THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF NİHAL ATSIZ

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

HAZAL DİLAY SÜSLÜ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

SEPTEMBER 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr.Yaşar Kondakçı
Director

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

_____

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ayata
Head of Department

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

_____

Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. L. Doğan Tılıç	(Başkent Uni., ILF)	_____
Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan	(METU, PADM)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Fahriye Üstüner	(METU, PADM)	_____

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

Name, Last name : Hazal Dilay Süslü

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF NİHAL ATSIZ

Süslü, Hazal Dilay
M.Sc. Department of Political Science and Public Administration
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan

September 2019, 125 pages

This thesis examines the political discourse of Nihal Atsız (1905- 1975) who is a radical, racist and Turkist ideologue in Turkish nationalism. The main purpose of the thesis is to analyze whether Atsız's discourse exhibits fascist features or not. Firstly, this thesis discusses the origins of Turkism and the general characteristics of Turkish nationalism until the 1970s in order to map Atsız's position within Turkish nationalism. Secondly, the major themes in his discourse including race, racism, eugenics, religion, state are analyzed. Then, the ways in which the political discourse of Atsız imagines its enemies such as Communists, Jews, Kurds and Gypsies are examined. Through these analyses, this thesis arguing that his discourse is mainly based on racism and enemy images, the study concludes that it shares significant similarities with other cases of fascism.

Key Words: Nihal Atsız, Turkism, racism, fascism, enemy images

ÖZ

NİHAL ATSIZ'IN POLİTİK SÖYLEMİ

Süslü, Hazal Dilay
Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan

Eylül 2019, 125 sayfa

Bu tez Türk milliyetçiliğinin radikal ve ırkçı-Türkçü figürlerinden biri olan Nihal Atsız'ın (1905-1975) politik söylemini incelemektedir. Bu tezin temel amacı Atsız'ın söyleminin faşist özellikler gösterip göstermediğini analiz etmektir. İlk olarak, bu tez Atsız'ın Türk milliyetçiliğindeki konumunu ortaya koymak için Türkçülüğün kökenlerini ve 1970'lere kadar Türk milliyetçiliğinin genel özelliklerini tartışmaktadır. İkinci olarak, ırk, ırkçılık, öjeni, din, devlet gibi söyleminin önemli temaları analiz edilmektedir. Daha sonra ise Atsız'ın politik söyleminde yer alan Komünistler, Yahudiler, Kürtler ve Çingeneler gibi düşman imgeleri incelenmektedir. Bu analizler yoluyla, bu tez Atsız'ın söyleminin ırkçılık ve düşman imgeleri üzerine kurulu olduğunu ve söyleminin faşizmin öteki halleriyle önemli benzerlikler paylaştığı sonucuna varmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Nihal Atsız, Türkçülük, ırkçılık, faşizm, düşman imgeleri

To My Parents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor and role model Prof. Dr Necmi Erdoğan. Throughout this thesis process, he always supported me and encouraged me to do better. He was not only a perfect Professor but he was also kind, heartfelt, and understanding. He taught me to the significance of working diligently and he disciplined me. I would not have been written this thesis without his advice and support throughout this long and distressed process. I will never forget his invaluable guidance during all of my master's years in METU.

I would also thank my thesis committee members Prof. Dr. L. Doğan Tılıç and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fahriye Üstüner for their valuable and constructive comments.

I would also express my heartfelt thanks to Prof. Dr. H. Bahadır Türk who always believe in me since my undergraduate years and he always been my source of inspiration.

My special thanks go to Dr. Esin Korkut Savul for her help and kindness. I would also like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. İnci Özkan Kerestecioğlu for her valuable resource recommendations. I wish to thank Rıfat N. Bali for his generous book sharing. I would like to thank Dr. Cumhur Boratav for his guidance and contributions to my intellectual capacity.

I am extremely grateful to my soul sister Nüve Yazgan for her true friendship since our childhood. I wish to thank Nesil Can for her positivity and close friendship. I also more than grateful to my dearest Dr. Yeşim Tok who always been there for me like a second mother. I am totally grateful to my mother Sevim and my father Akif for their endless love and patience through this long journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DP	Democrat Party
FRP	Free Republican Party
JP	Justice Party
NAP	Nationalist Action Party
RPP	Republican People's Party
RPNP	Republican Peasants National Party
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1.The Scope, Aim, and Significance

This thesis will analyze the discourse of Nihal Atsız (1905-1975), a significant Turkist intellectual in Turkish political history. In this study, I will provide a critical approach to examine main notions in Atsız's discourse. By analyzing the rising of Turkist ideology and characteristics of Turkish nationalism, Atsız's radical position within the Turkish nationalism will be revealed. This study aims to show that Atsız's radical discourse is predominantly constructed into two lines: racism and enemy images. By following this purpose, this study will shed light on his racist discourse, which underlies the enemy images, and also other notions which is related to his racist thought. This thesis will claim that enemy images and other notions in Atsız's discourse share similar features with fascism. The similarities between Atsız's discourse and Nazi fascism will be provided to support this claim.

"Great Turkist", "the strong voice of Grey Wolves", poet, novelist, racist, even fascist...Regardless of these descriptions, Nihal Atsız continues to inspire his followers, and he whets appetite of researchers examining Turkish nationalism. He has a significant position not only in Turkist-nationalist circle but also in the intellectual history of Turkey. Along his lifetime he dedicated himself to glorifying Turkish race and the ideology of Turkism. As a racist, aggressive and passionate intellectual, he published several journals such as *Atsız Mecmua*, *Orhun, Çınaraltı*, *Orkun*, and *Ötüke*n, and also wrote several books along his lifetime. Atsız created a special corpus where his followers still affected by. He was tortured, sentenced to imprisonment and lost his academic career. His racist discourse and "bold personality" which he never compromised until his death, made him a "timeless

intellectual" for Turkish nationalists. Therefore analyzing his discourse provides a significant insight to understand Turkish nationalism.

He was born as a son of military man in Istanbul, on 12 January 1905. After finishing his primary and secondary education in Istanbul, he enrolled the Military Medical School in 1922. However, he was kicked out of school due to he did not give military salute to the Arab lieutenant (Uzer, 2002, p.121). Then he was enrolled in the Istanbul University. After his graduation, while he became an assistant of Professor Fuad Köprülü, who was a significant Turcologist and historian, at the Istanbul University. Fuad Köprülü was against the Turkish History Thesis thereby he was criticized by Foreign Affairs Minister Reşit Galip, at the first history congress in 1932. For this reason, in order to defense Fuad Köprülü, Nihal Atsız published an article which led to his expulsion from the University. After that time, he worked as a Turkish language teacher at several schools and library officer at Süleymaniye library.

As mentioned by Özdoğan (2015) Nihal Atsız is the most important figure that carries Turkism from the 30s to the 40s and beyond. Although Kemalist nationalism and Atsız's racist Turkism were inspired by the thoughts of first period Turkists, Atsız did not share the same principles with Kemalist nationalism except for secularism. His first criticism towards Turkish History thesis led him to get in trouble with Kemalist circle and continued to establish problematic relations with governments from the 1930s to the 1970s (Erken, 2013). Due to the strong criticisms in his writings, he was tried several times, spent years in the jail, and tortured. The 1944 law case, especially, was one of the turning points in his life. As a racist, aggressive and passionate intellectual, he had a special position among any other Turkists. He never hesitated to describe himself as racist. Atsız bases his ideology on the racist-Turkist roots and main themes in his writings are enemy images, Turkism-Turanism, racism, militarism and xenophobia. Atsız's discourse within Turkish nationalism represents the secularist and anti-Kemalist branch of Turkism (Aytürk, 2014, p.697). In this sense his position was more radical than other Turkists.

Turkish nationalism, since its emergence in the late 19th century, has been continued to develop and perform as a mainstream ideology in Turkey. As it is mentioned, the racist and radical nationalism of Atsız has special characteristics which influenced Turkish nationalism. To this end, this thesis is significant for two reasons. Firstly, without understanding his ideology, developments and splits up in Turkish nationalism cannot be evaluated properly. In other words, the picture of Turkish nationalism would be inevitably incomplete. Examining Atsız's discourse, therefore, is significant since he provides a clear picture of Turkish nationalism between the 1930s and 1970s.

Secondly, in terms of the current political trends, it is crucial to examine Nihal Atsız's discourse. In this century, it can be said that radical nationalisms and fascism are still alive in the forms of political violence, xenophobia, and Islamophobia. Today, many countries are faced with the rise of extremist right-wing parties and their racist-fascist discourses. When viewed from this perspective, the rising of radical nationalists is neither a hidden reality nor a conspiracy theory. As is known, every nationalist thought has masterminds/ideologists who mainly aim to impose their own ideas to the masses. Analyzing the intellectual roots of the ideologies is also significant to shed light on current developments. In a similar vein, examining Atsız's discourse can help to develop a better understanding of issues we faced today.

This thesis will adopt textual analysis as a research methodology in order to examine Atsız's discourse. Throughout this thesis, corpus of Atsız will be analyzed over selected notions in his writings. However, like every study, this thesis has limitations too. His novels and historical studies will not be analyzed in this research, since the scope of this thesis is to focus on his political identity in the context of fascism. However, some specific analyses of his novels will rarely be mentioned.

By examining Atsız's discourse, I will seek an answer to the following questions: To what extent does Atsız's discourse show parallelism with fascism? To what extent is there a convergence between other fascisms and the discourse of Atsız? If

considering that the enemy image is one of the key elements of fascism, do the enemy images in Atsız's discourse have a fascist characteristic? Do the other themes such as democracy, state, militarism, discipline and eugenics in Atsız's discourse demonstrate fascist characteristics?

1.2.Literature Review

There are various studies in the literature regarding Atsız and his writings. While some of the existing literature about Atsız focuses on his novels and his literary analysis, there are also other studies that examined Atsız's discourse through specific notions[1]. Among those who analyze Atsız's thought, some research is much more significant.

One of the significant studies is Özdoğan's book. In this book, as a political scientist Özdoğan mainly focuses on Turkist-Turanist movement and 1944 law case through Nihal Atsız and Türkkan during Second World War period. To this end, Özdoğan interviewed Atsız's wife and his close circle. In her research, Özdoğan claims that the 1944 law case was not about only a trial on a group of Turkists who seeking an adventure during WWII, it was about the evolution of Turkism over the years. Moreover, she aims to illustrate that there was no contradiction between Kemalists and racist-Turkists, but rather they were both produced by Ottoman period Turkism. In terms of the thesis concerns, the analysis of Özdoğan is significant to understand the position of racist-Turkists and Kemalists during WWII.

In terms of the English literature, studies on Atsız and his thought are limited. A remarkable example is İlker Aytürk's article titled "The Racist Critics of Atatürk and Kemalism, from the 1930s to 1960s" which efficiently examines the tensions between racist-Turanist circle, predominantly Atsız, and Kemalist ideology. In this article, Aytürk (2011) aims to show that Atsız and his racist circle criticized the nationalist views of Kemalists and regarded Kemalists as cosmopolitans. By examining Atsız's satirical novels, Aytürk illustrates Atsız's negative attitude toward Atatürk and Kemalist elites. Aytürk also claims that the reason behind this

[1] The most of research on Atsız's thought was written by Atsız's supporters (Özdemir, 2007; Ülker, 2015; Karabulak, 2017; Ercilasun, 2018).

antagonism was not only about the determination of Turkishness but also the personal criticism of racists against Atatürk and Kemalist leaders.

A remarkable example regarding criticism against Atsız's though is analysis of Tanıl Bora who has been examining Turkish politics and nationalism in his voluminous writings. Bora analyzes Atsız's thought on two lines: on the one hand, he focuses on Atsız's discourse through the political background of Turkey between 1930s and 1970s, on the other hand, he mentions Atsız's position while examining the foundation of NAP. Atsız's negative discourse toward minorities is extensively discussed by Bora. In his study, Bora (2006) draws attention to the fact that Atsız's exclusionary statements influenced later nationalist circles. Bora (2017) also considers Atsız's position as a radical, anti-communist, secular, and racist.

In the same vein, Fatih Yaşlı (2009) in his doctoral dissertation which is published as "Kinimiz Dinimizdir" focuses on Turkist ideology. After the theoretical assessments, Yaşlı analyzes discourses of Turkist figures; predominantly Atsız and Türkkan over selected themes. Yaşlı claims that Turkist figures are influenced by Italian fascism and Nazi Germany, and therefore he calls Turkism as Turkist-fascist ideology. When the scope of this thesis is taken into consideration, Yaşlı's analysis on the discourse of Turkist figures offers a broader insight on the enemy images in Turkist ideology.

Both Yaşlı and Bora provide a hypothesis that Atsız's position in Turkish nationalism is radical, racist, militarist, and contains fascist overtones.This thesis will construct itself between the Tanıl Bora's work, which investigates the Turkish nationalism from Turkism to conservatism, and Fatih Yaşlı's work in the context of fascism and racism, while adopting a critical analysis of Atsız's discourse. This thesis, therefore, will develop the structure that Yaşlı has offered on enemy images, and also Bora's interpretations on the Atsız's position in Turkish nationalism.

1.3.The Concept of Fascism

In order to argue that the notions in Atsız's discourse contain fascist features, conceptualizing his discourse is necessary. To this aim, to explain what is meant by fascism, the concept of fascism will be investigated.

Although the intellectual background of historic fascism dates back to 1880s France, fascism emerged officially during the 1920s and 1930s and produced new social, political, and economic context, and also rejected existing features of liberalism, Marxism and democracy (Sternhell, 2008, p.282). Similarly, some scholars linked emergence of Fascist movements with systematical crisis of the inter-war period and noted that these movements were supported by the conservatives since traditional right wing ideologies were not successful to overwhelm the economic, social, and political problems (Passmore, 2002, p. 29). Italian fascism under the leadership of Mussolini was the first mass movement of fascism (Payne, 1980, p.8). The origins of the Italian word *fascismo* (fascism) was *fascio* which means "a tied bundle of sticks" or/and "a political group", (Mann, 2004, p.93). After Mussolini seized power in 1926 and established a fascist dictatorship in Italy, fascism became a widespread phenomenon alongside Europe and even in Brazil (Passmore, 2002, p.10). However, Griffin (2014) stated that since the concept of fascism started to develop outside of Italy, the scope of the word became a "generic term" (p.131).

Another breaking point in fascism literature is also the position of the Nazi movement. Prominent scholars mostly focus on the German Nazism and Italian fascism while analyzing the principles of fascism. Some scholars prefer to accept German Nazism as a fascist movement; some scholars believe that classifying Nazism within the fascist ideology cannot be possible. Although they shared some similar principles, Sternhell, a well-known historian, separated Italian fascism from German Nazism that was based on racist determinism. According to Sternhell, adopting racism was not a necessity for fascist ideology since all fascisms were not simply racist (Paxton, 1998, p.16). In other words, fascists do not have to be racist. For instance, Mosse (1966) took a similar approach and stated that Italian fascism was not racist until 1936 (p.23). He noted that Nazism and fascism were different

concepts due to the fact that Nazism relied on the racism and anti-semitism, which would make the distinctions clearer between national socialism and western fascism (Mosse, 1966, p.24).

On the other hand, Mann (2004) did not regard German Nazism and Italian fascism as a different political movement despite their differences. According to Mann (2004), the concept of fascism should be considered as comprehensive as possible, since both Nazism and Italian fascism shares similar tendencies, social basis and movements (p.25). Grand (2004) noted that both movements were the output of the same "socio-political crisis" and therefore Nazism and fascism were the same component of "generic fascist style" (p.117). In a similar fashion, German national socialism was postulated by Payne (1980) as "most radical and developed form of fascism" (p.9). Although all forms of fascism do not have to be racist, Griffin (2014) claimed that fascism is essentially racist. As many scholars have stated there is no single way to conceptualize the notion of fascism (Passmore, 2002; Mann, 2004; Griffin, 2012). Analyzing the boundaries between fascism and other ideologies, such as nationalism, totalitarianism and authoritarianism has been quite challenging. For this reason, defining fascism has always brought about insufficiencies (Paxton, 1998, p.1). As Passmore (2002) has remarked the definition of fascism can vary according to ideological perspectives of the scholars. Therefore there is no consensus about the definition of fascism (Griffin, 2012). In this regard, mentioning the different interpretation of fascism from various perspectives of the prominent scholars can be useful to understand "fascism phenomenon" better. However, this thesis is unable to examine the entire history of fascism and fascist theories.

A well known and most cited fascism definition is Nolte's famous concept of "fascist minimum". It conceptualized fascism under the six principles: "anti-Marxism, anti-liberalism, anti-conservatism, the leader myth, party army and the aim of totalitarianism" (Payne, 1980, p.6). On the other hand, Payne (1980) warned that Nolte's definition did not match with "broader political spectrum" due to the fact that "fascist minimum" contained the three characteristics of German Nazism

(p.6). In addition to this "hyper-nationalist" view, the description of Mann (2004) included statism, paramilitarism, transcendence, and ethnic cleansing (p.13). Here, Paxton gives a detailed description of fascism:

> Fascism may be defined as a form of political behavior marked by obsessive preoccupation with community decline, humiliation, or victimhood and by compensatory cults of unity, energy, and purity, in which a mass-based party of committed nationalist militants, working in uneasy but effective collaboration with traditional elites, abandons democratic liberties and pursues with redemptive violence and without ethical or legal restraints goals of internal cleansing and external expansion (Paxton, 2004, p.218).

Examining Paxton's definition gives a broader insight regarding the critical characteristics of the ideology. Macciocchi (2000) defines fascism as a hierarchy that controlled every stratum of the society from the top to the bottom (e.g. family structure, the position of women and race) by a strong leader, however, Jews, communists, and women were out of the hierarchy (p.18). As noted by Mosse (1966), on the other hand, the notion of hierarchy did not refer to class division. Moreover, fascist ideology extolled the cult of leader, war and death, masculinity, and family (Macciocchi, 2000, p.18). Griffin (2014), on the other hand, defined fascism as a "palingenetic ultra-nationalism", and he indicated that both Italian fascism and German Nazism were based on the myth of national rebirth i.e. palingenetic (p.131).

Racism, dictatorship, and political violence are proposed by fascism as a cure for the crises of liberal democracies (Finchelstein, 2019, p.96). Instead of economic revisions fascism/fascists aimed to transform the society and social practices (Paxton, 2004, p. 142; Sternhell, 2008, p.332). In order to create an unified nation, fascists desired to rebuild the ethic, moral and cultural codes of the nation. Therefore, the aim of Nazis and Italian fascists were to regain the glorious and respected history of the German *volk* and Italian *Romanità* (Paxton, 2004, p.142).

Fascism also focuses on creating a "new man" who has to be truly loyal and dedicate himself/herself to the ideology (Mosse, 1996, p. 164). In order to provide national unity, both Nazis and fascists focused on the extermination of enemies and mobilization of the society through fascist/Nazi organizations (Passmore, 2002,

p.62). The role of fascist organizations in Germany such as Hitler Youth, League of German Girls, and National Socialist Women's League was also significant in regard to the imposing of fascist thought on the society (Paxton, 2004, p.143). During the mobilization of the society, women and men were incorporated, although fascist ideology restricted the position of women both in working and educational spaces (Passmore, 2002, p.126). It also shows the *macho* characteristics of the ideology. Indeed the main duty of the women was raising healthy future generation i.e. master race (Mann, 2004, p.147).

The enemy images were a significant component of Nazism. The enemies of Nazis were aliens who were ethnically non-pure identities **(**Mann, 2004, p. 174**).** During the Nazi regime, the enemies of the nation especially Jews and Bolshevists were considered as a real threat to national unity, and these images were also intertwined (Mann, 2004, pp.144-145). Here, mentioning to Eco's concept of Ur-fascism or eternal fascism can be useful. According to Eco

> (…)the only ones who can provide an identity to the nation are its enemies. Thus at the root of the Ur-Fascist psychology there is the obsession with a plot, possibly an international one. The followers must feel besieged. The easiest way to solve the plot is the appeal to xenophobia. But the plot must also come from the inside: Jews are usually the best target because they have the advantage of being at the same time inside and outside (Eco, 1995, p.7).

