our current historical knowledge, the first organised Turkish army **was founded** in 209 B.C.E. by **Mete** (=Motun), the **god-king Mete** (=Motun).

unconditional obedience was accepted. The army was **divided** into units of 10, 100 and 1000 **men**. Just as **Fatih** had created **a new cannon** during the siege of Istanbul, Mete had created **a long-range bow**, and thanks to this army, he became the creator of Turkish nation by uniting the region from Kora to the Caspian into a single state.

After that, all our armies are the continuation of the army of Tannikut Mete. From time to time and corrections **were made**, but the spirit and foundation **remained** the same.

For this reason, 1963 was **not** the 600th, but the 2172nd year **of the establishment of the** Turkish land forces, i.e. the Turkish army.

This is an announcement to all generals and officers.

(Orkun, 18th issue, 15 July 1963)

30 August and the Turkish Army

When 30 August is mentioned, of course, Turkish army immediately comes to mind. When one thinks of the Turkish army, one cannot help but go back to the depths of the past and proudly remember an epic of battles.

Our history first and foremost a history of fights. A history of fights full of unique heroism, masterpiece examples of the art of command, and the epic of the distinguished army of history...

We do not know for certain when the Turkish army was founded, or more accurately, when Turkish warriors became an army. When we come to the light of history, an army. And what an army... That unique and invincible army created by our great emperor **Tanrikut Mete** or Motun, who was called "Oğuz Han" in the epic... Tanrikut Mete **realised** that religious system was more than just a weapon for an army. With this in mind, he built the most devout army in history and instilled such a spirit in his soldiers that whatever he commanded was done blindly. So much so that they did not hesitate to shoot their horses, which were their wealth, and their beloved ones, **their honoured ones** and their brothers and sisters, by making them targets, Tanrikut commanded them **to** do so.

Today's **softened** people, doubt, cannot and will not do such a thing. However, the philosophy of those who want to do much with little force, to build a great state and create a nation cannot withstand a shrivelled spirit. Mete, the God of God, established the eternal religion of the Turkish nation and showed the whole world what military religion is and what it **can** do.

is blind obedience, and in blind obedience the greatest creative consciousness is hidden. No difficulty can be solved by arguing in the face of death at the moment of crisis. **Even decision obeyed is more productive than the right decision argued.**

Mete's Huns had no need for bravery and glory. He was more brave and glorious than necessary. Mete added **discipline** to these virtues.

and eternalised the Turkish race.

Displac... The pride of giving orders and the intoxication of taking orders... This intoxication a marvellous thing, and in it a terrible force like atomic energy.

Huns, Tabgachs, Apars, Gök Turks, Uighurs, Karakhanids and Seljuks all fought with the same strategy and tactics. make an immediate raid or to retreat when the enemy attacked and to engage in a decisive battle after exhausting the enemy by driving him away from his base. Attacking the enemy in the form of a crescent moon with a rain of arrows, retreating quickly in the form of a crescent moon if the enemy held on, and back with unerring arrows while retreating.

It is a method that is always ready to trap the enemy in its pincers, in the chase and in flight, and has many times destroyed him by closing in.

War became a philosophy of life in the steppes. has not yet been born and Turks do not know eternal paradise, nor do they know that martyrs will go to paradise. Even so, they are eager to die in war, they are ashamed to die at home, and they turn yellow in the face of such a need.

Of course can't defeat such an army. , but defeated, never!...

It is certain that military service from father to son produced good warriors. When the division of labour in human life and society became more complex Turks also adopted military service with fiefs. This meant a military army and had very productive results for centuries. The fief soldier was the owner of a piece of land. He received the income from the land, but was ready for war. When he died, he was replaced by the best of his sons. The first conquests of the Ottomans, which were seen as an enigma and a miracle, were made by this small land aristocracy, the fief army.

Time has proved that Mete was the founder of a great military philosophy. As long as the Turkish army remained loyal to Mete's principles, it was not defeated, and even if it was defeated, it was able to recover immediately. When they deviated from Mete's principles, defeats became evident.

Military service a profession of sacrifice and renunciation. a soldier must also renounce personal whims. A soldier who does not unconditionally follow his command when he receives it

Man cannot be a soldier. There is a unique beauty in this worship. Everybody in the face of what he does not like. The most unlovely human being, even the animal, does this. But the human being who can sacrifice his pleasure, desire, and ideas for the sake of great principle, without thinking of what he likes, is the most superior human being. Religion and obedience are the qualities of a civilised person. In our history, the penalty for the times when religion is broken

paid with defeats. In our last period, we were poisoned by a new germ other than religious insecurity: **Politics! The Balkan War** showed what kind of germ this **is** and what it **can** cost. The Turkish army, which the whole world **thought** would destroy the Balkans in a few months, suffered terrible defeat because of the political germ that had entered the officer corps. In order to understand how the political system is a gnawing germ, it is enough to look at the honourable and epic battles of this army, which was defeated by the Balkans in 1913, against the champions of that time such as England and France in 1914-1918.

There are some people who say that in our time, when the Czech armed forces have emerged, there is no value **left in being** a soldier. If these **are not** deliberate defeatists, they pessimistic and ignorant people. If a nation with a military spirit **is prepared in the manner** required **by** reason, it is impossible to defeat it with a few atomic bombs. Little Sweden prepared for atomic warfare even though it had no atomic weapons. **bunkers**, atomic warfare training and guerrillas...

What does the Turkish army do when attacked **by an** armed enemy in the Czech Republic? If it has the same weapons, there is no problem. If they do not have the same type of weapons, they will scatter **in the** mountains and caves and the most glorious and bloody, longest and war **in** history.

When the French **attacked** Çanakkale, they were sure that the Turkish soldier, **who had just come out** of the Balkan War, could not do anything against those superior weapons against that morale and that education. Even the German officers in the Turkish army the same opinion. But **Enver** Pasha's strict discipline

The army, which had been prepared in a year and a half, under the command of its competent and self-sacrificing officers, fought against them and stopped them and drove them away. Because their souls were **filled** with the belief of victory. But the French, who did not have the belief of victory in their souls, were defeated by the German **attack** in 12 days, even though they were behind Majno.

As we commemorate 30 August, we think of the victory won by the power of faith and remember 26 August, which was the beginning of it. 26 August is also the anniversary of another **battle of faith**, Malazgirt, in which 40,000 men crushed 100,000. And we want the truth, the real holiday befitting the Turks of Turkey is the holiday of 26-30 August.

As we commemorate 30 August, we celebrate its martyrs and fifty million heroes, the martyrs of all wars. We think of our army, which is the essence of our nation, and its honour roll. We honour our officers, the officers of the army of the Godkut Mete

We wish that it would be as radical as it is. In our age when military service is becoming more difficult, wish that our officers and non-commissioned officers should be trained in a more dignified manner, and for this reason we regret the moves towards the closure of our military schools.

Life is war. Those who fear death should not live. Just as flags become flags as they are watered with blood, and soil becomes a homeland as it is watered with blood, societies mankind as long as they know how to die. Only animals and animalised human beings escape from death. The most beautiful death is for the sake of homeland and honour. Our martyrs, who make our hearts ache also our pride and joy...

This article is a tribute to Turkish army, its fifty million martyrs and tomorrow's martyrs.

(National Road, 31st issue, 31 August
1962)

Turkish Epic

It is an honour a nation to possess a national epic, which is the form of great events, **wars** and heroism in the past. Not every nation has achieved this goal. The national epic, which shows us the past like vague images seen through veils and saves us from great darkness, which vaguely expresses the hopes of a race for **the future**, which carries the seeds of a nation's high literature, is one of the most valuable jewels of the national treasury. However, in for this jewel to find its full value, it **must** be crafted and shaped for years in the hands of high artist. The most perfect **example** of this **work** is Iranian epic and Ferdowsi, who shaped it into the Shahnameh.

We are one of the fortunate half nations that have epics big pieces, most of which are continuations of each other. Our **unfortunate** fact is that until now, no great artist has **emerged** from our midst to unite these epic fragments.

A national epic is such an important national force that it is sometimes seen to sustain or **destroy** a nation. Ferdowsi: "Persian and Persian nations were destroyed!" He is right when he says: "Persian and Persian nations were destroyed! Iran, which had lost its entire national existence and even its old racial characteristics when it was destroyed by the Arab rule, gained spiritual and spiritual rule thanks to the Shahnâme Ferdowsi before its legal rule in the last period. It would not be an **exaggeration** to say that Persian language and Persian national spirit **lived** only thanks to Shahnâme. Some small nations, who realised the role of national epic in national life, even tried to invent their own national epic.

I wonder, what kind of is the Turkish epic? What times, what heroes, what thoughts and characters does it describe? Compared to the Greek epic, theirs is more full of myths.

On the other hand, it is immediately that ours is historical. Perhaps this is the result of the Turks' national character, which avoids **exaggeration**.

Leaving aside the fragment about the creation of the world and human beings and some epic fragments of Altai Turks **which remain** very localised, it is possible to call the Turkish epic a kind of folk history. However, **the** poetry in the legendary and the patriotism in the historical ones are invaluable elements for the artist who will create a great Turkish epic in verse and prose.

Our national epics, which are the patriotic and lyrical echo of Turkish history, bring us the fragments of the VII century BC. But unfortunately, we can learn the nature of this great epic and its protagonist **Alp Er Tunga** only Iranian sources. Only **lament** has **survived** from the Turkish version of this epic, which **was** committed to paper in the XI century after the Ottoman Empire and lost its authenticity.

F rdevsî mentioned the Turkish hero, whom the Iranians called "Afrās yâbat length in the Shahnâme. He portrayed him as a **defeated** and evil ; in fact, due to the influence of the Shahnâme on the Turks, Afrās yâb became the epitome of evil in Turkish literature of the Seljuks and Ottomans.

Even a cursory glance at Turkish epics is enough to see the physical and patriotic elements in them. The beauty of women, the inspiration and **loyalty of** women, immeasurability in heroism, always **winning**, the horse being a loyal **companion** to man, always being punished, honour and dignity being superior to life are the main elements in Turkish epics.

See the epic about the creation of the world:

"When there is nothing else, there is only God and eternal water. When God, bored with this loneliness, was thinking what to do, a white woman emerged from the water and said to God, who was thinking what to do, 'Create!

He disappears in the water with inspiration. It is on this inspiration that God creates the devil, the earth and human beings."

Remember the epic about the derivation of the Nine Oghuzes:

"One of the Hun emperors has two daughters so beautiful that he thinks that they cannot be given to any human being, they can only be the **wives** of God. With this thought, he builds a tower in a high place of the country, puts the girls there and away after begging God to take them as wives. After a while a wolf settles at the base of the tower and shouts incessantly, attracting the attention the girls. Thinking God has shown himself in the form of a wolf, they **marry** him. And the Nine Oghuzs were derived from this marriage, and since their ancestors were wolves, they sang folk songs in a voice resembling the howl of a wolf."

It is seen bed ilism, which manifests itself in the idolatrous societies, has become very entertaining among the Nine Oghuz Turks. In addition to the "descent from the wolf father", which is the memory of totemism or the old bozkurt dynasty, the motif of "birth from two beautiful sisters" as a physical element is probably powerful enough to be the subject of many historical-epic works and operas.

Today, knowledge of the Turkish epic is certainly not complete. There is to show that important parts of the epic are still alive in Anatolia. One of these is some new Dede Korkut variants during researches in recent years, and the other is a small book entitled *The Conquest of Adana* published by Bak Arık. The publication of the living memory of the conquest of Adana among the Turks of Adana made us think that our other cities may also have such conquest epics. Our conversations with some Anatolian intellectuals have taught us at least some of our cities have such epics, and that these epics, which are sung among the people and gradually forgotten as the elderly become fewer and fewer, will be lost if they are not put down on paper soon.

Turkish epic other issues as well. One of them is that the authorities have not reached a common opinion and conclusion on the epic fragments that have been published and even taken forms. For example, the epic "Battal Gaaz" a Turkish epic or an Arab epic translated or adapted into Turkish? Is the epic "Köroğlu" a part of the Gok Turkic epic of the VII century or an Anatolian epic the XVI century? "Manas" epic a Karakhanid epic of the Xth century or a Kyrgyz epic of the XVII century?

It is seen that these are not issues to be underestimated. Unless these are resolved, it is impossible to unite the fragments of the epic and create a monument of art. is impossible. Just as a long preparation is required to connect our national history to a system, a strenuous work needed put our national epic into a definite form, to illuminate its doubtful sides, to take what belongs to us and discard what does not belong to us.

(Orkun, 30th issue, 27 N san 1951)

Studies on the Turkish Epic

According to my knowledge, the first Turk to work on the Turkish epic was **Ziya Gökalp**. Although Gökalp was not a great poet, he put some parts of the Turkish epic into verse in a simple and concise language, and this was not for scientific, but only for national and educational purposes. However, the verse tales and epics Gökalp wrote for children, which he slightly changed from the original, were not in fact verses that children could understand. Since his first attempts in this field were of a symbolic nature, could only be understood by intellectuals with a certain culture.

A poem written by Gökalp under the title "Turkish Flood" in the weekly magazine *Çocuk Dünyası* (Children's World), which was once published for primary school children, is a modified version of the *Oğuz Epic*. Karahan was the father of *Oğuz Han* in the original of this epic, Gökalp turned him into foreign enemy and the word Karahan became a symbol of the blackness that oppresses Turks. As this poem appeared in the 30 May 1329 (=1913) issue of *Çocuk Dünyası* (Children's World), Gökalp was 37 years old at the time and had not yet matured in terms of turkology. He wrote this poem only during the disastrous days of the Balkan War, in order to draw strength from the past and hope for the future. The last verses of the 58 couplet poem clearly show this:

The truth is the lie, this
is in the remainder;
when the Turks were in
darkness, Oghuz saved
them from this trouble, he
gave them salvation! A
new life began;

The red apocalypse
has broken out, an
omen for the new day;
If today, asking God for
blood and arms
If we don't get out, let'
know: We are no
more...

Gökalp's poem "Kızılelma", published during the World War I, also contains some parts of the Turkish epic. The pieces titled "Alagey k" and "Ergenekon" are completely or partially taken from the Turkish epic. The poem "Alagey k", written in seventh syllable meter, a highly modified version of the Ergenekon Epic of the Sky Turks. Gökalp is a poet who demonstrates the power of Turkish in the most beautiful way:

I opened a diamond
room, I saw the giant
king asleep, I cut off his
head, I said: "O fr t,
khan, where is the world
beautiful?" He said:
"Hand in hand!"
I turned round and saw a
beautiful girl in a Kyrgyz
dress.
He's standing there
looking at me, and I feel
like lightning!

The part of this verse which shows that it is taken from the Ergenekon Epic is in the last verses.