In Eco's definition fascism has a racist nature. Therefore the racist nature of fascism internalizes and demonizes the enemies especially Jews and Bolshevists that threaten the national identity (Bora, 2006, p. 144-145). Although fascist mentalities share some basic principles, the limits of fascist thought are uncertain. In other words, all fascist thoughts do not have to show exactly the same characteristics as the previous examples. In the light of this information, this thesis will use fascism as a generic term, and will follow the idea that Nazism is the most radical version of fascism. In general, fascism can be characterized as ultra-nationalism in which the notions of leaders, races, national unities, and militarism are glorified while the enemies of the nation are excluded and demonized. Moreover, fascist thought is constructed in the context of enemy images through racist, xenophobic and conspirator mindset. The enemy image in fascism refers to ethnically non-pure

people who aim to destroy the purity of superior race and threaten national unity. As discussed above, while some scholars believe that racism is not a necessity for fascism, some scholars claim that fascism is racist by nature. As it is stated, Italian fascism was not racist until the mid-1930s, and there were also Jewish people in the movement. Without any racist emphasis, fascism aims to transform society through anti-democratic, authoritarian, militaristic approaches, and to restrict the liberty of the others who insist on remaining the out of the fascist ideology. In this respect, the non-racist version of fascism functions similar to the racist mentality. Although racism is not adequate to call someone a fascist, racist emphasis and enemy images are also intertwined in fascist thought. Atsız's discourse focuses heavily on enemy image that is why this thesis aims to understand whether his discourse of enemy images can be considered fascist or not.

1.4. Outline

To analyze Atsız's discourse and abovementioned research questions, this thesis will consist of three chapters. The first chapter aims to examine the development of Turkish nationalism from its formation process to the 1970s in order to shed light on the ideological background of Atsız's discourse. In this regard, the leading figures of Turkish nationalism such as Yusuf Akçura and Ziya Gökalp, and also Turkist organization named "Türk Ocağı" will be discussed. Moreover, the notions of pan-Turkism and Turanism will be identified. After analyzing the basis of the Turkist ideology, Kemalist nationalism will be discussed in order to understand the general characteristics of the early republican period Turkish nationalism. Then, developments in the ideology of Turkism during the single-party period will be elaborated. As will be discussed in this chapter, transition to the multi-party system and collapse of the fascist governments paved the way for new developments in Turkish nationalism. For this reason, the last part of this chapter will focus on the developments in Turkish nationalism between 1950s and 1970s.

The second chapter seeks to investigate the political characteristics of Atsız by focusing on key notions in his discourse. First of all, how he identified some concepts such as Turkism and Turanism will be discussed. Then, the notion of race in his discourse will be examined. As will be shown in this chapter, most of the

themes in his discourse have also to do with the question of race. In order to analyze Atsız's discourse, the racist tendency of the period will be discussed especially in the context of eugenics. Atsız's criticisms against Kemalist elites and the confrontation between Atsız and Türkkan will also be discussed. Then, his perception of religion will also be examined. To analyze his political identity, this chapter also shed light on the notion of state in his discourse. For this reason, his perception of the nation, citizenship, leader, and regime will be examined.

The third chapter will analyze the enemy images in Atsız's discourse in the context of Communists, Jews, Kurds and Gypsies. The construction of the other, which is the core of nationalist ideologies, is a necessary tool in regard to the creation of the identity. Similarly, as a Turkist ideologue, Atsız considers the world as a dichotomy between "us and the other". For this reason, the concept of the other will be discussed through the enemy images. As will be shown in this chapter, the whole world is regarded as an enemy by Atsız, and also his radical perception regarding the enemy images shares similar tendencies with Nazizm. Moreover, the 1944 law case will be elaborated as a result of his anti-communist discourse.

CHAPTER 2

THE ORIGINS OF TURKISM AND THE CHARACTERISTICS OF TURKISH NATIONALISM

2.1. Introduction

In order to comprehend the background of Nihal Atsız's thoughts, this chapter aims to investigate the origins of Turkish nationalism in the early Republican period and the rise of Turkism. Although there are a number of significant studies on Turkish nationalism, the analyses of Turkish nationalism can change depending on the conceptual framework. In the last period of the Ottoman Empire, three ideologies, Ottomanism, Islamism and Turkism, came into existence as a quest for a remedy for the survival of the state.

Although Ottomanism and Islamism had a great number of supporters, Turkism gained importance with the help of Turkist-Turanist intellectuals such as Yusuf Akçura, Ziya Gökalp, and Ahmet Ağaoğlu, who became the key figures of Turkish nationalism. After the foundation of the Turkish Republic, the creation of Turkish identity and the issue of Turkishness became one of the main targets of the state. During the nation-state building process, Kemalism aimed to constitute its own nationalism, while being influenced by the thoughts of Ziya Gökalp. Therefore, the early period of Turkish nationalism was shaped under the influence of Turkism.

In order to analyze the abovementioned information, this chapter is divided into four sub-titles. The first part of this chapter focuses on the early period of Turkish nationalism and the rise of Turkism. In order to do so, while the origins and developments of Turkism are elaborated, the main figures of the movement such as Yusuf Akçura and Ziya Gökalp will be discussed and some main notions such as Turanism and Pan-Turkism will be defined. In the second part of this chapter,

Kemalist nationalism will be elaborated in order to understand the characteristics of Turkish nationalism in the early Republican period. After that, Turkism in the Republican era will be discussed. It will also help to analyze how Kemalist nationalism and racist-Turkism are distinguished from each other. In the final part of the chapter, Turkish nationalism between the 1950s and the 1970s will be analyzed. During The Cold War, Turkists and conservative nationalists have united against communism with the purpose of protecting Turkish state from the communist threat. This rapprochement between Turkists and conservative nationalists led to the significant developments in the formation of Turkish nationalism. Therefore, how the rapprochement of Turkism with conservative-nationalists had affected to the establishment of the NAP will also be examined.

2.2. The Early Period of the Turkish Nationalism and Rising of the "Turkism"

In the 19th century, the French Revolution and its ideas were spread all over the world. Then, the new developments in the world scene conveyed a nationalism wind affecting the Ottoman Empire, which desired to find a suitable way in order to prevent the collapse of the Empire. The new movements of thought such as Ottomanism, Islamism and finally Turkism came into existence, respectively. During that time, other nationalities living within the Empire were impressed dramatically by nationalist movements that created a national consciousness. Therefore, nationalist movements which led to the ineffectiveness of Ottomanism and Islamism were no longer able to meet the Empire' needs of salvation. Ottomanism and Islamism were useless to protect the Empire from Nationalist movements because of the multi-ethnic and multi-faith characteristics of the Empire. However, in the Ottoman period, the concept of nation referred to the religious identity. As Feroz Ahmad (1993) states, "the term nation, nationality, nationalism were derived from *millet*, a word of Arabic origin which had come to means a religious community" (p.48). Therefore, it is used for defining the religious identities, not the ethnic identities within the Empire (Lewis, 1968, p.335; Köker, 2007, p.150).

In the late 19th century, until the Ottomans encountered the idea of Turkism, Turkish people used to define themselves as Ottomans. Being a Turk was out of the scope of Empire agenda. Even since the emergence of Turkish nationalism, the destiny of the Turkish nation has changed during both the collapse of the Empire and the foundation of modern Turkish state. Although belonging to Turkish race became a debatable issue in the late 19th Ottoman Empire, Turkism came into existence with strong dedication and as a critical playmaker. The first discussions regarding the idea of "Turkism", affected by Western Turcology studies, had linked with the cultural side of Turkish nationalism and its primary objective was focused on Turkish language and Turkish literature (Sarınay, 1994; Kurt, 2012). The early period of Turkish nationalism aimed for the unity of Turks and saving the Empire (Demirağ, 2006, p.155). In order to achieve the goal, the pioneers of Turkism, such as Yusuf Akçura, Ziya Gökalp and Ahmet Ağaoğlu, concentrated upon the creation of consciousness of Turkish identity among the Turk. In this sense, they played a significant role in the foundation of Turkish nationalism. It should also be noted that the early period of Turkish nationalism relied on Western civilization and the national culture which were influenced by Gökalp's theory of culture (*hars*) and civilization (*medeniyet*) (Bora, 2015, p.24).

Pan-Turkist ideology was first discussed by Yusuf Akçura , who was known for his famous Article "Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset". In his article, he discussed three different ideologies, Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism, with an emphasis on the problem of continuity of the state (Georgeon, 1986, p.36).The pioneers of Pan-Turkist ideology who emigrated from Russia can be listed as Hüseyinzade Ali, Ismail Gaspıralı (Gasprinski), Ahmet Ağaoğlu and Yusuf Akçura. According to Georgeon (1986), although Akçura did not select his favorite one among the three of them, Panturkism was mainly the prominent ideology for him; and also, he is regarded as the father of Pan-Turkist ideology. The critical point in here is that, with the emergence of Pan-Turkist ideology, "ethnicity" was emphasized for the first time (Georgeron, 2008, p.27). Akçura (1976) described nationality as people who share the same race, same language, same tradition and even same religion (pp.33-34). From Akçura's point of view, while religion remained in the background, the

major determinants of the national identity were race, ancestry and tribe (Karpat, 2011). Landau (1995) indicated that these writings were usually based on secular view.

This creates a necessity to be explicit about what is meant by Panturkism. As Georgeon (2008) stated, the idea of Pan-Turkism emerged for the first time at the beginning of the 20th century and was actualized by Tatar Bourgeoisies, who desired to dominate Muslim-Turkish minorities in Russia. For Landau

> The guiding objective of this movement is to strive for some sort of union- cultural or physical, or both- among all peoples proven or alleged Turkic origins, whether living both within and without the frontiers of the Ottoman Empire (Landau, 1995, p.1).

The propaganda of Pan-Turkism gained importance in Russia between 1905 and 1907, and the pioneers of Pan-Turkism spread Pan-Turkist ideology among Muslim and Turkish minorities. In the light of these developments, as Zenkovsky (1983) noted, Russian government decided to restrict the Pan-Turkist's movements. Pan-Turkism and its pioneers who emigrated from Russia transferred their efforts towards Ottoman territory and strongly affected the foundation process of Turkish nationalism. The above-mentioned Pan-Turkist ideologists established "*Türk Derneği*" in 1908, which aimed to conduct systematical studies in order to constitute a scientific Turkism (Landau, 1995, p.39). On 25th May, 1912(during the second constitutional period)Akçura founded a new organization called "*Türk Ocağı*"(Turkish Hearts), which directly aimed to enhance the scope of Pan-Turkism, and published "*Türk Yurdu*" magazine (Zenkovsky, 1983, p.165-166). During the second constitution period, *Türk Ocağı* was the origin of Turkish nationalism (Karaer, 1989, p.311). Pan-Turkist intellectuals such as Hüseyinzade Ali, Hamdullah Suphi, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, and Ziya Gökalp joined the organization. The essential motivation behind the Türk Ocağı, which has never been changed from The Second Constitutional Period to The Republican Regime, was the liberation of the state and Turkish nation. Therefore, as Karaer (1989) noted, the main objectives of Türk Ocağı were the construction of Turkish identity and Turkish consciousness, analysis of Turkish archaic history, culture and

tradition, and also the development of Turkish nation regarding to social, cultural and economic spheres (p.50).

Starting with its foundation, *Türk Ocağı* became one of the most critical bodies for Turkish nationalism and Turkish identity. Unlike other organizations such as *"Türk Derneği"* and *"Türk Yurdu Cemiyeti"*, Türk Ocağı was capable of influencing a wider range of masses(Üstel, 2004a, p.51).Landau states that, the similarities between Pan-Turkism and Pan-Turanism may have led to an undesirable confusion. While Pan-Turanism targeted to unify the Turan race - Turks, Hungarians, Finns, and Estonians- within the same border and enhanced the scope of Turkism, Pan-Turkism has only aimed at uniting all Turkic nations (Landau, 1995, p. 10). For this reason, the issue of outsider Turks was the core of Pan-Turkist ideology until the Republican period. Despite Turanist intellectuals' desire to unify, the thought of Turan was not adopted as an ideology; rather it remained as an ideal for Pan-Turkism. In this time, the ideal of Turan was discussed by the Party of Union and Progress (*İttihat ve Terrakki Fırkası*), and "*Türk Ocağı*" until the foundation of modern Turkey (Özdoğan, 2008).

Ziya Gökalp, a well known Turkist thinker, who later became the ideologue of Turkish nationalism, mentioned "the ideal of Turan" several times in his early poems and articles. Taha Parla (1985), however, states that "the ideal of Turan" referred to "the ideal of cultural unity" instead of the ideal of ethnic unity (p.36).Gökalp, who was inspired by Durkheim sociology and romantic German nationalism, made a critical contribution throughout his life to Turkish nationalism as the father of the movement. The origin of Gökalp's ideas was inspired by both Hüseyinzade Ali and Crimean Turk Ismail Gaspıralı (Heyd, 1950, p.107). While Hüseyinzade Ali attached great importance to the dissemination of Pan-Turkism, Gaspıralı formulated his ideas on the slogan of "unity in language, in thought, and action" (Heyd, 1950, p.107). Gökalp's Turkism completely based on cultural Turkism; and he differentiated it from the race based pan-Turkism(Berkes, 1998, p. 345).

As Heyd indicated:

> Gökalp's preoccupation with national folklore and sagas, ancient customs and popular traditions, bears a striking similarity to the romantic school of German nationalism and ideologies influenced by it. In his book on the foundations of Turkism Gökalp deals separately with its linguistic, aesthetic, ethical, legal, religious, economic and philosophical aspects. Thus Turkism resembles German nationalism which "more than elsewhere . . . aspired to be not merely a political program, but a complete philosophy of life (Heyd, 1950, pp.165-166).

In Ottoman Empire, he was the first person who addressed to "Turkish nation" within *Türk Yurdu* periodical (Oba, 1995).According to Gökalp there was no difference between nation (*millet*) and people (*halk*). Initially, Gökalp described the notions, race, tribes, nation and Islamic religious community (*ümmet*); and indicated the differences among them in order to reach a proper definition of the nationalism. He defined the term of nation as sharing the same values of language, religion, morals and esthetics (Gökalp, 2017, pp.51-58). As it understood from that, the definition of Gökalp did not identify nationalism according to an ethnic-based perspective like Akçura, and also religious identity was still effective in his thoughts. Parla (1985) pointed out that as Turkish nationalism was a cultural-normative system for Gökalp and Islamic religion was an ethical-normative system, the two were supplying the bases of solidarity in the society (p.38). Although his early thoughts affected by Islamic principles, his secular perception was the basis of Kemalist nationalism and revolutions. It is clear that some particular attempts such as *Ikdam* newspaper and *Türk Derneği* failed for Turkism and its followers. However, Gökalp and his circle expanded the narrow scope of the Pan-Turkist movement by publishing other periodicals (Heyd, 1950, p.109).

It is crucial to state that confusions did not only exist between Pan-Turanism and Pan-Turkism, but also in between Pan-Turkism and Turkism. As stated by Landau (1995), while Turkism emerged in among the Ottomans, Pan-Turkism arose in among Outer Turks in Russia almost at the same time. Turkism was considered as the definition of nationalism only for Ottoman Turks. For this reason, Pan-Turkism and Turkism were regarded as if they were different ideologies (Landau, 1995, p. 30). However, after the First World War, these two terms were used interchangeably.

2.3. Kemalist Nationalism

Kemalism has special characteristics within its own framework. It has broken the boundaries of the legacy of the Ottoman Empire and brought a new governmental system after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. In the 1930s, Kemalism became "Turkey's official ideology" (Cagaptay, 2002; Çelik, 2009), and consisted of six substantial principles: laicism, populism, etatism, nationalism, reformism and republicanism. Kemalist nationalism, however, is a constituent element of Kemalism(Yıldız, 2009). In order to understand Kemalist nationalism better, some of the relevant concepts such as the perception of Turkishness and Turkish citizenship in Kemalist nationalism are examined. According to Oran (1990), three main functions of Kemalist nationalism can be listed as independency, westernization, and the resolution of the identity problem. As Yıldız (2009) states, Turkish identity was problematic since the boundaries of the nation remained uncertain. For this reason, first of all, the definition of nation needed to be determined.

The characteristics of being a Turk and being Turkish nation for Kemalism were relying back on Ataturk's discourses and the texts of the RPP (*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi)*. As stated earlier, the definition of nation was based on religious notions during the Ottoman period. However, as Cagaptay (2002) notes, due to the principle of laicism, the definition of nation was changed. In the 1931, the party congress of Ataturk's RPP, the definition was re-conceptualized based on the thoughts of Ziya Gökalp, and "nation" was defined as "a concept that shares to language, culture and ideal of unity", while religion was no longer used as a part of the nation by RPP, which was different from Gökalp's definition of it (Heyd, 1950, p.63). According to Ataturk, there were three characteristics of being the member of Turkish nation which were sharing the legacy of the Turks, desiring to live together, and protecting the shared legacy as a voluntary action (Bali, 2006, p.43). These features indicate that after the foundation of modern Turkey, religion lost its excessive power over the state and the definition of nation (Poulton, 1997, pp.98-100). The organic bond between Kemalist nationalism and secularism led to the separation of nationalism from the religious notions at least theoretically. In other words, Kemalism was

grounded on secularism so that the social context was constructed on the national realm, not at the religious level (Schnapper, 1995, p.55).

Even though the concept of nation straight forwardly defined by Kemalism as the "Turkish" nation, it did not only consist of Turkish nationality but also Muslims including minorities such as Kurds, Arabs, and Lazs (Cagaptay, 2002, p.12). The rationale behind this argument was simple: if Muslim nations, who were located in Anatolia for many centuries, shared the same history and fought during the Independence War with Turks , got assimilated and preferred to speak Turkish, then they could be a part of the nation (Cagaptay, 2002, p.16). As it is seen, while secularism was integrated into the political system, religion still passed as a critical issue for identity and citizenship. As stated above, the existence of ethnically different but Muslim minorities were overlooked by the state, and the non-Muslim minorities were also excluded or stigmatized by the political elite and their sanctions (Bali, 2006, p.45). As stated by Cagaptay (2002), as preconditions for being a part of the nation seem to be including every people within the boundaries of the state, the citizenship and Turkishness became differentiated.

During the Republican period, the definitions of the Turkishness and citizenship were different. Some scholars claimed that Kemalist nationalism had a racist/ethnicist nature while others disagreed with that point of view. In other words, Kemalist nationalism has contained different types of interpretations throughout its historical developments (Çelik, 2009). For instance, according to Akşin (1999), Kemalism is a non-expansionist and non-aggressive ideology. In other words, Kemalist nationalism did not contain irredentist approaches. Moreover, Ataturk's famous words "who calls himself a Turk" is the indicator of the non-racist side of Kemalist nationalism. Therefore, Kemalist nationalism cannot be classified within the rightist or conservative perspectives (Akşin, 1999). However, with the 1930s policies such as Turkish History Thesis and Sun-Language Theory, the ethnic emphasis became more apparent in Kemalism. Turkish History Thesis is based on the idea that the origins of all civilizations relied on Turkish civilization (Oran, 1990, p.184). In this way, Turkish state aimed to prove that Turks were the founding

element of the civilization as much as Europeans who regarded Turks as an inferior race, and also Thesis was predominantly focused on pre-Islamic Turkish states and ignored the Ottoman period of Turkish history since the Ottoman was defeated during the First World War (Poulton, 1997, pp.101-102). In addition to this, Sun-Language Theory also claimed that all languages originated from the Turkish language (Oran, 1990, p.185). Poulton (1997) calls for attention to the fact that after the Turkish history thesis, Kemalism was the only determinant of the Turkish nationalism in the context of the cultural, political, economic and social realms since it also captured the ideological organizations such as *Türk Ocağı*.

In the 1930's with the support of Atatürk, such intellectuals as Afet Inan, who wrote a dissertation about the Turkish race and anthropology, focused on the superiority of Turkishness and Turkish archaic history (Copeaux, 2008). For this reason, Turkishness was turned out to be exclusively about Turkish race and Turkish language after the Turkish History Thesis (Cagaptay, 2002). According to Yıldız (2009), Kemalist nationalism has an ethnicist side rather than a racist approach because as Yıldız stated, in order to be racist, there must be systematical racist implementations. While Ataturk and his followers were building a new nation state, the developments regarding the language and the history were considered a kind of identity creation process (Yıldız, 2009). Therefore, the core of the Kemalism cannot be regarded as racist in the classical sense, despite of the relatively racist approaches like Turkish History Thesis and Sun Language Theory (Parla, 1985). In other words, Kemalist nationalism had ethnic emphasis rather than a racist one. Although in Kemalist nationalism the racial emphasis became much more apparent with the developments in the 1930s, civic nationalism was not completely abandoned. When considered from this point of view, Kemalist nationalism is more like the cultural nationalism of Ziya Gökalp, who is the father of Turkish nationalism (Zurcher, 2009). The boundaries between citizenship and nationality collapsed throughout the nation-state building process, however, the citizenship issue has remained as "national citizenship" and "non-national citizenship" in practice (Soner, 2005).

The most critical part of Turkishness is directly linked with Turkification processes, which led to assimilation along with an ethnicist approach. The term Turkification refers to the state policy imposing the features of Turkish identity such as language and culture on different religious or ethnic groups in order to create a homogenous society (Bali, 2006, p.43). For instance, the official ideology started with Turkification processes towards non-Muslim minorities during the 1920s and 1930s (Eligür, 2017). One of them was the policies of "citizen, speak Turkish" towards Jews which will be mentioned later in this thesis. Also, other ethnic origins such as Kurds that lived within the borders of the Republic of Turkey were neglected by the Turkish state. Fundamentally, the existence of Kurds in the Republic of Turkey was ignored by the state ideology through assimilation and civilization procedures (Alkan, 2013).

Kemalism, as an official ideology of the state, during the single-party period did not show any tolerance towards any other dominant ideologies such as Turkism and Islamism. Although the new nation-state ignored the Ottoman heritage, the origins of Kemalist nationalism was fed by the cultural side of Turkism which appeared through the end of the Ottoman Empire (Oran, 1990, pp.159-183). In other words, the concept of nation was depicted through cultural values i.e., language and history (Oran, 1990, p.183). Due to the abovementioned characteristics of Kemalist nationalism, the state structure rested on cultural citizenship to some extent. To conclude, in the beginning of the nation-state building process, the definition of nation continued to be influenced by religious connotations to some extent, however, after the 1930s; Kemalist nationalism became more restrictive and came to the forefront with ethnicist approaches.

2.4. Turkism during the Single Party Period

The debates regarding to Turkism in the Republican period were based on two main domains: while the first line of thought was fed by intellectual backgrounds of Yusuf Akçura and Ziya Gökalp which emerged in the pre-republican period, the second line relied on nationalist thought that gained momentum after the 1960's coup d'état and became a political organization called NAP which still exists today

(Ertekin, 2002, p.345). Ertekin divides the leading figures of the Republican period of Turkism into two sub categories. Accordingly, the first group of the Turkists was Ziya Gökalp, Yusuf Akçura, Hamdullah Suphi, Hasan Ferit Cansever, and Ömer Seyfettin so on and so forth, and the second group of the Turkists was Nihal Atsız, Reha Oğuz Türkkan, Fethi Tevetoğlu, and İsmet Tümtürk. Moreover, Ertekin (2002) draws attention to the fact that although the second group was inspired by the thoughts of the first group, these two categories had different characteristics. Since the first group of Turkists emerged during the Ottoman period, their ideological perspective was also influenced by the Ottoman tradition, and therefore their priority was the political interests (Ertekin, 2002, pp.349-350). Moreover, the first group of the Turkists influenced the founding principles of the Republic, and they were more inclusive in terms of race. On the other hand, the second group of the Turkist figures was separated from the first group of thinkers by the reason of being undoubtedly "racist". For this reason, the second group was much more radical and based on Racist-Turanist approaches including militarism (Ertekin, 2002, p.351).

After the foundation of Modern Turkey, some intellectuals who were well-known for their Pan-Turkist discourse, became differentiated from the irredentist side of Pan-Turkism, and therefore the Pan-Turkist ideal turned out to be a more democratic one, i.e. the ideology of Turkism (Georgeon, 1986). With the emergence of the new Turkish state, *Türk Ocağı* reorganized itself according to the cultural, social and scientific necessities of the period (Üstel, 2004a, p.127). Moreover, it became a significant component of the nation-state founding process. During that time, the relationship between Kemalist circle and *Türk Ocağı* was not problematic. In other words, Kemalists were aware that they were almost sharing the same ideals with Türk Ocağı intellectuals regarding to the liberation of the Turkish state and creating a Turkish identity. During the foundation of the Turkish Republic, Kemalist circle thought that Türk Ocağı would be helpful to reach their aims. The actions of the Türk Ocağı were supported by bureaucrats, the Turkish National Assembly and even by Atatürk both materially and morally (Karaer, 1989, p.311; Üstel, 2004a, p.133). Supporting the organization financially led to an increase in the number of

branch offices across the state. Therefore, *Türk Ocağı* was capable of influencing and accessing to people via their branch offices. In the beginning of their journey, the members of the *Türk Ocağı* intellectuals were decisive about remaining out of the party politics (Moralı, 1969). Nevertheless, in the beginning of the Republic, *Türk Ocağı* acted as a part of the RPP, and made a substantial effort especially in Anatolia in order to improve the formation of Turkish identity and Turkish language (Üstel, 2004a, p.345). The tendency among the *Türk Ocağı* intellectuals during the early Republican Period was not visibly racist; rather, their focal point was to take a joint action while constructing a consciousness of Turkish identity in the public space through Kemalist Revolutions. For this reason, *Türk Ocağı* was regarded by Atatürk as the protector of Kemalist revolutions (Yıldız, 2009). Despite the fact that *Türk Ocağı* supported Turkish revolutions and collaborated with Kemalism to fight against reactionary Islam, their relationship was still conflicting. In 1923, the *Yeni Mecmua* became the official journal of the organization and published articles regarding to their main issues (Üstel, 2004a, p.134). *Türk Ocağı* reflected their main stance through the help of the articles and public speeches of the members. Hamdullah Suphi, who was the president of the organization, characterized Italian fascism as a prominent example for Turkism, and he advised especially the young generation, to act anti-Bolshevist and to take action to fight against it (Üstel, 2004a, p.322). This anti-Bolshevik discourse later showed itself as an anti-communist or anti-Soviet discourses for several times in the Pan-Turkist intellectuals' writings.

Although the Republican regime initially seemed to be in cooperation with *Türk Ocağı* and its intellectuals in terms of the political interest of the state, Kemalism stood up against the Pan-Turkist ideals especially irredentism, which aimed for the unification with Outer Turks (Landau, 1995, p.186). It should not be forgotten that the authoritarian approaches of Kemalism were not only against the Pan-Turkists but also any other ideology such as Islamism or communism, which intended to be a superior power within the state. In other words, the main aim of the Kemalist elites during the single party period was to hold absolute power in their hands. In spite of the critical role of the *Türk Ocağı* in educating the Turkish people and propagandizing Kemalism, it became an unwanted institution for some reasons. The

process which led to the closure of the *Türk Ocağı*, was triggered by some Türk Ocağı members, who supported The FRF; in fact *Türk Ocağı* should have only been connected to RPP with regards to politics. Therefore, *Türk Ocağı* was accused by some RPP members of being associated with FRF. While Türk Ocağı did not accept this accusation, the relevant connections between the FRF and some of Türk Ocağı members were detected by RPP (Üstel, 2004a, p.345). Firstly, internal reasons like the economic burden of the organization and then the close relationship between some members of Türk Ocağı and FRF resulted in the closure of Türk Ocağı. Also, the external reasons, specifically the pressure of the USSR over the Turkish state, played a role in its closure in 1931(Üstel, 2004a, p.360). *Türk Ocağı* was replaced with The People's Houses (*Halk Evleri)*, which aimed to educate Anatolian people on behalf of Kemalism (Arıkan, 1999). As it is seen Türk Ocağı was shut down because of the fact that Kemalists could not transform the organization according to Kemalist ideals. Until that time the Pan-Turkist periodicals and organizations had a critical role in the creation of the national identity and national consciousness.

Turkism, which increased its sphere of influence until the 1930s, entered into a period of stagnation due to the closure of the *Türk Ocağı*, the Russian-German rapprochement and the dominant policies of the Republican regime (Soysal, 2008). Moreover, the number of Turkist periodicals declined steadily due to the governmental pressure on them, yet with the beginning of the 1940s, a new era began for the Turkist periodicals, which enhanced their sphere of influence more than ever and was regarded as a "golden era" of Turkism (Özdoğan, 2015, p.182). During the one party period, some of the Turkist intellectuals such as Zeki Velidi Togan, Fuad Köprülü, Rıza Nur and Nihal Atsız had an opposing attitude towards the Republican elites and criticized the Turkish History Thesis and Sun Language Theory. Kemalist nationalism, on the other hand, was mainly against the irredentist and racist approaches of Pan-Turkism (Georgeon, 1986, p.129).

As stated earlier, Kemalist nationalism in the 1930s, as consequences of the nation-state building process, became more autocratic and followed a more strict policy on religion, language, and history. Secularist and ethnocentric emphasis of Kemalist

nationalism was supported by racist Turkists in this period. However, most of the Turkist thinkers, like conservatives and Islamist thinkers, regarded Kemalist nationalism as an artificial ideology. Although Kemalist nationalism was supported by the early period of Turkists namely Gökalp and Akçura, other Turkist intellectuals who were regarded as a second group of Turkism, especially Atsız and his circle, has strongly criticized Kemalist nationalism in many aspects. The main controversy between the racist Turkism and the Kemalist elite was based on the struggle for being a dominant power. Racist Turkists believed that the state should be ruled by them due to the fact that Kemalist elites did not rule the Turkish state and Turkish foreign policy appropriately (Aytürk, 2011, p.310). Also Turkish History Thesis and Sun Language Theory were other breaking points between the Kemalists and their rivals. It should be stated that apart from these intellectuals and their critical discourse, there were other intellectuals who adopted a positive discourse toward Kemalist nationalism. For instance, Orhan Seyfi Orhon and Yusuf Ziya Ortaç published Çınaraltı periodical which attempts to use a softer discourse compared to other periodicals in the 1940s.

Landau (1995) indicated that in the beginning of the Republican Period, Turkists did not come together under the same organization by virtue of diversified purposes (pp.94-97). Due to this reason Landau divided the Pan-Turkists into four parts according to their pioneers: Dr. Rıza Nur, Zeki Veledi Togan, Nihal Atsız and Reha Oğuz Türkkan. Even though Nihal Atsız was inspired by both the Ottoman Turkism and the Republican Turkism, it would be an unrealistic view to evaluate his position as a representative of either one or both. The analysis of Pan-Turkism in the early Republican period was linked with the thoughts of Dr. Rıza Nur (1879 - 1942). As Tanıl Bora states (2017), Rıza Nur was the representative of continuity between the Ottoman Turkism and the Republican Period Turkism, besides he was also associated with the official nationalism and the racist Turkism (p.271). In the early period of his life Dr. Nur was a supporter of Ottomanism, after that, he became a prominent figure of Kemalist thought for a while, and then left the Turkish state because of the tension between his radical ideas and Kemalist circle. During that time he published French *Revue de Turcologie* and *Tanrıdağ* magazines (Landau,

1995, p.96). After the death of Atatürk, he came back to Turkey, and built close relationship with Atsız and his Turkist circle until his death in 1942.Furthermore, his memoirs in which he strongly criticized Atatürk and Kemalist circle were published in 1967 and 1968 (Özakman, 1995). It is worth emphasizing that he desired to establish a Turkist party and wrote "Turkist party program" in his published memoirs (Nur, 1967, pp.1886-1887). While the Turkish race was extolled in his writings, those who were non-Turkish were humiliated (Alpkaya, 2008). He was proud of being a Turk and supported ethnic-based Turkism. For this reason, he believed that nationality was linked with race and blood (Bora, 2017, pp.271-272). Similarly, Nihal Atsız, who was regarded as a God-son by Dr Nur followed these racist ideas in his Turkist-Turanist ideology (Ayvazoğlu, 2008, p.544).

Professor of History, Ahmet Zeki Velidi Togan, was another significant Pan-Turkist intellectual who affected directly to the thoughts of Atsız. As indicated in the Kemalist nationalism part, Kemalism presented a Turkish History Thesis which was criticized in the First Turkish History Congress by Professor Togan, who had an academic background in Turcology studies (Soysal, 2008, p.486). The main point that Togan strongly criticized in the Turkish History Thesis was the idea that Turks migrated from Central Asia because of the severe drought (Soysal, 2008, p.486). According to Togan, this idea was not true since there was no such drought at that time. After this highly charged event, Togan left the Turkish state. However, after his return to the country, he was tried with other supporters of the ideology of the Turkism in the 1944 case and spent 1.5 years in prison. Racism-Turanism trials of 1944 will be analyzed in following chapter. Along in his life, he was fighting for Pan-Turkism and published several articles issuing on the Outside Turks. After the 1940s, the case of Outsider Turks was no longer emphasized by Turkist intellectuals, even by Nihal Atsız (Soysal, 2008, p.503).

In the late 1930s, new Turkist periodicals "*Ergenekon*", "*Bozkurt*" and "*Gökbörü*" were published respectively by Reha Oğuz Türkkan, who was another prominent racist- Turkist figure in this period. For instance, the slogan of the *Ergenekon* was "Turks are superior to all other races", depicting the racist characteristics of the

journal (Özdoğan, 2015, p.209). Özdoğan states that the content of these periodicals were created by writings of the above-mentioned prominent Turkist thinkers. such as Nihal Atsız, Necdet Sançar, Fethi Tevetoğlu, Abdülkadir Inan, Peyami Safa, Zeki Velidi Togan, Akdes Nimet Kurat, Yusuf Ziya Ortaç and Orhan Seyfi Orhon (Özdoğan, 2015, p.213). The prominent elements of Reha Oguz' ideas were eugenics – or racial hygiene, the superiority of the Turkish race, and racial sanitation (*ırk hıfssızzsıhası*) (Ertekin, 2002, p.361). While he adopted a racist Pan-Turkism, he also defined himself as a "Bozkurtist" (*Bozkurtçu*) in his writings (Landau, 1995, p.96). In addition, he was a strong supporter of "anti-communism, racism and militarism" as much as Nihal Atsız was. According to Özdoğan (2015), the political and historical opinions of Türkkan were exactly the same with Nihal Atsız's discourse in the beginning of the 1930s (p.213).

Although Atsız and Türkkan shared ideas in many aspects, it became apparent that there was a disagreement between the two. Alternatively, this situation can be considered as a power struggle that led both to come into conflict with each other. Shortly before the Second World War, a new period began for Turkism which added new radical members like Reha Oğuz Türkkan. They have both been regarded as the leader of the racist-Turkist movement which rose again in the late 1930s. The main reason behind this dispute was probably linked with the desire of being the only leader of the movement (Özdoğan, 2015, p.236). Yaşlı (2009) indicated that tension between the Atsız and Türkkan could be regarded as an evident of different poles in the Turkist movement (p.73). One of the subjects that matter between the two related with the issue of being a real Turk. Both of them accused each other of having a non-Turkish root. Dissolution between the Atsız and Türkkan will be examined later in this thesis.

Atsız, on the other hand, was not only in conflict with Türkkan. One of the racist-Islamist intellectuals who criticized by Atsız was İsmet Hakkı Danişmend (Ayvazoğlu, 2008, p.550). Danişmend was an intellectual who was regarded as both Turkist and Islamist. Apparently, Turkism did not consist of a single line. While Atsız and his circle adopted a racist and a secular characteristic, there was also

another wing that had a religious-based understanding which would become more visible especially after the 1940s.

There was another nationalist movement, called Anatolianism, which mainly appeared within the *Türk Ocağı* as a reaction against both Turkism and Islamism during the Second Constitutional Period (Çınar, 2013, p.40). As a nationalist movement, Anatolianism was against racism, irredentism and Turanism. In this respect, it was separated from the Turkist movement. Moreover, the Anatolianists focused on solving the problems of Turkish peasants because they regarded Anatolia as the origin of Turkish nation and Turkish culture. Although the Anatolianists were against the western-oriented modernization process of the Kemalism, they did not criticize Republicanism as much as Turkism did. Memduh Şevket Esendal, Remzi Oğuz Arık, Şevket Raşit Hatipoğlu and Nurettin Topçu can be acknowledged as the pioneers of the movement. In 1942, Memduh Şevket Esendal was elected as a general secretary of RPP (Çınar, 2013, p.239). After that time, he encouraged other Anatolianists to take part in the parliament. However, many scholars believed that the election of the Anatolianists in RPP was linked with the rise of the racist-nationalism during the Second World War (Çınar, 2013, pp. 249-250).

In the light of the information above, even though Pan-Turkist intellectuals did not come together under the same roof, their common points, which were discussed in the Turkist periodicals, were the anti-communist approach, xenophobia and emphasis on the superiority of Turkish race. These periodicals oriented under the political, historical, cultural and social concepts such as the uniqueness of Turkish race, adventure stories of Turkic leaders and the history of the predecessor Turkic states (Yaşlı, 2009). It must be pointed out that these aforementioned periodicals were closed several times because of their criticism towards Kemalism, and also the Pan-Turkist ideals, especially irredentism, which they advocated. During the Second World War, the positions of Turkist intellectuals fluctuated because of the strategic policies of RPP. Zurcher noted:

> Throughout the war both domestic politics and the press were kept under tight control and they were both manipulated in Turkey's effort to stay out of the conflict. When Germany seemed to be on the verge of defeating the Soviets, there was a resurgence of pan-Turkist propaganda. A pan-Turkist committee was founded in July 1941 with German encouragement, a number of Turkish generals toured the eastern front at the invitation of the Germans and some pan-Turkist sympathizers were taken into the cabinet – all as a sort of insurance policy in the event of a German victory. When the impending German defeat had become clear, in May 1944, the pan-Turkist organizations and propaganda were suppressed (Zurcher, 2004, p.205).

As Zurcher states, after the Second World War, the collapse of Italian fascism and Nazi Germany affected Turkist intellectuals who lost the "hey-day" of Turkism. With the transition to multi-party system, the nationalist-conservative pole found their own voice in the public sphere with the Democrat Party. In this way, while the Pan Turkists period was almost over, yet some exceptional figures like Atsız continued with their racist discourses (Bora, 2017, p.287). Along with the Cold War, Turkish nationalism developed an intimacy with the conservative side. With this approach, some Pan-Turkists joined the nationalist-conservative side and advocated the existence of the significant ties between Islamic values and Turkic race. After the collapse of the USSR, while the new Turkic states were established, Pan-Turkist ideals gained popularity again in the Turkish state in the beginning of the 1990s (Bora, 1995, p.88)

2.5. Development of the Turkish Nationalism between the 1950s and the 1970s

In this part, the development of Turkish nationalism from the 1950s to 1970s will be analyzed in order to present the reasons behind the convergences and divergences between Turkism and the conservative nationalism. After the transition from single party regime to multi-party system (1946-1950), The DP became the ruling party as a result of the 1950s' general elections and remained the dominant party over the period of ten years. The fact that, the RPP lost its dominant position over Turkish people, created an advantageous position accidentally for radical nationalists, conservative nationalists and also Islamists.

The defeat of Nazi Germany in the Second World War was also meant the defeat of the fascist governmental systems. The close relationship throughout the 1920s and 1930s with the Soviet Union was turned into a Soviet fear again (Zurcher, 2004,

p.209). Moreover, the DP government established close relations with the United States and defined its ideological direction in compliance with the USA policy. For this reason, the anti-communist discourse became the state policy of Turkey. Conservative nationalists, Islamists and Turkists were able to find a common ground with regards to anti-communist approach and gave priority to anti-communism in their discourse.

Bora and Ünüvar considered the developments of the 1950s as a preliminary phase of the 1960's nationalists thought (Bora & Ünüvar, 2015, p.159). Therefore, between the 1950s and the 1970s, a general characteristic of anti-communist discourse and communist threat in Turkey was identified both at the parliamentary level and intellectual level. On the other hand, this anti-communist discourse created new enemy images onto the political stage of Turkey. The Turkists and other right-wing groups, encouraged by the anti-communist state policy, described ethnic minorities such as Greeks, Armenians, and Jews as an enemy (Bora, 2006, p.91). Except for the Turkist intellectuals, there were other thinkers who used enemy images in their discourses such as Cevat Rıfat Atilhan, Remzi Oğuz Arık, and Nurettin Topçu.