When we passed
through mountains
and rocks, we came to
Dem rkapi. I said,
"Open!" and it
opened. When I gave
way, the secret
dormitory,

He took us, a grizzly,
crossed Mount Kaf and
brought us to Turkel.

The poem "Ergenekon", written in syllabic eighth form, is both an epic and a history in terms of its content as well as form. In its first stanzas, it describes the well-known Islamic form of the Oghuz Epic and the Epic of Ergenekon. Gökâlp obviously took these parts from Ebûlgâz Bahadır Han's work titled *Türk Şeceresi*. The later stanzas are the essence of Turkish history.

However, Gökâlp also wrote his poems with the aim of inculcation, he did not neglect to give a lesson to the readers at the end:

Crimea, Kazan is wasted!
Danube, Caucasus have
been ruined! What in
Turkistan, our ears are
tuned.
When I entered the
dormitory, Ergenekon
happened again. Won't
Börteç ne come out? Won't
our apprentice be
enlightened?

After the War of Independence, in 1339 (=1923), Gökâlp published a book of verse and prose tales for children, *Altın Işık (Golden Light)* in which he set some Turkish epic fragments to verse. The fragments in *Altın Işık* are taken from Dede Korkut. The fairy tale "Del Dumrul", written in metre 4+4+3, is very faithful to the original and written in simple, beautiful Turkish. The long piece "Arslan Basat", which is a verse version of "Tepegöz" from Dede Korkut, is less successful than the other poems in terms of poetic technique and art.

Ziya Gökalp, being nationalist intellectual who grew up in a period when various national and social tasks were not addressed or not seen properly and because he suffered greatly from this, attempted to do all of them at once, and therefore some of his works were or unfinished. Such was attempt to write the Turkish epic. However, in many areas

The fact that he broke new ground in this field is one of his great honours.

* * *

H İm Ziya Ülküen one of the scholars who dealt with Turkish epic after Gökalp. Only 12 issues in 1340-1341 (= 1924-1925) coming out and Anatolianism for n to spread dealing with monthly magazine. He published the products of his studies on Turkish epic in Anatolia magazine. H İm Ziya Your country, oin the queues I see I think he was a teacher. He was a teacher who was the focal point of the belief in Anatolianism and who was the name and subject of our national history, and the name and subject of our nation. Name, Anatolia geography, m lli feast, Anatolia Among this group, all of whom were young, H İm Ziya was the only one who dealt with the Turkish epic. He dealt with this subject in two ways: He both wrote some epic fragments in long verses, and he also took the epic as a scientific subject and explained how that it has been formed.

It cannot be said that H İm Ziya was successful in his poetry. Because he was not a poet anyway. The poems he published under the title "Anatolian Customs and Epics" and his epic was not very successful in his two scientific articles. Because he was very young at the time, and the subject he dealt with was new and untouched for us. Furthermore, H İm Ziya, in accordance with the principle of the Anatolian magazine, begun his work with the premise of Anatolianism. It is certain that this prejudice prevented him from seeing some historical facts.

Nevertheless, his conclusion and judgement about the epics are correct:

"These are the epics that show all nations, whether victorious or defeated, rich or poor, their ideals and determine their strategies."

(Orkun, 31st issue, 4 May 1951)

The Experience of Classifying Turkish Epic

After Ziya Gökalp and Halim Ziya, studies on Turkish epic became more scientific and methodical. Prof. Zeki Velid Togan was the first Turk who analysed the works on the epics of other nations and classified the Turkish epic in an official way. Zeki Velid Togan, whose deep knowledge and interest in Turkish history is well known, was born in Bashkortostan, the western end of Turkestan, and travelled all over Central Asia for scientific and political reasons, the authority of travelling among the tribes of the Turks who were still living in the epic period, he focused on the national epics with great , and while doing so, he not only wrote the epic but also illuminated some dark points of history through the old epics.

Prof. Zeki Velid Togan's first important writings on the Turkish epic appeared in *Atsız Mecmua*. In the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 5th issues of this magazine published in May, June, July and September 1931, he published four articles under the title "Classification of the Turkish National Epic" and drew attention to the national epic and showed how this epic should be studied.

According to Zeki Velid Togan:

"National epics, rather than depicting historical events, are works of folklore that embody the high national feelings of the nation and show a deal world based entirely or more or less on history.
"barett r."

Three stages are necessary for the creation of national epic:

1- Folk poets tell the adventurous life of nation with an epic spirit in various eras in small pieces.

2- Millet in the whole long lendren b r hid se, this çeşitli It gathers the pieces of the saga around a central point.

3- Finally, there is great civilised movement in the nation and a folk who emerges at that time collects these pieces and creates a national epic. (This is how the Greek, Persian and Persian epics came into being).

According to Prof. Zekî Vel d Togan, Turks went through the second period several times.

"The epics, which gathered the thoughts and ideas of the whole Turkish nation in one place, came into existence due to the events such as the Oghuz (Hun-Kun) and Cheng z Vekay, which united the whole Turkish nation, but they did not enter the third period and could not take the form a regular national epic by being determined by a great folk poet and were blown away. We have only the debris of these great epics."

Can the "wreckage" of these old great epics be reorganised?
Isn't the time of the epic past?

Zekî Vel d Togan acknowledged that the epic era that had passed for Europe had also passed for the Turks, but he did not hesitate to say that the old national epics would be useful nations such as the Turks and the in the long conflict that he had foretold would break out in Europe at that time (i.e. in 1931). According to him, although today's situation and conditions are favourable to recall the old Turkish epics and to use them as a basis for national education, the lack of unity among us in understanding past also an important obstacle.

Prof. Zekî Vel d Togan argues that the Chagatai admiration (and the resulting spiritual Turkic unity) that survived in Türkiye until the time of Sultan Mehmed the Fatimid, was not a result of the propaganda of Egyptian and Syrian historians.

He says that it disappeared and was replaced by the enmity of Çeng z and Tem r. Again, according to him, the Safavids' propaganda of Shi'ism and the endeavour of Raniism are some of the movements that led to the undermining of the Turkish epic with the understanding of national history. Zekî Vel d Togan, who moves on to the main lines of the Turkish epic after putting them forward summarises this epic as follows:

The homeland of first Turks, who were fed by the she-wolf, was the mountains of **Azit Art** near Isig Gol. **Türk** had four sons, among whom **Tüng** salt. His son **Alp Er Tunga** the founder of the Turkish ruling dynasties. **Alanca Kara Khan**, one of his descendants, found out how to obtain msk from auroch, established trade, and introduced hunting with bow and arrow. After Alanca Kara Khan, the country was divided into **Türk** and **Oghuz** or **Mongol** and **Tatar**. **Oghuz Khan** (or **Oghuz Ata**), son of Kara Khan of Mongolian descent, makes great conquests. Vizier **Ulug Türk** is also regarded as the representative of reason and . After Oghuz Khan, his son **Gun Khan** becomes the ruler.

and his vizier named **Irkl Khoja** became famous. After Gun Khan, are nine more rulers, each ruling for 75-125 years, and the reign from the Oghuz dynasty to the **Buğra Khan** dynasty. After Buğra Khan, who is the epic form of the Karakhanids, **Chengiz Khan**, who was born with an extraordinary birthcomes to power. After a few pad shahs from Khan's descendants, **Temir**, **Toktamish** and **Edüğe** complete the epic.