In the beginning of the 1950s, some members of the nationalist circle aimed at uniting with the conservative circles. For instance, the Anatolianists integrated religion as a new component into their ideology, and also Nurettin Topçu and Remzi Oğuz Arık became the leading intellectuals of nationalist thought (Çınar, 2013, p.218). These figures are important not only for Anatolianism but also for the construction of the nationalist conservatism and pathway to Turkish-Islamic synthesis (Bora & Ünüvar, 2015, p.165).

Apart from the Anatolianist group, there were also other intellectuals who adopted nationalist views based on conservative principles. One of the periodicals, "*Serdengeçti*", which was published by Osman Yüksel Serdengeçti in 1947, took a position between Turkism and conservatism, and defined their nationalist approach as "as Turk as Tian Shan, as Muslim as Mountain Hira" (*Tanrıdağı kadar Türk,*

Hira Dağı kadar Müslüman) which was to be the slogan of the NAP (Ayvazoğlu, 2008, p.568).

In the late 1940s, the nationalists aimed at unifying under the same organizations. According to Landau (1995, p.149), the motivation behind this aim relied on two factors: to fight against the communist threat and enhance their political clout in society. In order to achieve this goal, they were united under the The Associations for Fighting Communism (*Komünizmle Mücadele Dernekleri*), which was founded in 1956. Moreover, they established the Federation of Nationalists (*Milliyetçiler Federasyonu*) and then on April 1,1951, it was renamed as The Turkish Nationalists Society (*Türk Milliyetçiler Derneği*) (Bora & Ünüvar, 2015, p.166; Aytürk, 2014, p. 700). The nationalist view of the Society synthesized sacred values with social, cultural, and traditional norms (Aytürk, 2014, p.700). Even though Turkish Nationalist Society provided a political support, on January 1953, it was closed down by the DP government (Bora & Ünüvar, 2015, p.167). Contrary to expectations', the DP government was disappointed both by the Turkists and the conservative nationalists. Karpat noted regarding the position of the DP:

> The DP policy towards secularism followed in the footsteps of the liberalization of religious education and practices began by the RPP in 1947. It allowed the reading of the ezan (call to prayer) in Arabic and took other steps to show respect for the "Islamic" culture and identity of the citizens. At the same time, it suppressed harshly any attempt to politicize the faith as indicated by the closure of the Millet Party (Karpat, 2004, p.16).

After the closure of the Millet Party[2] (Nation Party) in 1953, it was refounded as a Republican Nation Party (*Cumhuriyetçi Millet Partisi*) by Osman Bölükbaşı and merged with the Turkish Peasant Party (*Türkiye Köylü Partisi*). The new party named as the Republican Peasants' and Nation Party (*Cumhuriyetçi Köylü Millet Partisi*) (Ayvazoğlu, 2008, p.574).

In 1965, Alparslan Türkeş, a well known former member National Unity Committee and more importantly one of the defendants of the 1944 trial just as Nihal Atsız, joined the RPNP with his friends and dominated the party (Bora & Can, 1991, p.53). The Nine Light doctrine which resembled six principles of Kemalism, was written

[2] The Nation Party was founded in 1948 by some of the DP deputies (Ayvazoğlu, 2008, p.574).

by Türkeş and determined the new ideological perspective of the party. Between 1965 and 1967, Türkeş's thoughts were based on Turkist ideals and anti-communist discourse in a secular manner (Bora & Can, 1991, p.54). Meanwhile, Idealist Hearts, (*Ülkü Ocakları*) which were founded in 1968 as ultranationalist organization, had also an organic relation with the party (Yanık & Bora, 2017, p.299).

In 1969, at the general congress in Adana, Türkeş renamed the party as the NAP and also changed the emblem of the party which depicted Gray Wolves (*Bozkurtlar*) previously, into an emblem depicting Three Crescent, which added Islamic notions to the party (Bora & Can, 1991, p.55). Ümit Cizre (1992) believed that these Islamic overtones were the result of a pragmatic policy in order to enhance the scope of the party (p. 147). Similarly Landau regarded this ideological turn as a strategic "vote-getting" action and added:

> (…) the efforts of Atsız and other leading Pan-Turkists to dominate the party from within failed, as they were out-maneuvered by Türkeş. Thus, although some Pan-Turkist continued to support the Nationalist Action Party - even continuing their membership in it – others have left it, working outside the party for what they considered the true interests of Pan-Turkism. Among those who broke all contacts with the party was Atsız (…) (Landau, 1995, p.157).

As Landau indicated, although Atsız was detached from the party, the ideological principles of the NAP and Idealist Hearts were still inspired by thoughts of Atsız to some extent.

Throughout this period, the NAP was influenced by some intellectuals interested in Turkish-Islam synthesis. One of them, Osman Turan, who was both a historian and a politician in the DP and the JP (*Adalet Partisi*) governments, wrote several books and articles which aiming to synthesize Turkism, Islamism and conservatism (Ayvazoğlu, 2008, p.575). Another example was Seyid Ahmed Arvasi, who was the contributor of Türkeş's Nine Light doctrine and believed in Turkish-Islam Ideals (Aslan, 2014, p.521). Finally, as the leading organization of the Turkish-Islam synthesis, "Hearts of Enlightened" (*Aydınlar Ocağı*) designed to stop the intellectual efficacy of the left-wing intellectuals in every ground was founded in 1970 (Zurcher, 2004, p.288).

2.6. Concluding Remarks

Starting from the emergence of Turkism, this chapter aimed to show that the characteristics of Turkish nationalism until the 1970s.Turkism, during its newborn phase, focused on the issues of saving the Ottoman Empire and creating Turkish consciousness. After the foundation of modern Turkey, the issue of Turkish identity was problematized by Kemalist nationalism. At the beginning of the Republican period, Kemalist nationalism did not have an ethnic emphasis. Rather the notions of culture and language, with the influence of Ziya Gökalp, were regarded as the determinant of Turkishness. However, with the 1930s policies, Kemalist nationalism gained ethnic-based emphasis due to Turkish History Thesis, and being a member of Turk became more than sharing the same cultural values and ideals, at least in discursive level. As it is stated above, Ottoman Period Turkism and Kemalist nationalism were fed by similar sources even though they did not truly share the same principles. During the early Republican period, Kemalist policies of Turkish History Thesis and Sun Language Theory were criticized by some of Turkist intellectuals.

As it will be discussed later in this thesis, racist Turkist figures like Atsız were far different from the nationalist understanding of this period. While Turkists were tolerated by Kemalism until the Second World War, the RPP became intolerant towards Turkists and sentenced some of them in the 1944 trials. During the Cold War period, anti-communist discourse gained importance and became the state policy. Moreover, various nationalist intellectuals from different circles aimed to unify under the same roof in order to fight against the communist threat.

The rapprochement between Atsız's circle and conservative nationalists ended up after the Adana congress of the NAP in 1969. Atsız and his circle separated from the NAP because of the Islamic overtones of the party. Contrary to NAP, Atsız symbolized the secular vein in Turkish nationalism. Atsız's detaching from the party made him a representative of a radical and narrow branch of Turkish nationalism. On the other hand, the NAP and Idealists became the leading nationalist movement in Turkish nationalism.

CHAPTER 3

POLITICAL IDENTITY OF NIHAL ATSIZ AND ORIGINS OF HIS TURKIST IDEOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter aims to identify the political identity of Atsız by analyzing the main notions in his discourse. In this chapter I will claim that his political discourse is based on fascist ideology. In order to analyze his discourse better, first of all, his definitions on Turkism and Turanism will be identified. Then, the notion of race, which contains different themes, will be analyzed. This chapter will argue that all his notions are linked with the question of race. It will be discussed that his racism shares similarities with European racism. This chapter will also analyze the rationale behind the antagonism between Atsız and Kemalists in order to show how Atsız positioned itself in Turkish nationalism against the official ideology. Then, his understanding of religion will be discussed, and how these notions are intertwined will be illustrated. His discourse on state is also critical for analyzing his political identity. It is the notion of state will be identified so as to show how he idealizes the notions of citizenship, leadership, and a disciplined nation, while adopting a racist approach. Lastly, this chapter will also examine Atsız's own perception of fascism.

3.2. Turkism, Turanism and Racism: The Inseparable Trio of Atsız's Discourse

3.2.1. Turkism and Turanism from Atsız's Perspective

In the first chapter, prominent Turkist figures and their main perceptions have been mentioned. Although there were some similarities with the early period of Turkist thinkers, the position of Atsız differentiated itself with his radical and racist discourse. The notion of race is the main component of his discourse, which led his evaluations regarding to different notions to be intertwined within his racist

statements. First of all, as a Turkist-Turanist thinker, Atsız should be investigated in terms of his definitions about Turkism and Turanism. According to Atsız's view, Turkism is Turkish nationalism, but every nationalist Turks are not Turkist[3]. As it is seen, although Turkism is evaluated within the context of Turkish nationalism, the special position of Turkism in Turkish nationalism is emphasized. For him, Turkism is an idea as well as a belief. Therefore, it should be accepted without any debates. According to Atsız, Turkist is the one who believes the superiority of Turkish race[4].The characteristics of Turkists are specified as it follows:

> A Turkist is a fearless person in the fight against injustice with a high-level of work ethics, respect to the past and national values and prioritizing the national interests over the individuals. A Turkist cannot be a gallivanting person or a groveler. S/he likes to live bitter and s/he shows the most bitterness towards his/her own will. (…) A Turkist would be, without any doubt a Turk. However, every person saying "I am a Turkist" is not a Turkist. S/he needs to be sincere and meet the requirements of Turkism[5].

Moreover, racism and Turanism are formulated as significant components of Turkism[6]. The idea of Turan is identified as a political aim of Turkists i.e., unity of all Turks under the single state[7]. In his discourse, Atsız used Turanism in compliance with the general definition of the term which has been already explained in the previous chapter. He believed that:

> It means that you are not a real man if you are not a Turanist despite of being a Turk. If you do not know that the Turk is a lonely nation and if you are not after the goal of saving your imprisoned cognates, you are no different than an animal[8].

Being a Turkish is depicted as a necessity of being Turkist and Turanist. In this regard, the concept of race apparently is the core of his discourse.

---

[3]Atsız, N. 2012, "Türkçülük ve Siyaset", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.29.

[4]Atsız, N. 2016, "Türkçü Kimdir", in Türk Ülküsü, p.35.

[5]Atsız, N. 2016, "Türkçü Kimdir", in Türk ülküsü, pp.35-36.

[6]Atsız, N. 2018, "Veda", in Makaleler III, p.89.

[7]Atsız, N. 2018, "Bir Ansiklopedinin Büyük Yanlışları", in Makaleler III, p.53.

[8]Atsız, N.2011, "Milli Savunma Gücünün Yok Edilmesi", in Turancılık, Milli Değerler ve Gençlik p.167.

3.2.2. Race, Racism and Racist Notions in Atsız's Discourse

The concepts of race and racism in Atsız's discourse are linked with his Turkist-Turanist ideology. In order to understand his racist discourse, first of all, the concepts of race and racism should be briefly identified. At the beginning, the notion of race was used to be depicted as a form of national or ethnic identity, and then in the 18th century with the theoretical developments, it gained a biological perspective (Clair & Denis, 2015, p.857). After those developments, racism was defined as "the belief that certain groups or people are innately, biologically, socially, and morally superior to other groups, based upon what is attributed to be their racial composition" (Kleg, 1993, p.95). In the 19th century, the racist doctrines came into existence with the famous book entitled "Essay on the Inequality of Human Races" of Arthur Gobineau, who was called as the father of racist ideology (Kleg, 1993, p.95). He divided races into three parts: white, black and yellow. Although the yellow and the black races were depicted as intellectually and psychologically limited, the white race was illustrated as the ultimate superiority in intellectual capacity, beauty and strength (Biddiss, 1966, p.263; Kleg, 1993, p.96).Furthermore, Gobineau believed that the mixture of other races with Aryan white races was the reason for race degeneration. Also, the mixture of races was the only way for civilization to exist since all civilizations were created by the white race (Biddiss, 1966, p.263). On the other hand, the mixture of races led to the deterioration of both good and bad features of the races. Here Gobineau stated:

> The white race was originally possessed the monopoly of beauty, intelligence, and strength. By its union with other varieties, hybrids were created, which were beautiful without strength, strong without intelligence, or, if intelligent both weak and ugly (Gobineau, 1995, pp.209-210).

As it is seen, the hybridity of races was fruitful only if it remained at the minimum level (Fontette, 1991, p.51). Although the mixture of races was interpreted as a necessary element for civilization by Gobineau, the idea of the degeneration of the superior race was regarded as an inspiration for German racism. However, Gobineau was a theorist of Aryanism rather than Germanism (Biddiss, 1966, p. 269). Stewart Houston Chamberlain, who was an anti-semitist thinker and supporter of the supremacy of the white race, was influenced by Gobineau's ideas (Kleg,

1993, p.97). Chamberlain was one of the first supporters of Hitler and a follower of the National Socialist ideology (Woodroffe, 1981, p.143). European racism and especially Nazi racism were affected by the thoughts of these theoreticians. Moreover, at the beginning of the 20th century, racist approaches in Germany became the basis of archaeological and anthropological studies (Aydın, 2009). Suavi Aydın stated that these racist developments in anthropological studies were also supported by the idea of eugenics which was adopted by a variety of political systems in different ways. For instance, in Nazi Germany, eugenics was implemented as a form of racial hygiene (Moore, 2008, p.7).

On the other hand, the wind of racism in the 1930s did not only affect European nations but also a newborn Turkish nation-state. As it was mentioned in the previous chapter, in the 1930s, the Turkish state aimed to identify the boundaries of Turkishness. Even though The Republican Period of Turkish nationalism was shaped by Gökalp's culturalist nationalism, which was indeed inspired by German tradition; the racist anthropological developments in Germany were also influenced in the same period by the foundation of the Anthropology Institute and creation of Turkish History Thesis. This thesis aimed to show that Turks were the main element of civilization process throughout historical changes and also Turks were not a secondary or yellow nation as alleged by scholars, rather they were as superior as Aryan races (Aydın, 2009, p.358). Additionally, in order to investigate the characteristics of the Turkish race, large-scaled anthropometric studies were conducted under the leadership of Afet İnan, who used these data in her doctoral dissertation later, and alleged that Turks were similar to the white race of Europe (Aydın, 2009, pp.361-362). According to Aydın, this claim shows the impact of racist developments of that period on the official ideology. However, it should be noted that Kemalist ideology cannot be regarded simply as a racist ideology. Although, in the 1930s, Kemalist ideology emphasized the superiority of Turkish race as a necessity of the nation-state, Atsız disagreed with the Kemalist Turkish History thesis. This disagreement between Atsız and Kemalist ideology will be elaborated later in the thesis.

It is necessary to remind that the developments in racism in Germany affected the official ideology in Turkey. It is significant to illustrate how Atsız's discourse is positioned within the general characteristics of that period. As stated before, Atsız formulated racism as a fundamental element of his version of Turkism. According to Atsız, "The core of Turkish nation should be race and blood, not language. Let's be less, there will be no harm. Yet, let's remain clean and genuine"[9]. Yaşlı pointed out that Atsız's emphasize on blood rather than language is significant to understand the difference between Atsız and the first period of Turkist figures who conceptualized their discourse from the culturalist view (Yaşlı, 2009, p.169). According to Atsız, nationality above all was a matter of blood for Turks and a man who called himself a Turk must be came from Turkish race[10]. Furthermore, he stated that

> Blood is something symbolic. There is conscious in blood but there are heredities coming from our ancestors in the genes and chromosomes and these fixed heredities create our race. The spiritual virtue such as heroism is even hereditary since it depends on a race's strength[11].

The abovementioned features of racism such as eugenics and superiority are located in Atsız's discourse. He believed that Turkish race has always lived as a noble (superior) race: "We have been living as a noble race since the oldest times of the history. We are not a bastard nation whose language is Latin, homeland is Kalt and name is German." [12]. In the western racism, white race is the noble race and Turks are regarded as an inferior race. Superiority of Turkish race in his discourse signifies the hierarchy of races which is the focal point of racists because it illustrates which races are superior or inferior to others (Fontette, 1991, p.9). Moreover, Atsız was against anthropometric studies such as skull measurements, blood analysis and counting seven generations back because he stated that:

[9] Atsız, N. 1933, Çanakkale'ye Yürüyüş, p.7.

[10] Atsız, N. 2012, "Türk Irkı=Türk Milleti", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.117.

[11] Atsız, N. 2018, "Türkler ve Devşirmeler", in Türkçülüğe Karşı Haçlı Seferleri ve Çektiklerimiz, p.209.

[12] Atsız, N. 2012, "Türk Vatanını Peşkeş Çekenlere", in Basılmayan Makaleler p.612.

> This racism was not about the measuring the skulls, having blood tests, counting seven ancestors unlike the claims of a few charlatans. Instead, as well as being dependent on race and blood, racism was a cause of having Turkish consciousness and not owning any foreigner race's consciousness.(…) The racism, an internal cause of Turkists, is the principle of Turks' dominating the fate of Turkey and filling the key positions of Turkey[13].

On the other hand, in his defence during the 1944 law case, he stated that in order to be pure-blooded Turkish, one had to be Turkish for at least three generation back (Bakiler, 2010, p. 91).

Here, the characteristics of Atsız's racism should be specified. According to him, racism was a matter of national defense, racial sanitation (or hygiene) and historical consciousness[14]. First of all, he regarded racism as a form of national defense. As it will be discussed in the part related to enemy images, foreign elements that lived in Turkey were evaluated as a threat by Atsız. He considered racism as a necessary element for the protection of the state against the possibility of betrayal. Secondly, according to him, racism was a racial sanitation. He stated that

> Since being mingled is always to the superior part's disadvantage, when Turkish race, the superior one, mingles with the low races, the superior characteristics of the Turk gets lost in the cross-breeds and replaced with the primitive characteristics of the low race[15].

He also mentioned the issue of race health in this way and the idea of eugenics can be clearly seen in his discourse. In one of his articles, he regarded human beings as the most significant capital; and stated that there were a large number of disabled and idiot people who proved the issue of race health[16]. According to Atsız, "the issue of health was only not about good nutrition, adequate sun exposure, and physical exercises but it was also about a hereditary matter"[17]. He believed that "there were many people who had hereditary psychological problems in Turkey and therefore the sterilization of these people who would transmit their mental illnesses

[13] Atsız, N. 2012, "Biz Ne İstediğimizi Biliyoruz", in Basılmayan Makaleler pp.113-114.

[14] Atsız, N. 2018, "Veda", in Makaleler III, p.89.

[15] Atsız, N. 2018, "Veda", in Makaleler III p.89.

[16] Atsız, N. 2012, "Amerikalılar Aya Giderken", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.413.

[17] Atsız, N. 2011, "Türkiye'nin Yeniden Kuruluşu", in Turancılık Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.220.

to their children had to be taken into consideration firstly even before the family planning policies aiming to prevent Turkey from the overpopulation. Furthermore, "destroying factors of race which caused cancers and hysteria such as factory and radiator fumes, exhaust gases, tobacco, and heavy alcohol drinks, had to be avoided"[18].Here, eugenics in his discourse was similar to Galton, who was called the modern founder of the idea of eugenics, stated that in order to protect the health of the race, the reproduction of population had to be controlled because it was otherwise impossible to prevent hereditary diseases (Alemdaroğlu, 2008, p. 417). Moreover, these statements of Atsız can be evaluated as the general reflection of the period. In the beginning of the 20th century, nation states implemented biological policies regarding public health and hygiene in order to create a homogeneous society (Arpacı, 2014, p.129).