Zekî Vel d Togan did not say much about the epics of Western Turks, i.e. Turkic Turks and Azerbaijanis, he did not work on them much, and only said that the epics of Battal Gaaz and Dan şmend Gaaz, which spread in Anatolia, not Turkish epics, but Islamic epics.

Although the story of Sey d Battal Gaaz takes its subject from the Islamic-Byzantine fights in Anatolia, it does really seem to be a Turkish epic, these fights were the Seljuks, but the earlier Arabs, and the heroes all bear Arabic names. Although **Fuad Köprülü**, in his History of Turkish Literature, labelled it as the first of the Anatolian Turkish epics and suggested that it might have originated among the Turkish element in the Umayyad and especially Abbasid armies during the Islamic-Byzantine battles in Anatolia, certain that the story of Battal Gaaz, which is very mixed with the fairy tale element, does not show the general character of other Turkish epics. it may be thought that it differs from other Turkish epics in the sense that it reflects the religious wars that lasted for centuries in Anatolia, first between the Arabs and then between the Turks and Greeks, such idea and criticism cannot be justified. Because the stories of Dede Korkut, which preserve the memory of the wars fought with the non-Muslim Georgians and Abaza, do not lose anything from the national element even though they have a religious character. I believe that these Dede Korkut stories are the first epic products of Western Turks, namely the Turks of Turkey, Iraq and Azerbaijan.

Although it is clear that they originate from Turkistan and even partly from the era of the Gok Turks, these stories, which were settled, changed and matured in Eastern Anatolia, have a national and epic character that cannot be compared with Battal Gaaz. I do not think it is safe to consider the stories that are known today only among Anatolian Turks and that have an epic character as the epic of Anatolian. It is quite possible that they were passed on to the Turks from other nations and that they were forgotten by their former owners although they lived among the Turks. For example, the epic of Alp Er Tunga

Although it was the property of the Turks, it was almost forgotten among them, but its rich parts taken from us were introduced into the *Shahnâme* by Firdevsî and appropriated by the Iranians.

As for Prof. Zekî Vel d Togan's dismissal of the epic of Dan şmend Gaaz as a Turkish epic: I do not agree with the opinion of the valuable information here, because Battal Gaaz lived among the Arabs and has a historical origin, whereas Dan şmend Gaaz, as it is known, is one of the Anatolian Turkish heroes of the XI century. His epic is **nothing** but a popular folk history as well as an epic. It is certain that the epic of Dan şmend Gaaz is not very similar to the old characteristic Turkish epics. In my opinion, the reason for this is that this story **was** drawn on paper before it passed through an oral period long enough to become an **epic**. We see other examples to reinforce this belief in the beginning of Ottoman history: Ertuğrul Gaaz' coming across two armies in battle and helping the one about to be defeated, his standing in front of the Qur'an until morning, Osman Gaaz's famous dream and his marriage with Ede Balı's daughter after this dream, his crossing to Rumel with rafts, etc. all stories that have historical basis, but which remain between history and fable they were put on paper without completing all the stages of epicisation.

In Ottoman histories such as those of **Âşıkpaşaoğlu, Oruç Beğ**, it is possible to consider most of the events of the early Ottomans as **distorted** and **misidentified** histories, but it is also possible to consider them as epics. Just as some parts of the *Şehnâme* fit the history.

Therefore, if it is necessary to classify the epic of the western Turks, which Prof. Zekî Vel d 's neglected, it is necessary to list it as Dede Korkut, Dan şmend Gaaz, Adana Conquest and early Ottomans, and to leave **Köroğlu** - even if it originally belongs to Turkistan - to the experts to be placed after the Dan şmend Gaaz epic or before the Ottomans.

(Orkun, 32nd issue, 11 May 1951)

An Attempt to Write Turkish Epic

a) Uğuz Kagan Epic

In recent years, there have also been attempts to write the Turkish epic in verse. These attempts were made for the first time not in the form of small fragments as attempted by Ziya Gökalp, but on large parts or the whole of the Turkish epic. Dr Rıza Nur and Basri Gocul were the ones who tried to put the national epic into verse in this way.

Dr Rıza Nur, who was the first deputy minister of education of the national government, had produced many works in his adventurous life, of which twenty years were spent in expatriation, and felt the need to touch upon various subjects in order to serve Turkishness. Among these, the one entitled Uğuz Kağan Epic¹²—the last work of the deceased, and like many others, it was written with the sole purpose of serving Turkishness.

Although Dr. Rıza Nur did not attempt to write the Turkish epic as a whole from beginning to end, he enriched the Uğuz Kagan Epic with fragments from other Turkish epics and created a large work of over 6100 verses. He started his work on 1 November 1937 in İskenderiye. The completion date 1 November 1939. In his "preface" to his epic, Rıza Nur states following:

"The epics and tales of a nation are collected and edited centuries later. After many centuries, I too fell into the desire to write the Turkish epic. I collected them during my study of Turkish history and used them as a basis for Uğuznâme. What I had collected, I had written in prose and skeletal form in Paris in 1932. I was going to write it as a poem according to this basis. From that date until the beginning of 1936, I could not finish my other works and start this epic. They were all finished by this date, but my head was very tired. I had to rest for a long time. Otherwise it would not have been possible to work.

After that, I decided to spend my life, on the one hand, publishing my works and, on the other hand, gradually writing this epic. While I was resting, I also made some editions. Thus, I came to the first day of December 1937. In order to be able to write this epic as a poem and to write it well, I to have my head rested, my health in good health, my heart at ease and money in my pocket. Today, I am still abroad.

Again the head is tired, again the health is broken, again the heart is sad and miserable, again the money continues to be unacquainted with me. I realised that such a time as I wanted would not come to us, it is already opposed.

stemekt . I started writing on this date.

I have desire or ambition in the world, neither myself nor for anyone else. My desire is only this. Let's see how many years it will take to finish it. If I finish it before I die, leave this world with my eyes wide open. May death spare me until I see this service which I have nurtured for many years for the sake of the Turk, for the sake of the sacred Turkishness, in the most precious corner of my heart, like a sweet, golden-winged secret of an exuberant love, which captures the mind, the mind and the whole being, and which I keep in the most precious corner of my heart.

It was possible to write this epic only in Turkish. That's how my heart wanted it. National epics are already written in this way. However, gave up thinking that no Turk would understand such a work today. What is the use of writing if the nation does not understand it? And again, such epic, the vocabulary of language must have been honed, honoured and prepared for a long time. Arabic and Persian words in Turkish

Turkish words have lost these virtues after they were introduced. order to write purely in Turkish, it is necessary to wait until Turkish words are revised. So this is not the time for that yet. However, I have written in the simplest language possible today. There will be many old Turkish words in this work. Foreign words are not only few, but also words that have entered and adapted the Turkish language."

After this, Rıza Nur says that he will use the mesnev style in writing this epic, following the tradition of the ancestors, and will intersperse some small prose pieces. The meter he chose was syllabic ten. However, did not use it with 6+5 or 4+4+3 stops, but free, without stops. Although Rıza Nur says that this would eliminate uniformity , on the , it weakened the harmony of the work. The smaller verses he sometimes used in the epic gave the work a real flavour and these smaller verses were more successful. For example, it not bad for the forest fairies to praise Uğuz he kills K kıyat (i.e. dragon).

This is Uğuz
Kağan El nde
çağan His
posture is
pleasant His shield
on his arm His jida
hele
El nde yaman
This is Uğuz, this
is the one who
burns Acunu
Every Uğuz is
admired and
every Uğuz is
killed

Sev nd forest

Elsewhere, the boasting of hero named Kanturalı before the battle is also an example of successful verse:

I am baturum I am
baturum I am fond
of glory Plains,
mountains The
garden, the
mountains My
home is my
garden From the
sky to the ceiling
I have food I am
thirsty I am
thirsty for blood
Soft bed I do not
come to the lion I
am soldier Let
me do
something for
the enemy today
K c han main

As can be seen in these small examples, Rıza Nur uses both old and old grammatical forms. Especially in some places, he tries to use forms that are not used in Old Turkish, but are used in our spoken language, which is quite strange for us. For example, it is impossible not to find it strange that he says "the plain is full of blood and carrion" instead of "the plain is full of blood and carrion". However, it is also certain that most of us say this when we speak and we say "me, you" instead of "me, you".

The chapter titles of the work are as follows:

The beginning, the reason for writing the epic, the beginning of the epic, the closure of Ergenekon, the exit from Ergenekon, Karahan's kaganate, the birth of Uğuz Kagan, Uğuz Kagan's childhood and youth, Uğuz's battle with Khatla, Uğuz's marriage, Uğuz's poem, Uğuz's love and marriage, Uğuz's battle with his father Karahan, Uğuz's becoming khan, Uğuz Kagan's marriage, Uğuz Kagan's conquest of the world, the organisation of the army, Uğuz Kagan's transition to the army, the arrival of the Chinese envoy, Uğuz Kagan's diving into China, Uğuz Kagan's advice,

The great battug (= war), Uğuz Kagan's taking Khan Baluğu (= Pek n'), yumsab (= messenger) coming from Golden Khan to Uğuz Kagan, Uğuz Kagan's march on Urum, the great battug, Urus Beğ's coming and obedience to Uğuz Kagan and Uğuz Kagan's naming the Urus as Saklab; Uğuz Kagan's the It l river and the Kipchaks Uğuz Kagan's stallion's escape and the Karluksthe house without a key and the Kalachsthe death of Mamak Uğuz Kagan's witch Uğuz Kagan's march on Tangut, Uğuz Kagan's march on Karahitay, the siege of fortress, Itbarak's taking refuge in Uğuz Kagan Uğuz Kagan's return to the east, Uğuz Kagan's the west and Uğuz Kagan's arrival in Kyrgyz, Uğuz Kagan's march to H nd, battgu, Uğuz Kagan's conquest of Kashm r' and Gün Han's love with Sev m Hanım, Uğuz Kagan's return home, Uğuz Kagan's conquest of Iran, battgu Uğuz Kagan's conquest of Sur ye'y and Egypt, the golden bow and three silver arrows, Uğuz Kagan's advice to his sons and the taxation of his homeland, Uğuz Kagan's prayer, the feast, Uğuz Kagan's death, Uğuz Kagan's eulogy, Uğuz Kagan's cremation, bark and balbals, sağı (= mers ye), conclusion.

Rıza Nur was not a poet, it cannot be said that he succeeded in this long epic. there are some strong parts of the work, the whole is weak. In any case, a work written in the last years of his life, amidst all kinds of troubles, could not have been any other.

The most valuable aspect of the work is the purpose for which it was written. Like Namık Kemal and Z ya Gökalp, Rıza Nur resorted various literary genres solely for the sake of national service. In fact, it was for the same purpose that he wrote history, translated famous operas into Turkish in verse, and produced five large volumes on Turkish literature.

In the last chapter of his work, he describes the troubles he suffered to write the epic as follows.

Uğuz's champion is the pure Turk Rıza Nur,

- Thanks be to God a thousand times-

Taks m in Istanbul, Sülünpalas't-

[a\(1\)\(0\)](#)Alonemiserableweary and sick, he

completed it. A gift to the Turk... In Par

s, in Egypt, misery,

All sorts of dangers

I worked to write this epic,

The trouble has become so bad that I'm used to it.

Dr. Rıza Nur, one of the first class men of the last period of our history, who was so respected for his national goals, is only out of sight but also out of hearts and memories today, in his modest grave in Merkezefend Kabr stanı. The following words are inscribed on his stone:

He lived and died for
Turkishness (Orkun, 34th issue, 18
May 1951)

ANALYSES TURKISH EPIC: 5

9 Rıza Nur used to say and write "Uğuz" in contrast to the general "Oğuz". Today, both forms are used among Anatolian Turks.

10 The apartment where Reza Nur lived and died.

The Attempt to Write Turkish Epic 2

b) Kopuzlama and Oguzlama

The words "kopuzlama" and "oğuzlama", which many may find strange are the names that unknown village gave to the Turkish epic, which he had been working for years to prepare in verse.

"Kopuz," as it is known, is the national Turkish instrument which is the mother of today's *çöğür*, bağlama and saz, and "Oğuz" is the name of one of the most important elements of the great Turkish lineage, i.e. the name of the tribe to which the Turks living in Turkey, Azerbaijan and Iraq today almost generally belong. Then one may ask, what is kopuzlama and oğuzlama? It will be wondered if these words are also baseless, unreasonable objects put forward by fabricators.

No, these are not invented words, they are created words. Just as "koçaklama" was made from "koçak" meaning "y ğ t" in the sense of "hamasî ", and "güzelleme" was made from "güzel", this unknown village teacher also coined the words kopuzlama and oğuzlama. Kopuzlama means Turkish epic, and oğuzlama means the epic of the Oghuz Turks in comparison to the old epics sung to the accompaniment of the kopuz. Those who dwell on folk poems, very cursorily, get used to the words kopuzlama and oğuzlama after the second reading.

This unrecognised poet, perhaps the one who would later achieve national , was Basr Gocul, a village teacher. I remember a small sale that was once organised against the communist Nâzım Hikmet. had devoted his life a single ideal, the idea of writing the Turkish epic in verse, and like most people who run towards a single goal he was likely to succeed.

In these recent times, when all kinds of publications are very abundant, even abusive, I do not remember that the critics who talk about poetry and poets mention his name. The critics may be right in this. It is not possible to see all that has been written, but it is possible to see in moderation among the mass of writings.

It is also impossible to make a selection. However, "time" will use its filter without any filter; it will filter out the weak and worthless; then some of those who are not mentioned today will enter the history of literature.

I one of those who see this potential for Basr Gocul. The majesty and majesty of the subject he is **dealing** with, his poetry **technique** and poetic ability will perhaps make his name **eternal**.

Until now, we had seen fragments of his national epic some newspapers and . Then learnt that the Turkish Language Society had awarded this epic. However, the Turkish Institution, which published the Greek epic translated by Ahmet Cevad, did not seem willing to publish Basr Gocul's works. In any case, the poet published selected fragments of his epic in small books under the title of **Samples** and presented them to Turkish intellectuals. According to what we learnt from the first of these samples published in 1948 at Anıl Matbaası in Istanbul, Basr had the idea writing the Turkish epic in verse with a fixed idea. He **wrote** the Turkish epic in two volumes. The first volume is called **Kopuzlama** and covers the ages from "Türk Han" to "Çeng z Han". The second volume is **Oguzlama**. Dede Korkut stories are in second volume. We learn from the poet's statement that the second volume contains more than 10.000 verses.

Basr Gocul, who has well appreciated that only **poetry** is not **enough** to draw the Turkish epic into verse and that it is necessary to penetrate the spirit of the epic, has carefully **read** the writings on national epics and has **comprehended** it well. In Dede Korkut, he restored the poems **written** in free verse and **produced** successful results.