As stated by Arpacı (2014), these policies were adopted in the early republican period both in discursive and judiciary level in Turkey, and also the idea of eugenics and racial hygiene were used interchangeably during the 1930s. Although the thought of eugenics did not turn into a systematic racism in Turkey, the discussions of eugenics and some state policies regarding to the public hygiene could be observed in that period. For instance, in 1930,the general hygiene law (*Umumi Hıfzıssıhha Kanunu*) and in 1938, the physical training law (*Beden Terbiyesi Kanunu*) were enacted in order to raise healthy future generations and control every stratum of the population (Alemdaroğlu, 2008, p.415; Arpacı, 2014, p.136). As stated by Alemdaroğlu (2008), the tendency of eugenics of the early republican period could be clearly seen in Ataturk's speeches that emphasized the protection of the nation from degenerating threats and the creation of alive population both physically and spiritually (p.415). Without any doubt, these policies also directly targeted women and young generation to protect both family and society. In a similar vein, Atsız emphasized the importance of marriage in order to raise Turkist and upstanding children. Accordingly, he warned that Turkists had to be careful

[18] Atsız, N. 2011, "Türkiye'nin Yeniden Kuruluşu", in Turancılık Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.221.

about the health and race status of the girls that they would be married[19]. In his article entitled "How Turkish girls should be raised?" gave significant clues regarding to his traditional thinking and the idea of eugenics. Accordingly,

> Turkish girls should be raised as the virtue representatives just like Turkish girls at the ancient times. They should be cold-blooded, dignified, plain and dutiful. A girl who is only going after ornaments is a prospective coquette estranged from the emotions of motherhood and homeland. This homeland does not need girls who dance very well, have a particular amount of dresses, get painted nicely, or even who bake perfect cakes; instead, it needs girls who say, "It is my biggest duty to raise virtuous girls and honorable boys to this country[20].

The idea of eugenics has opposed woman's having a career or active life in order to protect the characteristics of their hereditary motherhood and housewife qualifications (Alemdaroğlu, 2008, p.419) Although he was not strictly against existence of woman in professional life, he drew attention to the role of Turkish woman as a protector of family life: He stated

> Turkism is open-minded on the issue of women based upon the tradition of Turkish race and respects women. However, it is also fiercely against women's falling to the level of coquette. (…). We are supportive of women's receiving all types of education and, except from some situations, women's participation in every branch of work-life. Yet, we expect women do firstly their duty of virtue and wifehood before anything else in relation to the preservation of family structure[21].

Another characteristic of Atsız's racism was historical consciousness. According to him, since the old Turkish states, those who betrayed the state were of foreigner blood that was at high positions in the state[22]. This statement was also linked with the enemy images which will discussed later in this thesis. Furthermore, he attached importance to Turkish history in his writings because historical consciousness was the basis of the nation. He stated that history is the memory of nation, and nation without memory cannot be called a nation[23].

---

[19] Atsız, N. 2018, "Veda", in Makaleler III, p.102.

[20] Atsız, N. 1997, "Türk Kızları Nasıl Yetiştirilmeli", in Makaleler IV, pp.185-186.

[21] Atsız, N. 2018, "Veda", in Makaleler III, pp.98-99.

[22] Atsız, N. 2018, "Veda", in Makaleler III, p.89.

[23] Atsız, N. 2011, "Bu Yurdun Kutsal Yerleri", in Turancılık Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.95.

His racist characterization of historical consciousness should also be considered with the abovementioned issue of national defense. He believed that the state should be protected against betrayal attempts of foreigners by preventing the foreign blooded to reach a high level of statues in the governmental bodies. The only way to achieve his goal was to eliminate the foreigner blooded at all. As it is seen, he attributed a great level of importance to Turkish blood and equated Turkish race with Turkish nation.

In Atsız's discourse, the purest form of Turkish race was constituted by Turkish peasants. Turkish peasants were characterized with their higher level of morality, sacrifice and virtue. According to Atsız:

> The peasant swinging a reaping-hook under the burning sun today, the hero shedding blood on the borders tomorrow, a poor citizen trying to pay his taxes in his village later in his life or if he has not been a martyr yet, then he is a disabled person. The nameless heroes that have made measureless sacrifices; yet, do not feel any need of priding on these sacrifices consist of the majority of our villagers[24].

He also romanticized peasants as follows:

> The ones who wants to say something, explain something and subjugate the Turkish peasantry to themselves learn the psychology and ideology of this unique mass before everything else. Because Turkish peasantry is not a money-lover trader like French peasantry or dumb and rude like Russian peasantry. It has life experience gathered from the heredity of Turkish history and the disasters in the lives of the past centuries. A deeply perceptive and sharp intuitive soul lives under the calm and meaningless looking shell[25].

The above-mentioned emphasis on peasants was also significant to illustrate antagonism between cities and villages. He described villages were the main sources of both national development and national defense[26]. On the other hand, cities were regarded as unnecessary and hazardous places in terms of morality, health, public safety and protection[27]. In this regard, he prioritized the development of villages rather than cities because he believed that peasants were exploited by resident of

[24] Atsız, N. 2011, "Milli Ahlak", in Türk Ülküsü, p.126.

[25]Atsız, N. 2012, "İleriki İnkilapçilara", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.91.

[26]Atsız, N. 2011, "İktisat ve Milli Müdafaa", in Turancılık, Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.76.

[27]Atsız, N. 2011, "Türkiye'nin Yeniden Kuruluşu", in Turancılık, Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.222.

cities (Özdoğan, 2015, p.188) Describing cities with negative terms was also signified his anti-modernist approach.

During this period, racist Turkists were accused of implementing a type of German fascism and racism by leftist[28]. In this regard, in 1943 a booklet titled "The Greatest Threat" (*EnBüyükTehlike*) was published in order to criticize Turkists. As response to these accusations, articles were published by Reha Oğuz Türkkan, F. Oğuzkan and Ziya İlhan, and Atsız (Ayvazoğlu, 2008). Atsız, in his response entitled "The Most Sneaky Threat" (*EnSinsiTehlike*) claimed that there was a significant difference between German racism and Turkist racism. Turkists racism is against all nations, while German racism is only against Jews[29]. His main refutation held in opposition to these accusations was the nativeness of Turkism and Turkish racism. In another article he stated that

> It is apparent with the documents that Turkish racism is way older than German racism and that there is no relationship between Turkish racism put forward as a principle of protection against every nation and German racism against only the Jews. The objection arguing that a national goal has been injected to the Turks by a foreign nation is so rotten that there is no need to dwell on[30].

What Atsız denied in here was not racism; he denied the idea that his racism was inspired by German racism. As it will be discussed later in this thesis, in the 1944 case, Turkist figures would be accused of overthrowing the state by the inspiration of German Nazism. According to him, those who insulted the Turkist and slandered them as fascist and German agents, were indeed Muscovites[31]. After he described Kemalist regime as racist, he gave a relevant example of the racist practice of the Turkish state. Accordingly, in order to be accepted to the military school, the Turkish state stipulated that the applicant's descendants must be Turkish. According to Atsız:

[28] The background of these accusations, and the secret propaganda of Nazis that aimed to influence Pan-Turkist circle was precisely discussed by Özdoğan. Please see: Özdoğan,(2015,pp.156-164).

[29] Atsız, N. 1943, "En Sinsi Tehlike", in En Sinsi Tehlike, p.50.

[30] Atsız, N. 2011, "Dışarıdan Gelmeyen Tek Düşünce", in Türk Ülküsü, pp.37-38.

[31] Atsız, N. 2012, "Solcu Foyası", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.426.

> It can be seen that one does not necessarily become a fascist by being a racist. Because Turkish government, not a fascist, is being racist. What racist Turkists demand are that by taking this racism a step further, they should make sure that all schools only accept the students from Turkish race, that even all people playing a role in Turkish ideas and ethics are from Turkish race, and that all doctors, engineers, architectures and teachers to be Turkish in terms of blood[32].

And he replied those who accused him of being fascist: he was neither fascist nor democrat, because, as a Turkist thinker, he did not adopt any foreign ideology[33]. What denied in here is not fascism but adopting a foreign ideology. His understanding about fascism will be identified later in this thesis.

3.2.3. An Inevitable Breakup: Atsız and Türkkan

At this point, the antagonism between Reha Oğuz Türkkan and Atsız should also be discussed. As stated in the previous chapter, during that period, Türkkan was another prominent Turkist figure as well as Atsız. In the beginning, their relationship was not problematic, and both wrote articles in the same Turkist periodicals. However, afterwards, their criticism turned into an insult against each other. In this regard, first of all, Türkkan published an article titled "*Hesap Veriyoruz*" in order to criticize Atsız and his circle and then, Atsız responded to Türkkan's criticisms with the booklet "*Hesap Böyle Verilir*". Although the main problem between two rivals was a power struggle, they had also contradictory opinions in some respects. For instance, they did not have a similar understanding of Turkish history. Unlike Atsız, Türkkan believed that Sumerian, Hittite, Egypt, Greek civilizations were established by Turks (Özdoğan, 2015). However, the main issue, which deepened the dispute between two rivals, was that they had different perceptions of race and racism[34]. Türkkan, a young and ambitious Turkist, was against the mixture of races, and believed in the superiority of Turkish race and Turkish blood (Özdoğan, 2015, p.236). At first sight, Türkkan and Atsız seem to share similar perceptions of racism. However, as stated by Özdoğan, the racist

[32] Atsız, N. 1943, En Sinsi Tehlike, p.51.

[33] Atsız, N. 1943, En Sinsi Tehlike, p. 53.

[34] In his memories, Türkkan noted that he was upset due to their relationship breakdown and also he denied that rationale behind their antagonism was about the purity of Turkish race (Türkkan, 1975, pp.38-39).

perception of Türkkan was affected by the 1930's anthropological studies which aimed to depict a real Turk by taking a skull measurement. His understanding also relied on the physical characteristics of Turkish race. On the other hand, Atsız believed that being a Turk is not only about kinship (or blood tie) but also having the same moral, ethical and traditional values which were more crucial than the anthropological data (Özdoğan, 2015, p.237). Türkkan's perception of race was even regarded too much radical by Atsız. The racist ideas of Türkkan, who believed that hybrid Turkish children under the age of three had to be executed in order to protect Turkish race, were criticized by Atsız[35]. Another conflict between the two figures was the issue of being a real Turk. Atsız and Türkkan accused each other of "not being a real Turk" at every turn (Landau, 1995, p.97). Türkkan claimed that Atsız's skull was not brachycephalic (Özdoğan, 2015). In fact, Atsız claimed that the ancestors of Türkkan were Armenians, and he was called "*Ermenikan*" (Armenian-blood) by some of the Turkists[36]. In this regard, Atsız criticized him and poked fun at Türkkan's appearance in order to prove that he was non-Turkish. Consequently, their personal antagonism against each other turned into reciprocal criticisms which caused a split within the Turkists. Although this antagonism was about power struggle within the Turkist circle, it is also significant to understand Atsız's discourse better. He accused a Turkist figure, such as Türkkan, of having non-Turkish roots. This condition illustrates that according to Atsız, the fact that a person accepted Turkist ideology was not enough to make him a Turk. Apparently, in order to be accepted as Turkish, every condition must be compatible with Atsız's definition of Turkishness. This skeptical attitude toward everything and everyone turned into a fight against enemy images, which will be discussed later in this thesis.

3.3. Antagonism between Kemalism and Atsız

In the first chapter, it was stated that there was always a conflict between Atsız and Kemalist ideology. However, it should be noted that this antagonism was not a surprising case since Kemalist ideology was dominant as a consequence of the

[35] Atsız, N. 1943, Hesap Böyle Verilir, p.12.

[36] Atsız, N. 1943, Hesap Böyle Verilir, p.31.

nation-state structure. There were some cornerstones about this tension. The first breaking point between Atsız and Kemalism was Turkish History Thesis. As stated earlier in this thesis, Turkist scholars criticized Turkish History Thesis for some reasons. Especially, it was argued that this thesis lacked applaudable scientific basis. In order to associate Turks with western nations, Turks were depicted as the member of white races. Furthermore, Turkish History Thesis claimed that there was a racial affinity between Turkish race and old Central Asian nations. In terms of Atsız's view, considering the old nations and every people living in Anatolia as Turkish was ridiculous. According to him, unlike Turkish History Thesis, Turkists' history thesis was a national view based on a scientific framework [37].

Although Atsız's negative attitude toward Republican ideology began with the history thesis, this negativity turned into enmity after the 1944 case, after which Atsız was sentenced to imprisonment. He described both Atatürk and İsmet İnönü as dictators[38]. Altan Deliorman, who was one of the students of Nihal Atsız, stated that Atsız's feelings towards Atatürk were negative (Deliorman, 1978, p.169). However, in his articles, Atsız did not explicitly criticize Atatürk; in fact, in some writings he emphasized Ataturk's success in the war of independence and glorified his political genuine (Kakışım, 2016). As it is seen, his discourse on Atatürk varies from positivity to negativity. Surprisingly, the antagonism between Atsız's thought and Kemalism was not frequently mentioned by Atsız's admires. This issue was ignored by his followers who wrote his life journey and biography (Aytürk, 2011).

As emphasized by Aytürk (2011) his criticism against Ataturk and his circle came up later in his famous satirical novel, "*Dalkavuklar Gecesi*" (p.308). Although the real name of the politicians and scholars of the period were not mentioned in the novel, his imaginative characters could be easily identified as the real-life politicians and intellectuals (Aytürk, 2011, p.309). This novel was about a Hittite king and sycophants around him. According to Aytürk (2011), in this novel, the king of Hittite, who represents Atatürk, is an immoral and alcoholic person, having an affair

[37] Atsız, N. 2011, "Türkçülüğün Önemli Meseleleri", in Türk Ülküsü, p.88.

[38] Atsız, N. 2011, "Açık Yürekli Olmak", in Turancılık, Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.182.

with adopted daughter, and who is under the influence of mixed blood sycophants (p. 321).

As states by Aytürk (2011), Reha Oğuz and his circle declared that they did not share Atsız's allegations. On the other hand, some scholars opposed the idea that this novel was a proof of Atsız's opposition to Atatürk. According to this perspective, the existence of the king in the novel is a necessity in order to criticize the sycophants, but the king depicted in the novel was not Atatürk. Moreover, Atsız's antagonism toward Kemalist circle and Kemalist ideology was regarded as a result of the difficulties experienced due to Kemalist regime[39]. The tension between Atsız and Kemalism was evaluated by his admirers as a consequence of the policy of Kemalist regime toward Turkists, especially during the 1944 case.

According to Atsız, the reason behind the negative perception of Turkism was the anti-propaganda of local Muscovites, Devshirmehs and also the RPP, which was the mother of leftism in Turkey[40]. As it will be mentioned in the next chapter, Muscovites and Devshirmehs became significant the subject of his enemy images. Mentioning the RPP together with Atsız's enemies proves that his perception of the RPP and the Kemalists was as negative as other enemies of Atsız. Therefore, it is possible to deduce that he regarded Kemalist regime as an enemy of Turkists since he believed that the RPP sided against Turkists and Turkism. He also believed that there were many Muscovites who captured significant positions in the party[41]. From Atsız's perspective the RPP was not a Turkist party and was surrounded by the non-Turkish such as Muscovites, Devshirmehs and Masons.

When his racist nature is taken into consideration, his emphasis on non-Turkish elements in the state structure becomes meaningful. He was also against the understanding of Turkishness of the RPP which left ambiguities between those who was real Turk and those who was not. For instance, during the single party period,

[39] Ercilasun, A.B. (2018,January 5). Atsız'ın Atatürk ve Cumhuriyet Hakkındaki Görüşleri. Retrieved on April 10, 2019 from http://www.turkdevrimi.com/yazarlar/prof-dr-ahmet-bican-ercilasun/atsizin-ataturk-ve-cumhuriyet-hakkindaki-gorusleri/1817/

[40] Atsız, N. 2018, "Türkçülük ve Siyaset", in Makaleler III, p.25.

[41] Atsız, N. 2012, "Milletin İfşaatı", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.342.

the RPP implemented a language policy for non-Turkish minorities which encouraged them to speak in Turkish with the slogan of "citizen, speak Turkish!". In terms of Atsız's point of view, this policy made it harder to realize *Türkümsü* elements (those acting as Turkish while not being a real Turkish) which had capacity to betray the state. Therefore, as stated by Aytürk (2011), one of the main breaking points between Atsız and Kemalism was the definition of Turkishness. While Kemalist interpretation defines Turkishness as Turkish citizenship, Atsız's version relies on the superiority of Turkish race. Although there were some ethnicist emphases in Kemalist nationalism after the 1930s, it never gained a racist framework as much as Atsız's Turkishness did. For Atsız, the RPP and Kemalist regime were not sufficiently nationalist, and they allowed the state to be ruled by non-Turkists.

As it was stated above, another breaking point between Atsız and Kemalist ideology was the issue of racism. Accordingly, he stated that:

> I wonder if racism is a destructive idea of the national unity, is Kemalism an idea that provides the national unity? Today, both the racists and the Kemalists are small communities within Turkish nation. If the Kemalists do not fancy racism, then the racists do not fancy Kemalism, either. When you separate the ones, who differ from the others in thinking as the breakers of national unity within the existing communities, it is necessary to interrogate altogether political parties and associations and bring the Kemalists who have caused troubles to this nation for thirty years to head them[42].

His anti-Kemalist discourse which stems from ideological differences between his Turkist-Turanist ideology and Kemalism, are illustrated in these statements clearly. While Kemalist ideology is based on Ataturk's famous quote "Peace at home, peace in the world", Atsız believed that life itself was a war, and one should not never flee from a war. According to him, statesmen can pretend to offer peace for political interest or bureaucratic kindness, but "the greatest danger for a nation is to sleep by swallowing the opium of peace and friendship"[43]. In this regard, the main world views of these two perspectives were conflicting with each other.

[42] Atsız, N. 2012, "Milli Birlik", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.255.

[43] Atsız, N. 2018, "Ülküler Saldırıcıdır", in Makaleler III, p.80.

3.4. Atsız's Perception of Religion

According to Landau (1995), although the position of Turkists about religion was complicated, in general, they adopted secularism for pragmatic and tactical reasons. Similarly, Yaşlı (2009) stated that most of Turkist figures evaluated religion as an important component for the society in terms of moral codes rather than as a complementary element of Turkish race, and also they strongly opposed Pan-Islamist movements (p.92). As stated in the previous chapter, in terms of moral and ethical values, religion was regarded by Gökalp as a binding element of the nation. Although Atsız did not attribute as much importance to the notion of religion as Gökalp did, he considered religion as a necessary element for the morality of the nation. According to Atsız;

> The belief in God and therefore, religion, is an indispensable spiritual and ethical big base both for the nation and the individual. Hence, we believe that being one of two main bases that Turkish world is dependent on today, Islam is an inseparable part of our national existence[44].

Furthermore, he criticized Pan-Islamism and political Islam because they ignored Turkishness and they were enemies of nationalism[45]. He believed that "Turks did not rise above thanks to Mohammadanism, instead, Mohammadanism did thanks to the Turks."[46].

In his writings, religion was always in a contradictory position. His thoughts about religious notions and Islam evolved according to developments of the respective period. In his early writings, he put emphasis on secularism in the secularist atmosphere of early Republican period. For instance, he supported Turkification of Islam with translation of Koran and azan into Turkish[47]. On the other hand, he criticized the RPP for being too much secularist. The rationale behind his contradictory discourse was that he considered religion as a dissuasive force to

[44] Atsız, N. 1997, "Türk Milletine Çağrı", in Makaleler IV, p.49.

[45] Atsız, N. 2012, "Sağcı Kimdir", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.94.

[46] Atsız, N. 2012, "İslam Birliği Kuruntusu", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.550.

[47] Atsız, N. 1997, "Aynı Tarihi Yanlışa Düşüyoruz", in Makaleler IV, p.464.

communist threat. According to Atsız,

> Communism could not be stopped either by nationalism or religion. It would be wiser to use both of them without any doubt…(…) Religion could be the source of a big national energy and defense as being a strength embedded into the soul of the people. Yet, since The People's Party declared secularism, it felt itself outside of the scope of religion, even faithless. This is one of the biggest mistakes of The People's Party[48].

On the other hand, he considered religious movements as dangerous as communism. For instance, Nur movement and its leader Said Nursi was criticized by Atsız. Accordingly, "From the perspective of Turkishness, there is no difference between communism and Nurcu movement. Both of them are working to destroy Turkish nation and culture. One of them is the political cause of Arabism"[49]. As it will be seen in next chapter, communists were the greatest enemy of Atsız. While communism originated from the Muscovite, Nur movement was inspired by Egypt (Şanlı, 2010, p.62). Hence, both communism and Nur movement were not native ideologies. As stated earlier the only native ideology was Turkism. While he criticized the Nur movement, he also mentioned the ethnic origins of Said Nursi and defined him as a Kurdish nationalist.[50] Furthermore, in his perspective, both communists and Islamist bigots were enemies of Turkism. According to Atsız, "Religion is a social institution that walks along with life. The ones that freeze and leave religion behind by not adjusting to the requirements of life are the bigots"[51]. Bigotry which is international disease can be red or green. While communists were defined as red international (*kırmızı beynelmilelci*), Islamist bigots were depicted as green International *(yeşil beynelmilelci*).[52]

Moreover, he stated that Islamist bigots cannot be part of the NAP: "This party is not a party where the bigots can take shelter in. The ones presuming that Islam is

[48] Atsız, N. 2018, "CHP'nin Türkçülere ve Komünistlere Karşı 1944'den Evvel Tutumu", in Türkçülüğe Karşı Haçlı Seferleri ve Çektiklerimiz, p.160.

[49] Atsz, N. 2012, "İslam Birliği Kuruntusu", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.551.

[50] Atsız, N. 2012, "Nurculuk Denen Sayıklama", in Basılmayan Makaleler, pp.530-531.

[51] Atsız, N. 2012, "Yobazlık Bir FikirMüstehasesidir", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.582.

[52] Atsız, N. 2012, "Türkçülüğe Karşı Yobazlık", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.566.

bigotry do not have any business in this party"[53]. It should also be stated that Atsız's religious identity was discussed many times by scholars and his admirers. While some of his followers claimed that Atsız was Muslim, his son Yağmur Atsız falsified this belief. As stated by his son, Atsız could be described neither as a shamanist nor a Muslim. Although he did not believe in divine religions, he was not an atheist[54]. In fact Atsız criticized Mohammed and believed that Koran had been written by him. Atsız's radical approaches on religion were one of the important features that separated Atsız from the NAP. As stated in previous chapter, after the Adana congress of the NAP, the constitutional ideology of the party was integrated with religious notions. As a result, Atsız's negative discourses on religion were not accepted by the party.

3.5. The Notion of State in Atsız's Discourse

In order to analyze Atsız's ideological characteristics, his perception of the state should be examined. In this regard, this part of the thesis focuses on the notions of citizenship, nation, leadership and state structure. The first factor that emerged in his discourse regarding the notion of state is the narrative of deep-rooted state. In contradiction to Kemalists, Atsız believed that, until that time, Turks had only established a single state. Turkish Republic was a continuation of Turkish states which always existed since the old epochs. According to him, Turkish states, such as the Ottoman Empire, Gokturks, and Seljukians established by different family or stirpes were successors of each other[55]. Therefore, after the foundation of the Turkish Republic, the only thing that changed was the regime of the state. For him, political regime was like a dress which could be easily changed[56]. The underestimation of regime in this definition is directly related to the functions of both the republic and democracy as it will be discussed later. Atsız's discourse frequently focused on the motivation to protect the state. In order to do so, he

[53] Atsız, N. 2012, "Türkçülüğe Karşı Yobazlık", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.565.

[54] In Star newspaper, YağmurAtsız responded some claims about the thoughts of his father. Please see: https://odatv.com/nihal-atsiz-musluman-degildi-1205091200.html

[55] Atsız, N. 2014, "Türk Tarihine Bakışımız Nasıl Olmalıdır", in Türk Tarihinde Meseleler, p.12.

[56] Atsız, N. 2011, "Milli Kültürü Koruma Kanunu", in Turancılık Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.77.

sepeated that the owner of the state was real Turks and emphasized how inner enemies had weakened the state throughout history.[57]

3.5.1. Nation as a Citizen-Soldier Profile

State and nation were seen as an inseparable whole by Atsız. This idea is also the basis of nationalist ideologies. Hence, as stated above, it was incorrect to identify the state with the regime or dynasty because the main thing that defined the state was "the nation". Here, there is a reciprocal relationship: the existence of the nation is based on state, while the existence of the state is based on the nation. The nation was thought as a part or organ of the state on the one hand, and on the other hand as a notion that created and made sense of the state. Atsız tended to romanticize the concepts of the state and the nation. Atsız especially focused on the necessity of a president with a strong personality, and also a strong national ideal with consciousness. In spite of all these romantic touches, he stated that one of the most significant forces of the state was the police force[58]. Although it seemed contradictory to his romantic discourse at the first sight, his emphases on the police became meaningful when his discourse on obedience, authority, and discipline was taken into consideration. His focus on these abstractions will be discussed later.

Atsız defined the state as an independent nation organized by citizens[59]. Similarly, Zeki Veledi Togan, a well-known Turkist Turanist figure, defined Turks as an organized dominant nation and also as an etatist nation (Bora, 2006, p.46). According to Tanıl Bora, the understanding of a dominant state refers to a state having custody of its citizens (Bora, 2015, p.30).A similar tendency can be seen in Atsız's discourse regarding to the notion of state. However, this custody seems to be that of a night watchman rather than a protective family. In other words, it refers to a system that disciplines its citizens under a certain order by observing and keeping them under control as it is in any fascist ideology. As a matter of fact, Atsız's

[57]At least until the coup d'état on September 12, 1980, the notion of protection of the state became one of the decisive principles of NAP and Idealists which developed after the 1960s (Bora&Can, 1991, p.48).

[58] Atsız, N. 2012, "Solcu Foyası", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.420.

[59] Atsız, N. 2012, "Konuşmalar I", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.595.

emphases about an authoritarian and disciplined state are paralleled with this perception. At this point, it is necessary to take a detailed look at how Atsız understood the concept of citizen. Notions such as race, culture, the unity of ideal and history also took place in his understanding of citizenship. However, he also separated citizens into different types. As it can be seen below, the ideological axis which he followed also in his perception of citizenship relied on the separation of the sides:

> There are a few types of citizens in terms of the loyalty towards the nation and the homeland. Foremost among them, heroes come. They are hero citizens who can always sacrifice themselves for the sake of nation and homeland without expecting anything in return. The number of this class is pretty small. The second class refers to the good citizens. Even if they do not always sacrifice themselves alone and with their own will, they can sacrifice themselves in order to leave a good reputation after their death. These good citizens who sacrifice themselves for sacred duties and goals gets encouraged when they see others alike and closer to the first class. The third class is the citizens, apart from being unable to sacrifice themselves by nature, can bear any other sacrifice, and even when it is required them to sacrifice themselves, can bear this without any desire, meaning they do not consider of running away is the third class. The fourth class is a bad class which can sacrifice in return for another gain, except from sacrificing their blood, and can do every type of trick in order to avoid the sacrifice of blood[60].

His formulation of different citizenship types focused on a separation between good and evil as it will be discussed later in this thesis. In Schnapper's (1995) own words, making such a distinction on citizenship is contrary to the Universalist goal of modern interpretation of citizenship (p.10). As a racist ideologue, Atsız could not be expected to adopt Universalist or integrative approaches.

According to Atsız, Turkism was based on the principle of a well-disciplined nation. A disciplined nation meant a system of mutual rights and duties between state and individual, and "a nation with an evident life conception, values, taste, enjoys, sorrows and even guise and schedule"[61]. Citizen, created as a social subject in public sphere by modern state, indicates a militarized citizen in the discourse of Atsız (Üstel, 2004b). His emphases on discipline regarding every stratum of society and every organ of state gained meaning in this context.

[60] Atsız, N. 2016, "Büyük Adam", in Türk ülküsü, pp.78-79.

[61] Atsız, N. 2018, "Veda", in Makaleler III, p.97.

According to Füsun Üstel, with the emergence of the notion of citizen in the Second Constitutional period, the notion remained indefinable both in the Second Constitutional period and in the Republican period. On the other hand, the racist-Turkist ideology of Atsız tended to reject this ambiguity which continued during the Republican period. As stated before, the notions of nation and citizen were used interchangeably in this period. However, this situation was related to the period in which Kemalist pedagogy was built. Therefore, being a Turkish citizen was based on the feeling of Turkishness and possessing Turkish consciousness. For instance, in the Malumat- Medeniye[62] books, written during the Republican period, the homeland was seen as a home, for this very reason, every citizen was regarded as siblings of each other (Üstel, 2004b, p.73). Furthermore, the new man, who became meaningful with his good and bad attitudes, was built as a citizen in terms of body, wisdom and morality (Üstel, 2004b, p.80).

The uncertainty within the concept of citizenship led to ambiguities in terms of the representation of the individual. This point is where Atsız separated from other thinkers and also the Republican ideology: the frequently repeated expressions in Atsız's discourse stems from his tendency to clarify and adopt all these notions. With the above-mentioned concept of the militarized citizen, the subject was transformed into a citizen-soldier profile. This profile follows a clear and a straight line in the public sphere, family life, relations among women and men, and young generation. According to Atsız, Turkey was in need of a strict military discipline[63]. As stated by Weber (2004), each discipline arises from military discipline (p.333). Social authority and discipline instill both the ruler and the ruled in the sense of obedience. Here, Atsız stated

> Discipline is a blind-folded obedience.(…) The obeyed wrong decision is even more fruitful than the discussed right decision is. (…) Discipline… The pride of

[62] Füsun Üstel explains the concept of citizen which takes place in Malumat-ı Medeniye books in this era, as an understanding of community citizen rather than individual citizen (Üstel, 2004, p.73).

[63] Atsız, N. 2018, "Milli Uyanıklık", in Makaleler III, p.206.

> giving orders and the buzz of getting orders… This buzz is something amazing and, an enormous force like atom energy is hidden[64].

These expressions were also good examples of his militaristic view. In this regard, the concept of war and death should be identified. The concept of war became a significant component of Atsız's discourse as a result of his militaristic view. According to Atsız, the whole life itself was war. As a result of his perception on the relationship between war and life, while he extolled war, he also romanticized death:

> The life itself is a war. The ones that fear death shall not live. How flags become the flag as they become bloodshot and how lands become the homeland as they are watered with blood, communities are the nations to the degree they how to die. Only animals and brutish people run away from the death. The most beautiful death is the death for the sake of homeland and honour[65].

Being a warrior was located within the genetic codes of Turkish nation. In his narratives about Turkish history, he always emphasized how Turks were great warriors and how they conquered the enemies' lands. Therefore, most of his writings were war-related with historical victories of Turks and their characteristics as warriors. War was also a thing that could prevent moral corruption. According to him, if a nation did not fight for a long time, the morality of that nation would degenerate[66].

3.5.2. The Perception of Leader in Atsız's Discourse

In old Turkish states, the leader of the state was called *Başbuğ* which means the commander of the Turkish armed forces. Moreover, the notion of *Başbuğ* had a historical and mystical meaning (Bora & Can, 1991, p.360). As stated by Bora and Can, this historical meaning was also based on the idea that *Başbuğ* was the deputy of God. In this way, it attributed superiority to *Başbuğ*. Surprisingly, as a Turkist thinker, Atsız did not include any remarkable emphases regarding the *Başbuğ* figure

[64] Atsız, N. 2014, "30 Ağustos ve Türk Ordusu", in Türk Tarihinde Meseleler, p.142.

[65] Atsız, N. 2014, "30 Ağustos ve Türk Ordusu", in Türk tarihinde meseleler, p.145.

[66] Atsız, N. 2016, "Büyüklük Ülküsü", in Türk Ülküsü, p.18.

in discourse[67] except for some historical works such as Aşıkpaşa Oğlu Tarihi, and Dokuz Boy Türkler and Osmanlı Sultanlar Tarihi.

The *Başbuğ* image took place in his analyses on the history of Turkish states and their founders and leaders. Moreover, he mentioned heroic behaviors of old Turkish statesmen and their high level of ruling abilities. These statements, however, did not explain his perception on the position of political leader. In these works, he mainly focused on reminding old Turkish Başbuğs' success in terms of war and the state government. Hence, the image of Başbuğ referred to a heroic figure extolled by Atsız. He stated "In the memories of the nations, there are such some wars and some heroes [*Başbuğs*] that commanded in these wars that the places where they fought, died and killed become the symbols of "the faith in being a nation" and sacred[68]. As it is seen he attributed special position to the image of Başbuğ. Therefore, he was against the dependence of the chief of the general staff to the Prime ministry like a cadastral manager[69].

In his discourse, the president of the state was more significant than the government agencies and governmental systems. Moreover, the president of the state was considered as a constituent element of Turkish race and nation. According to Atsız

> As a part of 3000 years old national character, Turkish race has got used to take shape in accordance with the leaders. If there is a good man in the lead, Turkish nation would be strong, otherwise, it would be weak. That a strong leader sometimes saved Turkishness from big dangers is one of things that have been observed[70].

As it is understood from his statements, if the president of the state was powerful, then the Turkish nation would be powerful. This pre-condition of the strong nation illustrates that the soul of the nation and the superiority of Turkish race arise in the

[67] Although Atsız was not preferred to use *Başbuğ* in his writings, in the 1960s for both NAP and idealists the image of Başbuğ was used frequently and identified with Alpaslan Türkeş's personality.(Bora&Can, 1991, p.360)

[68] Atsız, N. 2011, "Bu Yurdun Kutsal Yerleri", in Turancılık Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.95.

[69] Atsız, N. 2011, "Hukuk Her Şey Değildir", in Turancılık Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.203.

[70] Atsız, N. 2018, "İsmet İnönü'yü Tanıyorum", in Türkçülüğe Karşı Haçlı Seferleri ve Çektiklerimiz, p.83.

authority of the leader. Thus, the existence of the nation was identified with the superiority of the leader/or head of the state. This superiority also attached the leader a characteristic of charismatic leadership. In this respect, Atsız's perception of the leader image resembled with Nazizm since the leader myth and charismatic leadership were significant components of Nazism (Welch, 2002, p.107).

When his racist nature is considered, the leader or Başbuğ had to be Turkish. As it has been illustrated in the racism part, he was against the non-Turkish who were located in the governmental bodies since they betrayed the Turkish states throughout history. Naturally, the racial purity of statesmen was the significant subject matter of his discourse. As it is seen, the main element during the determination of the political elites was the racial purity of statesmen (Özdoğan, 2015, pp.198-199). That was evaluated by Özdoğan as the indicator of Atsız's elitist nature.

According to Atsız, state presidents were always authoritarian during Turkish history, so it was not possible to even imagine a non-authoritarian president. Moreover, because of their strong personality, they could be a dictator[71]. In order to provide an authoritarian order, Atsız stated that

> Increasing the statutory authority of the state leaders and letting them to get elected twice, in short, bringing the statutory authority that Turkish nation has been familiar and missed is a precaution to block the anarchy path towards which Turkey was dragged in speed[72].

Here, there is a contradictory situation: on one hand he emphasized the superiority of the head of the state; on the other hand, he mentioned that the president should be elected two times. If the president had the potential for being a dictator with his strong personality, then how would he accept to be elected only two times? It is not possible to answer this question since there is no explanation on this issue in his writings. However, it is a remarkable indicator in order to understand how Atsız's discourse is contradictory in some cases.

[71] Atsız, N. 2011, "Türkiye'nin Yeniden Kuruluşu", in Turancılık, Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.224.

[72] Atsız, N. 2012, "Otorite", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.434.

3.5.3. The Change of Regime: From Anti-Democracy to "*Türkeli*"

In 1950, Atsız wrote an article entitled "The Assembly of Founders" which efficiently expressed his thoughts regarding to both the state and regime. According to Atsız, "The Turkish Republic was founded in May 1950. Before this, the period, 1923-1950, was a time of illegitimate and imperious dictatorship"[73]. These statements were also linked with Atsız's confrontation with Kemalist regime and the RPP. The 1950 was the year when the DP government came to power and the opponents of the RPP gained victory. In this sense, it is significant that he regarded the 1950 as the establishment of modern Turkey. As stated earlier in this thesis, in 1946, Turkey entered into a multi-party system. This power change was actualized by the functions of the democracy. While he evaluated the period of the DP government as a disputed and noisy democracy, he regarded the period after the 1960 coup as a system that was dominated by a democratic order[74]. Here, it is necessary to ask this question: Did Atsız believe the idea of democracy? Although he evaluated the year 1950 as a collapse of the dictatorship, it did not mean he was a strong supporter of democracy. He attributed a negative meaning to the concept of democracy in most of his writings. He believed that: "Democracy is the most arduous management system"[75]. He stated

> Democracy is the regime of deciding by extensively talking and discussing for every issue. Nevertheless, these discussions are bound to long period of time and they can happen when there is no outsider threat (…) Even though it used to constitute power, the tolerance of democracy today is serving for the enemies within itself. Fascism and communism have grown thanks to the tolerance of democracy[76].

This was exactly where Atsız's thoughts intersected with fascism. Democracy was by nature vulnerable to enemies, especially to communism. As it will be discussed later, for him, fascism was born in order to be protected from the threat of communism.

---

[73] Atsız, N. 2011, "Kurucular Meclisi", in Turancılık, Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.197.

[74] Atsız, N. 2012, "Partiler ve Tutumları", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.221.

[75] Atsız, N. 2011, "Bize Bir Gençlik Lazımdır", in Türk Ülküsü, p.138.

[76] Atsız, N. 1943, "Üç rejim", in En Sinsi Tehlike, p.39.

After all these negative attachments, he developed a positive perception toward democracy in particular cases. He regarded democracy as a necessity of both social and political conditions at those times. Accordingly, "As this idea has rooted in our nation day by day, it is also the regime of our allies we are obliged to act together"[77]. He saw democracy as a means of alliance politics. In his words, regimes were the clothes that could be changed whenever the conditions were convenient. At the same time, it was something to be got rid of in case of dangerous situations. For instance, when intellectuals and political leaders led the nation to disaster for the sake of their desires, the way of salvation was to give up democracy[78]. Democracy, which he was ready to give up whenever it was necessary, is a tool to carve a pathway toward fascism. This quotation also illustrates his enmity against intellectuality, which is also significant component of fascist understanding.

In his article entitled "Call for Turkish Nation" he mentioned a nine-point progress plan which he called "National Development Programme". According to this plan, he stated that: "We are Turkists. Supporter of purified Turkish language. Legalists. Communitarianists (*Toplumcu*). National traditionalists. Supporter of democracy. Moralists. Scientists. Technicians"[79]. As it is seen, after all negative associations built on the concept of democracy; he included democracy as an element of his development plan. According to Bora, the inclusion of democracy into the program increased the scope of actions of the program (Bora, 2017, p.305). It is thought-provoking, in terms of scope and functioning of the program, that a Turkist-Turanist ideologue is mentioned together with democracy, *toplumculuk* and technicianism.

Atsız depicted the notion of democracy from the perspective of Turkism as it follows: "The democracy in Turkism is a democracy that has not been slacken, degenerated, strictly disciplined and does not allow any immoral suggestions"[80].Although democracy has different definitions, in the simplest way;

[77] Atsız, N. 1997, "Türk Milletine Çağrı", in Makaleler IV, p.51.

[78] Atsız, N. 2012, "Konuşmalar II", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.623.

[79] Atsız, N. 1997, "Türk Milletine Çağrı", in Makaleler IV, p.53.

[80] Atsız, N. 2016, "Türkçülük ve Siyaset", in Türk Ülküsü, p.116.

democracy is a system of thought based on popular sovereignty. Considering democracy as a form of strict discipline and morality control mechanism indicates that democracy principle presented in Atsız's development programme has nothing to do with the mainstream meaning of democracy. In other words, it is everything except democracy. Then, why did he mention democracy even if his statements and definitions had nothing to do with democracy? As it is stated in the previous chapter, the perception regarding to democracy was built in Turkish society with the transition to multi-party regime. Furthermore, this development program was written after the coup d'état on May 27, 1960. Although the democratic regime was interrupted by military intervention, the idea of democracy was something needed and desired by the society. Therefore, the principle of democracy in development programme can be regarded as an output of his tactical thinking in straightening his attachment to the mainstream discourse of democracy in this period.

Another remarkable point in this program was Atsız's emphasis on the idea of "*toplumculuk*"[81]. According to him, "*Toplumculuk* is a nationalist populism and it should not be mistaken for socialism which is an internationalist populism"[82]. Additionally, he stated that "Turkish morality has *toplumcu* connotations since old epochs"[83]. Similarly, the idea of *toplumculuk* also took place in the Nine Light doctrine, which was written by Alparslan Türkeş as a nationalist manifesto. During this period, the idea of *toplumculuk* is discussed by different intellectuals. One of them was Kurt Karaca, who aimed to construct a theoretical framework for "*Milliyetçi-Toplumcu*" view, and he stated that there was no connection between National Socialism and *Milliyetçi-Toplumculuk* in the preface to his book (Karaca, 1971, p.11). In the following years, the idea of *toplumculuk* was removed from the ideological basis of the NAP due to the possible connections with National Socialism, and the "*toplumcu*" wing was suspended from the party (Bora & Can,

[81] The direct translation of "*Toplumculuk*" into English is socialism. As stated above, however, this connotation was rejected by Atsız and other nationalist figures.