Basr Gocul **wrote** **Oğuzlama** in various syllabic forms and mostly **used** 7, 8, 11 and 12 syllables. Old Turkish words are not few either. However, there is nothing artificial or forced these verses. For example, look at this verse yelteme, yan offence:

K y r k y r k y r k chirping
Horses eat the ground
mate to mate!
The sunrise has turned red,
Let's spread out on the
mountain!
"Tayma! "Tayma!" Let it
frighten the flying bird!

Let's attack for a cause,
while the arrows are
striking! The minds of the
enemies are astonished by
our boldness! Khans, kings are
among us; Our labour will not
be in vain!

You can't worry about your
life, What is written will
come to you; You won't be
exhausted by being broken;
You shouldn't look at three,
five!

Bronze maces scatter faces,
Kunt islands shout!
When the battlefield is full, the
raven should fall dead!

The meaning of "k y r k y r k y r k shnemek" in this piece, which is a complete hamasî , is not foreign to us at all, and we understand its meaning without looking it up in any dictionary. Similarly, we easily realise that "tayma" is also an **attack** cry. "Döş" Although the word is not used in literary language today, it is used in the phrase "fertiliser". The word "mattress" also comes here. Although "ada", a kind of pike, is that has remained in dictionaries, it does not make the reader feel strange in the atmosphere of this poem.

It can be seen that Basr Gocul was engaged in folk poetry. The upper part:

Dont run out of breakage;
He shouldn't look at three and five

couplet the folk poet "Muh bbî":

We can't be counted on
, We can't be
exhausted, We can't be
exhausted, We can't be
exhausted, We can't be
exhausted, We can't be
exhausted.

Nobody knows what we're going through.

reminds us of the verse. Again, the in the line "what is written comes to the head" is a common all folk literature, in anonymous literature and in the Turkish nation. Even Sultan Cem:

"What is written comes to everyone, it is a revolution"

has sung the same poem in verse. In the penultimate couplet, the beginning of the verse with the word "dah" is also foreign to us. In this respect, Basr Gocul, in the words of the late Rıza Nur, "An epic of Turkish words "to be formalised in such a way as to be able to express". Indeed, in the other pieces, too, this b llûrisation is noticeable. It is as if various epics have been written in Turkish for a long time. The power of eloquence, which is seen in various Turkish dialects, especially in Kazakh, also becoming mature in Basr Gocul. As an example, I take one of "Kanturalı's" verses:

Kanturalı is about embark on a dangerous adventure. In order to dissuade his son, his father tells him about the horrible steepness of the place, the sharpness of the people, the executioners who cut off heads, the zdans, and the prostitutes who lead people into trouble. Kanturalı's answer is as follows:

Am I afraid of the roads?
My stallion would shoe!
Am I afraid of the archer?
My pocket will bend the !
Am I afraid of the
executioner? My fist will
break mattress!
Am I afraid of you? My
comrade is forty guards!
Am I afraid of a whore? This
is the place I'm going back
to!...

those who immerse themselves in the beauty of the national epic, these repetitions, similar to the in Dede Korkut, are very pleasant. Of course those who have no national culture will not enjoy this. As national epics spread to the public and primary school children, the pleasure derived from them will become more generalised and grow.

Because taste is partly a matter of learning and environment. Just as **we** like half rhymes that were not acceptable in the past today, the spirit in epics will be appreciated tomorrow.

In this respect, Basr Gocul today working on a great **work**, perhaps **without** realising it himself. The reasons for his success are that **he** takes his time, what he writes (he says this himself) and works non-stop. He is far away from the noisy life of the cities. **is** in an environment where he can rest his mind and heart. Therefore, it is possible for him to embrace his work with passion and create the highest value **he** can.

The **age** of Shahnames has **not passed**. Today, we witness that many historical novels are written as prose epics in other nations. **We** are in a historical age that will achieve . In the midst of terrible social hurricanes, in the midst **of** becoming and dying, there are indications that we are heading towards a new spiritual order, towards a new epoch of heroism. Promising work on the national epic is one of these signs.

(Orkun, Issue 34, 25 May 1951)

Who is a National Hero?

Heroes have been respected in every era of history; heroes have always and everywhere grown up. Heroism the highest of human virtues. It a well-known fact that nations gain reputation and endurance in proportion to the number of their heroes.

However, there is a difference between being only a "hero" and being a "national hero". A "national hero" is person who shows his/her influence on a larger scale, commands future centuries and leaves unforgettable marks. National heroes shape the lives of nations.

It is not necessary to hold a high position to be a national hero. For example, Japanese Lieutenant **Onoda**, who has been living alone on the island of Lübang for 30 years without surrendering to the Americans and the Finns, and who is now 51 years old, is also national hero. though the fact that he did not obey the order he had received at the time did not help the Japanese defence, he gave honour and pride to the Japanese nation the spirit of heroism he represented, and he passed into history as eternal hero.

National heroes are the energy sources that accelerate a nation. Without them, raising great scholars, geniuses, poets or philosophers would have no value and meaning. India is an example of how countries that raise philosophers and poets but do not produce national heroes live.

However, we should not forget that nation that raises national heroes but forgets them is a heap little different from a herd of animals. It is doomed to be herded by others sooner or later.

Just as national heroes is a disaster, forgetting false national heroes is an equally grave disgrace. This is same as considering theft as intelligence and fraud as genius.

If we need to give an example from our own ancient history, in the third century before Christ, there were many people who did not give their piece of homeland to the enemy even though they gave their horse and house to the enemy.

We can show **Mete**, who created the Turkish nation, as a national hero type. He is defeated national hero.

The defeated national hero is **Kür Şad**. Had it not been for that insane heroism, the Turks would have melted in China and the Turkish nation have been wiped off the face of the earth today, as the weak Sirtardush, who dominated the Turkish state, would not have been able to cope with China. The fact that 41 people all of whom died, terrorised a huge empire a testament to what kind of national heroes they were. Those defeated and killed national heroes became the creators of later victories and the whole national life. Because to be a national hero, one must believe and risk death.

When we come to our new history, if we consider only the period of the War of Independence and which national heroes it has produced, our judgement be the following without any hesitation: The national heroes of the War of Independence are **Pashas Kâzım Karabekir** and **Mustafa Kemal**, who believed in the success of the war even in the darkest days. They received this honour by defeating a large armed **Armenian** army with a force half the size of the army, and by winning Sakarya, another epic battle, and **Dumlupınar**, a fine example of the battle of destruction. The effects of these battles on Turkish and life are still continuing.

There are many other heroes of the War of Independence. However, although the famous soldier **Field Marshal Fevzi Çakmak** was at the forefront, none of them were of the calibre to be national heroes.

The truth cannot be muddled with mud. if those who have no value are declared national heroes today, tomorrow they be deprived of that position.

Stal n's body was taken from Len n's side and destroyed for the same reasons.

11 March 1974

(Ötüken, Issue, 123, March 1974)

Namik Kemal

In the works written so far about Namik Kemal, one of the greatest people of our recent history, very contradictory opinions have been expressed. It is natural to have dissimilar ideas and opinions about all human beings. However, to see and show a person of high morals, who has served the homeland, worked for the nation and endured everything for the sake of freedom, as the opposite of virtues, of course, to act with specific intentions.

The greatest works written about Namik Kemal are those written by Sadettin Nüzhet, Rıza Nur and Necati Fazıl, in that order. The last one, which was printed with money and custom-made by the Ministry of National Education, has no scientific value. Rıza Nur's book is not included among the sources, a copy of his book, which is understood to be a copy, but

In fact, the author of this work, which does not contain any scholarly and serious opinions, is not authorised to write an official monograph on Namik Kemal.

The works of Sadettin Nüzhet and Dr. Rıza Nur are written from different perspectives. The ideas and opinions expressed about Namik Kemal in Dr Rıza Nur's work are in line with the majority. Namik Kemal's patriotism, high poetry, nationalism and moral greatness are accepted. Sadettin Nüzhet, on the other hand, although he accepts some virtues in Namik Kemal, does not accept his nationalism and idealism, and, he claims that Namik was Albanian.

I know that these ideas of Sadettin Nüzhet, whom I know very well, are not sincere. I also know with what concerns and what thoughts he has written like this. In order not to get personal, I will not enumerate reasons for this forced enmity. However, this wrong behaviour of his has confused and will continue to confuse many minds, will respond to them. Non-Turks or people who are involved in foreign ideals exploit these ideas.

n, Sadett n Nüzhet unknowingly and unwillingly falls into a situation of having done evil.

* * *

1- One of the most prominent offences and attacks against Namik Kemal is the one about his **Albania**. This attack is based on two reasons:

a) Kemal's mother's father Abdüllât f Pasha was a Kon çel,

b) In Namik Kemal's work titled *Tak b*: "I am an Arnavian, but I do not like so much liver. Every time I come across a cı ğer mazmun on every page of *Hârâbat*, I think that I am in Süslü's restaurant in Bahçekapısın, and my heart gets stressed."..

With these two weak proofs, in order to make Namik Kemal an Albanian, a person must be bad person. Because a person's mother father being Albanian does not necessarily mean that he is Albanian himself. According to embryology, that person has only 25 per cent Albanian blood. If Namik Kemal's mother's father really Albanian, can accept that he has Albanian blood in a quarter of his body. However, it is ridiculous to attribute Albanian blood to Kemal, let alone the fact that three quarters of his blood and all of his culture were Turkish. Moreover the **Albanianness** of his parents is **not**, it is only a wish. Because the Kon çels **not** Albanians. Dr Rıza Nur, while writing his book *Namık Kemal*, had made research on the race of Kon çels and **asked** me to do research in Istanbul. According to my research, learnt that the word "Kon ce" was not Serbian, Greek or Albanian, that the Kon çels considered themselves Turks, that **they spoke** a broken Greek language, a Turkish language similar to the Selan language and partly Albanian in the bazaar.

Against this possible 25 per cent Albanian population, Namik Kemal's paternal Turkish **genealogy** is too strong to be denied. Namik Kemal's first known grandfather was Bek r **Aga** from Konyalı, his son was the grand vizier and martyr Topal Osman Pasha, his son was the sea captain and son-in-law of Ahmed III, the poet and calligrapher Rât b Ahmed Pasha, his son was the son of a man who had been given the rank of admiral-lieutenant and

Şemsedd n **Beğ** was Mustafa III's chamberlain, and his son and Namik Kemal's father was Mustafa Asım **Beğ**, Abdülham d II's **chief public** prosecutor. It can be seen that Namik Kemal belongs to a family of 250 years of aristocratic and patriotic service. Rât b Ahmed Pasha, who married Ahmed III's daughter Ayşe Sultan

ten . These were probably **not** by the same wife. If Namik Kemal's grandfather, Şemsedd n, **was born to** Ayşe Sultan, then Kemal partly a member of the Ottoman dynasty. Accordingly, Kemal's genealogy is as follows:

Some people not accept Bek r Agha, the father of Topal Osman Pasha, because he is not mentioned in historical records. It is quite possible that what is not mentioned in historical records can be found in the private surnames of families. If this were not the case, Namik Kemal's son Al Ekrem Bolayır would not have included Bek r Ağa from Konya in his book *Namik Kemal*.

if Konyalı Bek r Ağa was a fictitious name, there is no evidence against Topal Osman Pasha's Turkishness. old state translation books, the original nationality of those of non-Turkish ancestry is recorded, but there is no such record for Topal Osman Pasha. To disregard an Ottoman pasha as a Turk when there is no record against his Turkishness is nothing but bad faith.

Namik Kemal's statement "I am Albanian, but I don't like that much meat!" is an obvious mockery. This statement was said to belittle Z ya Pasha, who was at odds with Kemal at the time. Z ya Pasha's mother was Albanian. Namik Kemal **made** such remark about Z ya Pasha while criticising his Hârâbat.

Kemal's son Al Ekrem was my professor at the Faculty of Literature. Al Ekrem, who was a complete Ottoman, did not have such an extreme sense of Turkishness. For this reason, if there really was Albanian in his family, we should have heard this from Al Ekrem, who spoke to us in a very special and sincere way. On the contrary, we heard the complete opposite from him.

It can be seen Namik Kemal's claim that he was Albanian is as false as the claims and lies made by **the enemies of** Turks in recent years that Ömer Seyfedd n, Abdülhak Hâm d, Z ya Gökalp and Osman Gaaz were of other ancestry.

2- Namik Kemal's words about receiving money from Pad Shah ft radır. When Kemal was in Europe, he struggling make ends meet with the money given to him by Mustafa Fazıl Pasha. When that money was cut off, he returned to Turkey. A man who received money from Pad Shah used to live in Turkey.

Namik Kemal's **enemies** also used the fact that he was hostile to the Ottoman dynasty, but took office from them as evidence against him.

they want. It should be known for certain that Namik Kemal was **not** an enemy of the Ottoman dynasty. On the contrary, he was a person who loved and respected that dynasty. This fact is very clear in his historical works. He had only **clashed** with the Sultan to overthrow absolute rule and bring in constitutional rule. For his taking office, nothing could be more natural than this. Because he was serving his homeland and in return for his service, he was receiving a **salary**, which meant the money of the nation, in order to live. Namik Kemal was not serving the Russian tsar. The man who gave him his official authorisation was, after all, a Turkish sovereign. Just as the fact that Atatürk, who overthrew the Ottoman dynasty, was an officer in the Ottoman state and a squire to the sultan is **not a matter** to be recorded against him, the fact that Namik Kemal, who was **an** enemy of absolute authority, was a district governor of a **pasha** would never minimise him.

3- They say that Namik Kemal **not** a nationalist, but an Ottomanist and Islamist.

One should think about this: Could Turkism be practised in nineteenth-century Turkey as it is today? Why is Namik Kemal accused without taking into account his time, when everything should be measured by time and environment?

Namik Kemal was an Ottomanist and an Islamist. But in his time, nationalism could only be practised in that way. Sultan Mehmed the Fat h, whom we honour so much, was **not** a Turkist in today's sense. Are we going to criticise him like this too?

These ridiculous claims are nothing but demagoguery. It should not be forgotten that Namik Kemal called our country "Turkistan" a time **when** he called it "Memâl k- Osmân yye". He **used** the term "Turks" for our nation in many places. Don't these show that he was a conscious nationalist?

And, after all, there is one more proof that Namik Kemal was a true Turkish nationalist, which cannot be underestimated: Why did the communists in Turkey always **attack** Namik Kemal? Probably because he was the very opposite of them. ... If Namik Kemal had not been a great nationalist, enemies of Turkishness and homeland would not have attacked him first.