[82] Atsız, N. 2012, "Sosyalizm Maskaralığı", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.394.

[83] Atsız, N. 2011, "Türk Ahlakı", in Türk Ülküsü, p.47.

1991, p. 80). As it might be expected, Atsız also strongly denied the accusations that there were similarities between Turkism and Nazism. His reference point was the idea that every nationalism was against the other nationalisms. Following this logic, he concluded that since the Nazism was German nationalism and Turkism was Turkish nationalism, they could not be the same things[84].

As mentioned above, Atsız emphasized morality and moral development rather than economic development, and that was one of the bridges between Turkish right and conservatism. For instance, Nurullah Topçu, a well known conservative intellectual, offered "*toplumculuk*" as a third way alternating capitalism and communism. His third way was based on morality (Sarıtaş, 2006).

In addition to his national development program, more rigid expressions on state structure can be found in Atsız's discourse. He stated that the Turkish Republic should be demolished and a more powerful state should be established instead of the old one[85]. According to Atsız, the name of this new state should be changed from *Türkiye* to *Türkeli*[86]. This issue was also elaborated by İsmail Hami Danişmend's book entitled *Türklük Meseleleri.* According to Danişmend (1983), the name "*Türkeli*" covered Turkish homeland, Turkish nation and Turkish state at the same time (p.159).

Atsız's reformist approach can also be seen in his discourse on education. To him, the reform in the field of education was not easy to achieve. According to Atsız "The teachers who has the illness of "Marx, Lenin and Mao" in their heads should be sacrificed for the sake of education reform"[87]. Moreover, he believed that the Minister of National Education should be authoritarian and Turkist[88]. In connection

[84] Atsız, N. 2016, "Türkçülük ve Siyaset", in Türk Ülküsü, p.116.

[85] Atsız, N. 2012, "Türkiye'nin Yeniden Kurulması", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.507.

[86] Atsız, N. 2018, "Milli Kültürü Koruma Kanunu", in Makaleler III, p.261.

[87] Atsız, N. 2014, "Malazgirt'in 900. Yıl Dönümü ve Milli kültür", in Türk Tarihinde Meseleler, p. 82.

[88] Atsız, N. 1997, "Dün ve Yarın", in Makaleler IV, p. 228.

with this idea, he supported "very harsh discipline" in education[89]. As it is seen, his understanding of education was based on obedience, discipline and authority. Here, the aim was to take people's personality under the state control. In this way, the state could create an internal control mechanism in the individual (Teber, 2001). According to Teber (2011), this mechanism works with the external control mechanism of social institutions, and they mutually reproduce each other. Thus, authority becomes an internalized and voluntary situation. While society reaches the consciousness of discipline in the military perfection, the education system becomes an ideological device of the state.

In the light of this information, it can be inferred that he was in favor of an anti-democratic, authoritarian and disciplined state structure. However, he did not construct his discourse on a systematical political theory (Özdoğan, 2015).

3.6. Atsız's Notion of Fascism

In his article "The Fascist", he defined the etymology of fascism and explained that it was Italian nationalism. Therefore, the nationalist movements of different nations are named in a different way, i.e. German nationalism is called National Socialism[90]. According to him, the main principles of fascism were national ideal, national pride, tradition and religion, and he conceptualized fascism as a cure for communist threat:

> [Fascism] is a remedy the nations fall back on in order to protect their national existence against communism that denies nationalism and is hostile against the traditions and values to destroy the nations. It is a discipline path appealed against the disorder and chaos born from the freedom, anarchy and communism. Fascism in Europe has been born in only three countries, Italy, Germany and Spain, which have fallen in danger of communism. Thus, fascism is a social antidote[91].

As it is seen, he idealized fascist ideology and attributed a savior mission to prevent the nation/state from falling into the clutches of communism. After he mentioned the victory of fascism in Germany, he associated the failure of fascism in Italy with

[89] Atsız, N. 2012, "Konuşmalar I", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.610.

[90] Atsız, N. 2012, "Faşist", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.78.

[91] Atsız, N. 1943, "Üç Rejim", in En Sinsi Tehlike, p.40.

the captivity of Rome and Italian hybridity. He idealized fascism as a successful ideology, and although communists and secret communist party existed in Turkey, he believed that instead of fascists and fascist party, there was Turkist youth who called themselves Grey Wolves protecting the state against enemies[92]. In order to clarify his understanding with regards to fascism, his discourse about Hitler should also be mentioned, even though Hitler was mentioned few times. In another article "Vacation to 68th Province", which was written in 1969 after his vacation in Germany, he praised Hitler's activities such as building great freeways and stated that:

> No matter what wrongs and faults Hitler has, he has made Germans taste the unity of Germans and the glory and majesty of Prussian national history. When nations are overwhelmed, they set their eyes on the shiny leaves of the past. The Germans can be expected to turn back one day as a result of such fragmentation, contempt and destruction coming from the inside[93].

This article written during the Cold War is significant in illustrating Atsız's expectations regarding to the revival of fascist ideology. The reason why he rejected the accusations of being a fascist was not related to how fascism was defined but the fact that he saw fascism as a foreign ideology. Even though he did not regard himself as a fascist, all these discussions in this chapter reveal that his discourse demonstrates fascist characteristics.

3.7. Concluding Remarks

Throughout this chapter main concepts in Atsız's discourse were examined. Beginning from his Turkist-Turanist ideology, this chapter has illustrated that the notion of race was the basis of his discourse. It has revealed that Atsız's racism shared a similar understanding with the racist perception of the period, especially with Nazizm, in the context of eugenics. According to Atsız's perspective, racism was a necessity to protect the superiority of Turkish nation from the other races. This also shows that the Atsız's position in Turkish nationalism was more radical

[92] Atsız, N. 2012, "Faşist", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.80.

[93] Atsız, N. 2012, "68. Velayete Seyehat", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.299.

than the first period of Turkists'. Since he regarded other races as a threat for national unity, the protection of the nobility of Turkish race is prominent.

The antagonism between Türkkan and Atsız is also significant to illustrate the power struggle and the split up within the Turkist circle. As a consequence of this antagonism, both accused each other of not being a real Turk. Atsız also criticized extensively Kemalists and its policies and he held an anti-Kemalist approach. Although both Atsız and Kemalists were influenced by the newborn Turkism, they did not share the same ideals apparently, except for secularism. As it was discussed, Atsız believed the superiority of race rather than Islam. He also supported the Turkification of Islam. He valued the protective force of religion on the national morality and communist threat, although he regarded Pan-Islam and political-Islam as the enemies of nationalism.

As it was discussed, his discourse on the notion of the state relied on race. According to his perception of the state, all ideological apparatuses of the state determined the structure of a society. He regarded all Turkish states as a single state in contrast with Kemalist regime. Atsız's perception of the state was based on Turkish race, and he cherished the idea of the state by idealizing the concepts of citizens, leadership, and institutions. He regarded the State and the nation as a single entity that should only be ruled by Turks. Predominantly, he emphasized the significance of a well-disciplined nation. The concept of citizenship was defined according to different subcategories and the importance of discipline was emphasized as a control mechanism for the citizens. Another significant component of his discourse was the image of leaders. The narrative of strong state structure was linked with the strong character of a leader and he extolled the image of leaders. When the issue of regime is taken into consideration, radical statements were more apparent in his discourse. Although he did not support democracy, the concept of democracy was regarded as a necessity of the period due to tactical reasons. Furthermore, he glorified the notions of war and death which were the significant components of fascist view. From his perspective, fascism, as an Italian nationalism, is a thing that protected the state from the communist threat. His definition of

fascism illustrates that his perception toward fascism was positive and he praised also Hitler. The reason why he rejected the accusation of fascist was the origin of fascism, not its principles.

This chapter has revealed that Atsız's perceptions of war, death, state, nation, race, and above-mentioned other notions in his discourse shows fascist characteristics. To shed light on whether his enemy images contain fascist features or not, the next chapter will be focused on the enemy images in his discourse.

CHAPTER 4

THE ENEMY IMAGES IN ATSIZ'S DISCOURSE AND ITS REFLECTIONS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter aims to investigate enemy images in Atsız's discourse over his writings about Jews, Kurds, Communists and Gypsies. In order to analyze his perspective regarding to enemy images, firstly, the concept of other will be elaborated briefly. Although there are several different perceptions about the concept of otherness, in this chapter, the concept of other will be referred to as the image of enemy. Thus, enemy images and the concept of other will be discussed as supplementary concepts. By referencing to Carl Schmitt and his perception of the image of enemy, the dichotomy between "the other and us" will be mentioned. Afterwards, enemy images in Atsız's discourse will be analyzed. Moreover, with the aim of comprehending Atsız's discourse, a summary of how these images were identified in that period of Turkey will be provided. This chapter intends to illustrate that these images were intertwined together in some cases although every image had separate presence within his discourse, and that how Atsız's discourse alternated between the visibility of and the invisibility of enemies. First of all, the image of Muscovite will be examined as the greatest enemy of Atsız. In this regard, this chapter also discusses the 1944 law case which was a consequence of his anti-communist discourse. Secondly, Jewish image will be analyzed focusing on how Donmehs and *Türkümsü* elements were presented as a part of Jews. Then, the image of Kurds and the image of Gypsies will be discussed respectively. I claim that the enemy images in his discourse share similar patterns with Nazizm, and he presents the enemy images to legitimate his racist discourse as a necessary tool for overthrowing the enemies of the Turks.

4.2. Enemy Images and the Exclusion of the Other

As it is well-known, the construction of national identity is linked with the image of other. The concept of other has been studied by political theorists, psychologists and sociologists since the 20th century with the inspiration from Hegelian and Freudian studies (Brons, 2015). In order to define the other, there should be an "us" which is a part of the identity creation. The concept of other has been created by this resonance. The other is depicted with the outer habitats of the society, while “us” represents the inner component of the society. In other words, the group of people or/and race who are suppressed and excluded by the dominant group/race or ideology can be defined as the other. However, it should be noted that the process of othering is not only performed by the dominant group. To put it in another way, the dominant group might be excluded by the submissive group. The definition of the other, therefore, is highly correlated with the discourse of interpreters’ own thoughts/beliefs/ideology due to the inferior (the other) and the superior (us) dialectic (Brons, 2015). Similarly, as indicated by Boesch (2007), the image of the other might change according to the one who imagines it (p.5).

Although there are a number of approaches with regards to the concept of other, this chapter aims to investigate "the other" in the context of enemy images[94]. At this point, it is necessary to refer to the duality of friend and enemy based on Carl Schmitt's political concept. According to Schmitt, the discussion that enables us to perceive the political actions in the most competent form is based on the distinction of friend and enemy. Here, for Schmitt, the political enemy is considered as “the other, the stranger, something different and alien” (Schmitt, 2007, pp.26-27). For Edelman, the distinction between friend and enemy can be regarded as a power struggle (Volkan, 2010, pp.8-9). Enemy images as a social, political and psychological product involve current political concerns (Öztan, 2012). With using this product, the enemies will be dehumanized and the violence to be imposed on

[94]It should be noted that image of the other does not always associate with narrative of the hostility. In Ancient Greece, for instance, otherness relied on two factors: the other should be either a foreigner to Greek culture or positioned in a different category i.e. woman, barbarian or slave (Schnapper, 2005, p.36). However, these differences were not evaluated as a reason for the inequalities.

them will be legitimized (Öztan, 2012, pp.137-169). On the other hand, the presence of the enemy elements is necessary to ensure the integrity of the group and to enhance the group harmony that leads to a psychosocial balance. Especially, these images are often used by nationalist political ideologies (Moses, 2010). The fight against enemies is seen as a victory against the targeted foes. This normalizes the violence and reinforces the feelings of fear and hate (Öztan, 2012). In order to construct own identity, this distinction is invented by its creator. While the concept of friend represents all positive meanings and beliefs, the concept of enemy has the opposite meaning. This image may be the reflection of its creator who regards the other as a threat for his/her own existence.

Nationalist ideologies are constructed within dichotomies such as good vs. evil, enemies vs. friends, the other vs. us, which illustrate their own boundaries. Zizek defines these special boundaries as a field of enjoyment which is threatened by the existence of the other (Zizek, 1998, p.203). Hatred towards others, which is a typical form of racism, is related to the enjoyment of the other because the other is a thief of our enjoyment (Zizek, 1998, p.203). In other words, the tension between the "us" and “the other” stems from “the other” who desires to perform his/her own identity. That is the reason why racists trouble with the existence of the other: “the smell of "their" food, "their" noisy songs and dances, "their" strange manners, "their" attitude to work. To the racist, the "other" is either a workaholic stealing our jobs or an idler living on our labor” (Zizek, 1998, p.203). While the racist perception cannot tolerate the identity of the other, the accusations of the other in any case of trouble increase the in-group solidarity (Schnapper, 2005, p.137). The vague position of the other, therefore, occurs in here: the enemy cannot take part in the group; on the other hand, his entity outside of the group is problematic. Thus, the out-group position of the enemy develops a paranoid reflex in the racist discourse. Specifically, as Zizek (Zizek, 2008, pp.73-74) mentioned, "The paranoiac Nazis who believed in the Jewish conspiracy” can be given as an example. At this point, it should also be identified conspiracy mentalities along with the concept of other.

4.2.1. Conspiracy Mentality and Paranoid Perception as a Part of the Other

The concept of conspiracy and conspiracy theories have been examined with an interdisciplinary fashion. Although the notion of conspiracy did not get much attention from a wide circle of scholars, there are some scholars aiming to identify conspiracy mentalities and conspiracy theories academically. The term, conspiracy, is depicted as a group of people or an agent who aims to influence the actions of others in a secret way (Coady, 2006, pp.1-2).The definition of conspiracy and conspiracy theories underlines common points. In this regard, conspiracy theories share some main features (Oliver & Wood, 2014, p.953). According to the conspiracy mentality, the reason behind the unexpected political and social events was sinister agents. This also shows the paranoid reflex of conspiracy mentalities. In other words, finding enemies as the scapegoats under every circumstance is another component of that reaction. Furthermore, people with such paranoid reflexes also believe that the public is misguided by secret powers, and they set the tone of political and social events (Oliver & Wood, 2014, p.953). Moreover, conspiracy theories also consist of two opposite poles i.e. good and evil, friend and enemy, us and the other (Muskovici, 1996, p.50).According to Muskovici (1996), a stranger or a minority who is accused of in every situation is the core of the conspiracy theories which have emerged in many cases (p.51). In this regard, the Jews, in terms of the European and Middle Eastern oriented anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist discourses, are the core of conspiracy mentality. Linked with the definition of conspiracy, the Jews have been accused of managing the whole world and having the economic superiority which caused the misery of others (Hirsh, 2007, p.63).

The idea of conspiracy also relies on the belief that there are hidden connections among the Jews, Masons and Communists, and that they fight in favor of foreign powers (Muskovici, 1996, p.51). Thus, conspiracy theories that produce new scenarios regarding to the position of the other became a significant element of the racist discourse (Karaosmanoğlu, 2009) because the essence of racism relies on the destruction of the other, which is the most perilous way of othering (Schnapper, 2005, p.26). Moreover, the moment when other gets articulated with racism, or in other words, the moment when the other turns into an enemy, a relationship with

fascism is formed. Even though enemy images are not certainly adequate alone in terms of the fascist description, the abovementioned dichotomies are still the key elements for fascist ideologies. As a matter of fact, the images of enemy exist everywhere and, in every circumstance, even politics itself are constituted based on these enemy images. As it will be discusses below, these enemy images in the discourse of Atsız are intertwined with xenophobia, racism and conspiracy theories which are significant components of fascism (Karaosmanoğlu, 2009).

4.3. The Enemy Images in Atsız's Discourse: the Whole World except Turks

The specific characteristic of Atsız's enemy images is that, he does not think of enemy images only as an enemy against himself, but also as something that needs to be fought against, cleansed and destroyed. As it was mentioned before, one of the main principles of fascism is to focus on the enemy images created by fascism. Atsız separated enemies in two parts, internal and external. Internal enemies stated by Atsız are Jews, Communists and Sycophants[95] Also, there is a so called testament written by Nihal Atsız to his son Yağmur Atsız[96]. Although the existence of Atsız's testament was controversial, he introduced the enemies of Turks to his son as follows:

> Communism is an ideology that against to us. Learn this well. Jews are hidden enemies of all nations. The Russians, the Chinese, the Acems, the Greeks are our historic enemies. Bulgarians, Germans, Italians, British, French, Arabs, Serbs, Croats, Spaniards, Portuguese, Romanians are our new enemies. The Japanese, the Afghans and the Americans are our future enemies. Armenians, Kurds, Circassians, Abaza, Bosnians, Albanians, Pomaks, Lazs, Lezgins, Georgians, Chechens are our inner enemies[97].

It is not important whether the testament is real or not because the similar expressions were frequently located in his discourse. For instance, in the article

[95] Atsız, N. 2012, "Komünist, Yahudi, Dalkavuk", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.187.

[96] Yağmur Atsız stated in his article that there was no such a testament of Atsız, and he never saw it even if there was such a thing. However, in the same article Yağmur Atsız noted that during the arrestment of Nihal Atsız in 1944 case, the writings of Nihal Atsız were taken by police that came into their house, and they could not get those documents again. Please see: http://www.star.com.tr/yazar/Atsizin_Vsiyetnmesi-yazi-634487/

[97] This testament is located in Turkist web pages that were established by Nihal Atsız's followers. Please see: http://www.nihal-atsiz.com/yazi/h-nihal-atsizin-vasiyeti.html

entitled Jew, Communist, and Sycophant, he stated that all foreign nations were the enemies of Turkish nation. According to Atsız, the oldest enemy of Turks was Chinese[98], and also the most obstreperous enemies were French[99]. The Armenians were eternal enemy[100]and Greeks were enemy to Turks[101].

The legitimization of the enemy image as the whole world was based on the idea that the other nations constituted a threat to Turks. Here, he clarifies why he attributed the enemy image to the whole world:

> The nations also need national grudges. Because the other nation is hostile towards you. It carries on its open or covert program to destroy you. Your ignorance in trying to be friend with it while it carries on such programs will cost your national survival. Can the Turk and the Russian, the Turk and the Greek, the Arab and the Jew, the Germany and the Polish and several others be friends?[102].

In this part of the study, significant enemy images in Atsız's discourse which are Communists, Jews, Kurds, and Gypsies are taken into consideration respectively.

4.3.1. Anti-Communism in Nihal Atsız's Discourse and the Image of Muscovite

The general tendency of the literature indicates that the anti-communist emphases became more apparent in Turkish politics with the Cold War. After the World War II, the Soviet threat toward Turkey caused deterioration in the relations between the Soviets and Turkey. Therefore, with the 1940s, an anti-communist discourse was grounded on the image of the Muscovite by both the RPP and the nationalists (Bora, 2017, p.291).The main characteristic of the anti-communist discourse can be listed as follows. First of all, those who adopted communist ideology cannot be a Turk. Secondly, communists are the symbol of absolute evil and the most dangerous enemy. Last but not least, as a reflection of conspiracy mentality, communists can

[98] Atsız, N. 2018, "İçeriden Çökertmek", in Makaleler IV, p.317.

[99] Atsız, N. 1933, Çanakkale'ye Yürüyüş, p.1.

[100] Atsız, N. 1997, "Ders", in Makaleler IV, p.445.

[101] Atsız, N. 2018, "Türk ve Rum", in Makaleler I, p.21.

[102] Atsız, N. 2012, "Milli Şefin Bergüzarı", in Basılmayan Makaleler, pp.278-279

take over everywhere; therefore, they should be on alert against of communists' actions (Bora, 2017, p.292-295).