* * *

will **not** respond to the criticisms about Namik Kemal's poetry and knowledge. They have little to do with the main subject. However, it must be said that Namik Kemal was a poet who knew all the nuances of Ottoman Turkish literature. I believe that even the most important Ottoman poets

He had read it. The verse he wrote on a ghazal by Neşrî, one of the historians of the end of the XVth century, this. Because Neşrî was a worthless poet.

The attacks on the great Namik Kemal either to destroy nationalism or to curry favour with some people. There are, of course, aspects of Kemal that can be criticised. But these are not the things that neither communists nor their sycophants suggest.

(Çınaraltı, Issue 22, 3 January 1942)

Turkey and Cyprus

Nations and their organised states are obliged to take certain measures and find remedies in order to survive. States grow and become stronger to extent that these measures are constant and wise.

All history us the following **fact**: There are three stages and three unchangeable principles in the life of : Independence, **unification** and growth.

If a nation is under the sovereignty of another nation or nations, it first strives to become independent. If it has gained its independence, it tries to save its kinsmen in foreign dominions. If it **has** completed its national unity, it **endeavours** to grow.

Whether one talks about human rights and human rights as much as **one** likes in our time, whether colonialism and imperialism are denounced as much as one likes, this is the reality that prevails. Today, as in all , **pacifism**, and opposition to **war** are only distracting lies.

only. Foolish nations who believe in eternal **peace** and the assurances given in this regard suffer by losing their independence and dignity. No matter how outrageous it may be, **the** truth **is** that nations are busy lying to each other, digging their own holes by showing a smiling face, and making profit under the mask of friendship.

The most horrible **example** of the lies of friendship and **peace** was recently given by the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia. The motive was the most It's too watery to fool people: West Germany was **preparing** to conquer Czechoslovakia.

Even without this invasion, the lie of **humanitarianism** would have been again exposed their bright tongues: The Russians had destroyed the independence of 40 million Turks, 40 million Ukrainians and many smaller nations. Khan said: "for people, freedom for nations.

"class" was to be given? Han colonialism, imperialism was not to be done?

In the face of the unchanging laws of the C han history, which are becoming more and more complex day by day, there is nothing natural for Turkey think about its **cognates who are** outside the legal borders.

The Republic of Turkey, as the current representative and heir of the great Turkish nation and its history, would first have to think of the left over from the Ottoman **Empire**, and then of the others. This was the immutable law of history. The fact that Turkey did not think of them was an old Ottoman rule.

le is already "opposed to the nature of things".

This was such a powerful law that even if the government did not want it, the nation would force the government **to do so**. It was only a few days after the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Professor Fuad Köprülü, said, "**There is no such issue as the Cyprus issue for us.**" It turned out that there was big Cyprus issue for us, and with a few articles by the late Sedat S mavi, who was not a brilliant journalist at all, the Turkish nation suddenly rose up and Cyprus into a national ideal.

What is Turkey's interest in Cyprus? Why Turkey interested in Cyprus, where only a fifth of the population is Turkish, when it has enough land to feed perhaps 100 million people if it applied the latest technical ? Cyprus is not a place with rich oil resources or iron ore mines. Nor can it provide Turkey with great political benefits. Then why did the nation and the government **pay so much attention** this issue?

Because national ideals cannot be founded on matter alone. Inter-national The concepts of **honour** and dignity, which are found only in human beings but not in other creatures, as well as spiritual and moral factors, play a major role .

The reasons for our interest in Cyprus are as follows:

1- In the event **that** Cyprus passes to or a state under Greek rule is established in Cyprus, 100,000 Turks will be dispersed **and** destroyed in time. As it happened in the Twelve Islands and Thrace.

2- The Greekisation of Cyprus to the south of us, after our former islands which have been **introduced** to our western coasts and which must one be returned to Turkey, an enemy base **introduced** to the south of Turkey. Although the Greeks **alone** can never pose a threat to us, they can be a threat in the event of an armed conflict or when Turkey is attacked from other directions.

At the moment, Cyprus be dangerous base against Turkey, and since it is **not** small the other islands, it would not be easy for the Turkish air force to hit it.

3- Greece is the eternal and irreconcilable **enemy** of Turkey. Let us not deceive ourselves and talk about the friendship between Atatürk and Venizelos. Those were temporary legal manoeuvres. The transfer of Cyprus to would not only strengthen Greek manoeuvres in terms of Megalo Idea, but would also lead to a pessimistic view in the Turkish public opinion that "Our governments can never protect our national interests". After Cyprus, the door was **opened** to Greek ambitions extending to Pontus, and the continuous Greek successes created great sympathy them in Europe.

4- Cyprus **has remained** a Turkish country for centuries and is an island **that has become** our property. Cyprus will be taken back just as Hatay was taken back. In the present situation, the small Turkish population can never take away our historical right. When the state of Israel was established, what was the percentage of Jews in the land of Israel? When a nation's national belief is strong, knows how to take back its rights and fills those lands one hundred per cent with its own people.

5- The Turkish Cypriots have demonstrated their commitment to reunification with the motherland through their heroic defence over the years. No heroism can go unrewarded.

6- The closure of Cyprus cause a great demoralisation in Turkey. Cyprus the only issue on **which** the Turkish nation is united with all its parties, groups and individuals. The seizure of Cyprus will unite Turkish nation, **which is struggling** to gouge each other's eyes out in the political arena, for a period of time and **prevent disintegration**, and will make us more mature and reasonable by providing the strength that victories bring to the national psyche.

* * *

Our position on Cyprus **was wrong** at the beginning. Cyprus To ask for partition, then to agree to partition, then to talk about a federative system is a sign of a critical **confusion** and lack of planning in the Cyprus issue.

matter what other states said, the slogan "Cyprus is Turkish" was to be adopted and no concessions were to be made. When the state of Cyprus was established and the Turks were **granted** more rights than their population, the then President of the National Assembly Ref k

Koraltan had said to them: "Welcome, Cyprus fat hats!" This was a very unseemly boast. This was a very unseemly boast, a boast **unworthy** of the Turkish nation. It **was** quickly **realised** that Cyprus had not been **conquered** and that the matter was only a matter of cotton **plastics**.

At the present time, **when the Cyprus issue is being** discussed by the communities, we know that the government **is facing** some difficulties **from outside**. But also know that a government based on the whole nation will be very strong against the outside world. It is possible for a government with a plan to take advantage of historical opportunities when they arise only if it has national consciousness. Nothing can be gained by being afraid and by pushing legal **favouritism** to the level cowardice. At a time when Little has set a terrible example of imperialism and **ignored** the United Nations resolution, it is absurd to expect Turkey to make some attempts to annex Cyprus to Turkey (yesto regain our state. This would be accompanied by tiresome and meaningless statements such as "when half of the nation is **illiterate**, when the country is poverty...").

We know that they **will** be opposed with objections. When Greece was thinking of taking Cyprus and Constantinople, had solved all its problems. Neither was Israel when it took large tracts of land. While India was a backward and impoverished country of fools, where cows were worshipped, rats **were** not killed because it was a sin, and therefore millions of people died of starvation, it did not hesitate to eat Pakistani Kashmir. Even in Russia, which launched a rocket to the moon, the people are mostly in poverty and hardship. In short, an ideal move does not recognise time and space.

In that case, what should Turkey, which has a big trump card like the Patriarchate, do? If legal relations and **treaties** bind the government, what are the tens of thousands of military personnel and volunteer soldiers who can land in Cyprus and resolve the issue in a few days?

(Ötügen, Issue: 85, January 1971)

BERSERKER

BOOKS