The anti-communist discourse becomes embodied in the actions towards any communist or any leftist ideas. For instance, on 4 December 1945, the printing house of the Tan, a left-wing and anti-Nazis newspaper, was raid by a group of nationalists. The academic liquidation in the faculty of language history and geography in 1948 can be given as another example. Behice Boran, Niyazi Berkes and Korkut Boratav were dismissed from the university with the accusations of supporting communist activities. With the 1950s, anti-communism became the official ideology of the state (Bora & Ünüvar, 2015, pp.159-176). One of the most significant anti-communist entities was The Association for Fighting Communism in Turkey (*Komünizmle Mücadele Dernekleri*), which was also supported by the government (Meşe, 2017). With the mid 1960s, the grey wolves and the National Turkish Student Association (*Milli Türk Talebe Birliği*), which was known for its nationalist-conservative structure, became other perpetuators of the anti-communist violence (Bora, 2017, p.296). It must be stated that, the Muscovites and communists were regarded as a common enemy by the state, Turkists and conservative-nationalists.

Abovementioned features of the anti-communist discourse and more radical statements are found in Atsız's discourse. Atsız had always been against communism and communists since the 1930s. His strong anti-communist discourse, therefore, continued until his death. In other words, he was an intellectual who was obviously anti-communist. In his writings, he sometimes defined communists as the Muscovite, which directly referred to the Soviets. Atsız states that the Muscovite means both traitor and evil in Turkish[103]. A communist is a stateless bummer who sold his soul to Jewish Marx[104]. Although the definition of communist has different forms, the unchanging element of a communist in his discourse is that he/she is a traitor.

[103] Atsız, N. 2011, "Tarihin Barışmaz Düşmanları", inTürk Ülküsü, p.68.

[104] Atsız, N.2012, "Komünist, Yahudi,Dalkavuk", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.187.

According to him, most of the communists in Turkey were not Turk. They were hybrids or non-Turkish who lost their original nationality[105]. Here, he created a linkage between communism and being a foreigner. In other words, a real Turk could not be a communist. He explained a supposed hostility between the Muscovite and Turkists in his article as follows:

> Since the Muscovites are the enemy of our race, communism, the Muscovite imperialism, is also our most dangerous enemy. Since communism has become Muscovite property, the communist partisanship is treason. From the perspective of Turkism, it is obligatory to destruction of all communists who are to be the lowest traitors[106].

As stated by Yaşlı, there was a personal hostility behind his anti-communist discourse (Yaşlı, 2009, p.154). The reason behind his personal hostility toward the Soviets was that the boundaries of the former Turkish states and Turkish race remained within the Soviet borders. As it was mentioned before, he was the one who supported the idea of Turan and provoked his followers in this regard without any hesitation. He explained the roots of this hostility in his article titled "Uncompromising Enemies of History", where he examined the Ottoman-Russian wars chronologically. He stated that the Muscovite would always be an enemy of the Turks, and gave examples from history:

> Without being able to resist their desires, they [the Soviets] were demanding and getting prepared for the Bosporus, Kars and Ardahan since they could not acquire those lands. In their minds, a complex of inferiority derived from Deli Petro's[Peter the Great] sending his wife to Baltacı Mehmet Pasha; and the grudge born from the complex of inferiority and in their hearts, the rough ambition of being Slavs, meaning being inferior[107].

As it can be seen from this quotation, he was not only against the Muscovite but also against Slavic race. This situation can be regarded as an evidence of his racist thought. One of the most significant reasons why Atsız was against communism was that it was not a national ideology[108]. According to Atsız, the destruction of

[105] Atsız, N. 2012, "Komünist, Yahudi,Dalkavuk", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.187.

[106] Atsız, N. 2018, "Veda", in Makaleler III, p.99.

[107] Atsız, N. 2011, "Tarihin Barışmaz Düşmanları", in Türk Ülküsü, p.68.

[108] Atsız, N. 2012, "Solcu Foyası", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.147.

communism was even more significant than the revival of national culture. He believed that communism was like a cancer that had the metastasis growth[109]. For this reason, one of the main goals of Atsız was to fight against communism and warn the Turkish nation about this threat.

Another distinctive feature of his anti-communist discourse was the focus on a supposed "communist immorality", such an emphasis on morality indeed is a tool for gaining dominance (Newman, 2013, p.121).Atsız claimed that the reason behind the emergence of Fascism was the immorality of communism[110]. He believed that morality is the basis of a nation, and the moral codes of the foreigners led to the failure of the Turks[111].Atsız's approach regarding to morality is similar to Nazi ideology which emphasizes morality while building the principles within the conservative limitations for the youth. Similar emphases regarding to this issue can be seen in Reha Oğuz writings. Communists were defined by Türkkan as an enemy of the morality. According to Türkkan, communism was threatening the moral principles of Turkish family and Turkish youth, and an immorality like this did not match up with the moral nature of Turkish race (Yaşlı, 2009, p.168).

The image of the communist was also an expression of the absolute evil. In Atsız's discourse communists were the main reasons for all malignancy, which was a reflection of the conspirator mentality. According to Atsız, people who blamed Turkists for being a Fascist or a racist were communists[112]. The image of the communist was even used by Atsız as a form of opposition to the RPP. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the relationship between the RPP and Atsız was problematic for many reasons. One of the reasons was that the ideology of the RPP was not as nationalists as Turkism. He believed that there were communist members within the RPP. Even the village institutes established by the RPP were regarded by

[109] Atsız, N. 2012, "Komünistler", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.375.

[110] Atsız, N. 1943, "Üç Rejim", in En Sinsi Telike, p.40.

[111] Atsız, N. 2011, "Türk Ahlakı", in Türk ülküsü, p.50.

[112] Atsız, N. 2012, "Solcu Foyası", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.426.

Atsız as the nest of communists[113]. He believed that communists could hide themselves under the socialist identity:

> It is undisputable that one of the three socialists we face is a very red communist, in other words, a traitor. Since it is not possible to differentiate, they should be approached with suspicion. However, it is known that the fiercest communists are insidious people who do not cast doubts on being socialists. Yet, not knowing the fiercest communist cannot prevent us being on the alert against people with possibility of being communists[114].

As it is understood from his discourse, enemies could hide their true natures behind different masks. For this reason, here, one could not possibly be sure of their exact nature. In other words, another critical feature of Atsız's enemy image is ambiguity. This is the point which should also be considered in the context of conspiracy mentality. Many others were accused by Atsız of being a communist or a Muscovite. Even Türkkan, a Turkist intellectual, was regarded as an old communist by Atsız[115]. The presentation of a Turkist figure as an enemy gives a clear understanding of Atsız's mentality. As it was discussed previously in this thesis, Türkkan also accused Atsız of being non-Turkish. Then, who was a Turkist and who was a real Turk? Accordingly, the image of enemy is a thing internalized by Atsız and his circle. Paradoxically, the enemy is both a thing that he must get rid of and a thing internalized at the same time. In other words, the thing that he desires to destroy becomes a part of his entity. Another example was Nazım Hikmet, a well known leftist poet, depicted by Atsız as follows:

> I have not seen any communist growing out of pure-blood Turkish people whose ancestors had shed blood to these lands. These people are always of bad stock, ignoble, homeless, shady family and non-Turkish. As a matter of fact, Nazım Hikmet is not also Turkish, himself[116].

[113] Atsız, N. 2012, "Konuşmalar I", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.607.

[114] Atsız, N. 2012, "Komünistler", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.376.

[115] Atsız, N. 1943, Hesap Böyle Verilir, p.27.

[116] Atsız, N. 1935, Komünist Don Kişotu Proleter Burjuva Nazım Hikmetof Yoldaş'a, p.6.

However, the most effective version of Atsız's anti-communist discourse can be clearly seen in his open letters to Şükrü Saraçoğlu, who was then the Prime Minister of Turkey. These letters were to be the main reason of the 1944 case, which turned out to be a tragic situation for the Turkists and was influenced by the Second World War atmosphere. Atsız wrote those letters to Saraçoğlu because Saraçoğlu stated that "We are Turks, we are Turkist and we will remain Turkists" in one of his speech in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey[117]. He stated in his first letter that while communist threat increased both in high schools and universities, the RPP was ignoring the communists and their actions.

In the second letter, Sabahattin Ali, Pertev Naili Boratav, Sadrettin Celal and Ahmet Cevat, who were significant figures in the Turkish education system and academia, were declared as communists by Atsız, and he demanded that the Prime Minister should dismiss these communists[118]. Moreover, Atsız criticized Hasan Ali Yücel, the Minister of Education of that period, for being in friendly terms with communists. Two intellectuals accused by Atsız in those letters were also more significant than the others. Sabahattin Ali and Pertev Naili Boratav[119], who had written articles in *Atsız Mecmua* and had been described by Atsız as Turkist in that period, had also been the friends of Atsız (Yaşlı, 2009, p.69). However, their friendships came to an end because of the ideological differences. Pertev Naili Boratav and Sabahattin Ali became leftists, while Atsız insisted on his racist discourse. Before those letters, the disagreement between Atsız and Sabahattin Ali was based on Sabahattin Ali's famous novel entitled "The Devil inside Us"(*İçimizdeki Şeytan*) about the racists (Mumcu, 1990, p.72). After that, Nihal Atsız wrote a booklet entitled "The Devils inside Us" (*İçimizdeki Şeytanlar*) as a response to Sabahattin Ali's novel and accused him of carrying on a communist

[117] Atsız, N. 2011, "Başvekil Saraçoğlu Şükrü'ye Açık Mektup", in Turancılık Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, pp.103-109.

[118] Atsız, N. 2011, "Başvekil Saraçoğlu Şükrü'ye İkinci Açık Mektup", in Turancılık Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, pp.110-111.

[119] Even the surname of Boratav was suggested to Pertev Naili by Atsız during the surname law. A member of Boratav family stated that the close relationship between Nihal Atsız and Pertev Naili Boratav continued until their ideological differences came into existence. Personal interview with Rıza Cumhur Boratav, 07 July 2018.

propaganda in his novel[120]. According to Atsız, there were two significant outcomes of those letters. First of all, as a result of his accusation towards the Minister of Education and the RPP, he was dismissed from his teaching position in *Özel Boğaziçi* High school, and secondly, Sabahattin Ali opened a libel case against Atsız and the case of the Sabahattin Ali-Nihal Atsız began in this way (Özdoğan, 2015, p.100).

On 3 May 1944, when the second hearing took place, a group of Turkist students gathered in Ulus Square and shouted anti-communist slogans in order to support Nihal Atsız. The polarization between the leftist and rightist became more visible with the 3 May demonstration, which was mentioned in the Turkish political history as a turning point for Turkists. Nihal Atsız was found guilty for his insult against Sabahattin Ali and sentenced to four months imprisonment, yet his punishment was suspended on 9 May 1944 (Müftüoğlu, 2005, p.77). During the case of Sabahattin Ali and Nihal Atsız, Pan-Turkist periodicals and the demonstration of Turkist students were regarded by Kemalist elites as a threat for public order (Özdoğan, 2015, p.104). Thus, the scope of Nihal Atsız-Sabahattin Ali case was turned into a Racism-Turanism case, and 57 people, except for Nihal Atsız, including Alparslan Türkeş, Zeki Veledi Togan and Reha Oğuz Türkkan, were arrested as a result of the accusation of having attempted to overthrow the state. Arrested Turkists were exposed to different tortures during their interrogation process (Müftüoğlu, 2005, p.122).

The President İsmet İnönü, on May 19th, 1944 The Youth and Sports Day, gave a public speech which set the tone of the Racism-Turanism case. İnönü stated that they were against racism and Turanism because they were contradictory to Turkish foreign policy (Özdoğan, 2015, p.106). Moreover, 23 people were jailed during the pending trial and 10 people were sentenced to prison, including Nihal Atsız (Müftüoğlu, 2005, p.218). They were accused of establishing a secret society, attempting a coup and trying enter the Second World War in alliance with Germany (Bakiler, 2010, p.26). Specifically, Atsız was accused of conducting Turanist

[120] Atsız, N. 2018, "Sabahattin Ali ile Tanışıyorum", in Türkçülüğe Karşı Haçlı Seferleri ve Çektiklerimiz, p.54.

propaganda and promulgating racist ideas via periodicals among young generation (Özdoğan, 2015, pp.111-112). Atsız, in his defense, stated that as nationalists, they were fighting against communism, and Turkism was not against the constitution (Özdoğan, 2015, pp.115-116). According to Bakiler (2010), the common opinion among those who were arrested during the Racism-Turanism case was that they were arrested not because of being guilty; rather because they were Turks and Turkists (p.21). This idea was probably stemming from the President İnönü's speech and Education Minister Hasan Ali Yücel's circulation letter. The defendants were acquitted after being kept in prison for one and a half year, and acquitted on March 31, 1947, in spite of the contrary decision taken on March 29th, 1945 (Özdoğan, 2015, p.114). As Özdoğan stated, there was a remarkable difference between the government's attitude at the beginning and at the end of the case. This change of attitude was related to the political condition of the period (Özdoğan, 2015, p.124).

It should be remembered that, the Turkist-Turanist case took place in the Second World War atmosphere. Turkish government followed a balanced foreign policy during the Second World War[121]. For this reason, on the one hand, the RPP tolerated Pan-Turkists between 1941 and 1943 in order to be perceived more sympathetic to Germany; on the other hand, Nazi Germany aimed to provoke Pan-Turkist ideals by approaching the Turkist circle in order to receive the support of Turkish government during the World War II (Özdoğan, 2015, pp.126-127; Mumcu, 1990, p.2). However, after the unexpected defeat of the Germans in the war, the RPP's manner toward the defendants of the Turkist-Turanist became harsh with the purpose of protecting the state from the Soviet threat (Mumcu, 1990, p.48).

After the Soviets' victory in the Soviet-German war (1941-1945), the Soviets demanded Kars and Ardahan provinces which were within Turkish borders, and also a revision of the Montreux Convention in favor of their own benefits (Özdoğan, 2015, p.176). Although the Soviets' demands were rejected by Turkey, the tension between Russia and Turkey remained to be tense. The aggressive and expansionist policies of the Soviets affected the case of Racism-Turanism. Thus, the defendants

[121] For detailed analysis please see: Selim Deringil (1982) The Preservation of Turkey's Neutrality During the Second World War: 1940, *Middle Eastern Studies*, 18:1, pp.30-52.

were tried in a court again, and charges such as conducting a Turanist propaganda, attempting a coup and establishing a secret organization were dropped on the ground that they were acting with national purposes (Özdoğan, 2015, p.177).

Atsız, in his later works, emphasized the significance of 1944 law case in terms of the Turkism, and cherished every 3rd of May as The Turkism Day. Furthermore, he believed that the May 3, 1944 demonstration saved the hometown from the communist threat[122].As it is discussed above, in his discourse, communism and communists were depicted as the symbol of absolute evil. For this reason, he was always on alert against the communist threat and secret communists. How the communist image is intertwined with the Jews' and Kurds' images in some cases will be discussed in the following section.

4.3.2. The Jewish Image and Secret Jews

Although the history of anti-Semitist movements goes back to the ancient times, the modern version of anti-Semitism arose after the mid nineteenth century, and Germany became one of the leading countries that developed the systematic anti-Semitist thought (Cowen, 1997). The phenomenon of anti-Semitism reproduced itself again and again since the beginning of the Turkish Republic (Bali, 2013, p.51). Although a systematic anti-Semitism was not implemented in Turkey, the fact that there were indications of anti-Semitism in Turkey was ignored. According to Bali (2013), until the multi-party period, the rationale behind anti-Semitists depended on two factors: economic imbalance between Jewish citizens and Turkish citizens, and the Republican ideology imposed on non-Turkish citizens to identify themselves with a determined Turkishness for the sake of the unity of the nation state. There were some cases in which Jewish people were apparently targeted as enemies.

One case was the despoilment and expulsion attempts against the Jews who lived in the cities of Thrace, where the Jewish population was concentrated in 1934 (Bali, 2016, p.39). Levi (1996) believed that one of the reasons for the event of Thrace in

[122] Atsız, N. 2018, "Veda", in Makaleler III, p.100.

1934 was the anti-Semitic and racist publishing (p.127). Accordingly, Cevat Rıfat Atilhan and Nihal Atsız were the main figures of the anti-semitist discourse of that time (Bali, 2008, p.3). Cevat Rıfat Atilhan, who dedicated his life to an anti-semitist discourse, and was the first publisher of the anti-semitist periodical, namely "*Milli İnkilap*"[123] (National Revolution), was mainly inspired by "*Der Stuermer*", an extremely anti-semitist tabloid in Nazi Germany (Güven & Yılmazata, 2014). Another case was the November 11, 1942 Wealth Tax which aimed to receive more taxes from non-Muslim minorities than from Turks. While non-Muslim minorities had to pay ten times more, Donmehs (Thessalonians Jewish who became Muslim) had to pay two times more than Turks did (Lewis, 1968, p.297). The unfair implementation of the wealth tax was evaluated as an output of the Second World War atmosphere.

After the World War II, anti-Semitism in Turkey stepped up into a new phase along with the foundation of Israel, the emergence of Palestinians issue and the Arab-Israeli Wars (Bora, 2017, p.383). The images of Jews were also linked with the conspiracy theories regarding to Masons as members of a secret Mason organization aiming to capture the Turkish state as they did in the Ottoman Empire (Bora, 2017, p.385). Starting from the 1950s, the nationalist-conservative wing developed hostile discourse against Jews, Donmehs and Masons, and that discourse fed from the immorality of modernity and capitalism (Bora, 2006, p.97). As Bora stated, nationalist-conservative intellectuals and periodicals, namely *Sebilürreşad* and *Büyük Doğu,* made a critical contribution to anti-semitist discourse in Turkey. Necip Fazıl Kısakürek, as a remarkable ideologist of the nationalist-conservative wing, enhanced the boundaries of Jewish hatred and anti-Semitism through identifying Jews as an absolute evil in his writings (Bora, 2006, p.100; Bora, 2017, p.384). With the contribution of anti-semitist discourse of conservative-nationalists, anti-Semitism was linked with the immoral, materialist, and untraditional nature of

[123] The *Milli İnkilap* was first published on 1 May, 1934 and closed down by governemnt o 1 Jun, 1934.

communism in order to demonize the leftists within the context of anti-communism of Cold War atmosphere (Bora, 2006, p.97).

In Atsız's discourse, Jewish image was constructed in a similar vein. The enemy image of Jews in Atsız's discourse mainly reminded the main characteristics of anti-Semitism in Turkish literature, as well as Nazi and European examples (Yaşlı, 2009, p.141).He defined Jews as sneaky, insolent, humiliated, coward but opportunist[124].Furthermore, Turkist figure, Rıza Nur, who had an influence on Atsız's thought, stated that Jews who lived in Turkey were ugly and dirty (Nur, 1967, p.195). These definitions were used both in the Hitler's and Goebbels's discourse used in Nazi Germany (Klemperer, 2018, p.201). Atsız tried to convince us that this strong enemy image was based on a mutual affair:

> Jews are hostile towards the Turks from whose hands they have not suffered evil. This is because their core is Jewish, in other words, treachery. (…). Let's not forget the claims of our great and wise ancestors. They said people buying eggs from the Jew could not find yolks in them. This is a great aphorism revealing the fraudulence in the Jew[125].

He believed that Jews treated Turks as an enemy for no reason. Hence, he warned Turks not to trust them because of the possibility of betrayal. The anti-Semitic statements of Atsız having fascist and romantic roots called for distrust on any race, other than Turks. Accordingly, The Jews were regarded as an internal enemy, and he emphasized how unreliable they were. He stated that: "The Jew that spied on behalf of our enemies during the world war and sucked our blood with their mercantilization was the same as the hypocrite Jew of the history"[126]. Similarly, in his another article he noted that: "Nobody loves the creature called as the Jew but the Jew and the bounders"[127].

[124] Atsız, N. 1933, Çanakkale'ye Yürüyüş, p.5.

[125] Atsız, N. 1933, Çanakkale'ye yürüyüş, p.6.

[126] Atsız, N. 1933, Çanakkale'ye Yürüyüş, p.6.

[127] Atsız, N. 2011, "Musa'nın Necip Evlatları Bilsinler ki", in Turancılık, Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.251.

Another underlying reason behind his anti-Semitism was that Jews generally dominated trade-related issues and other economic fields where they got the best of profit. Similarly, the anti-Semitism was shaped by economic issues in European Countries. The Jews drew attention because of their economic superiority in society. For this reason, most of the criticism against Jews was directly economic (Draper, 1977, pp.591-608). Following the pattern, Atsız stated that "His [Jew's] God is money!"[128]. Atsız believed that even communism was generated by Jews who sold their conscience to Jewish Marx. Here, there was a connection between two enemy images. In other words, being Jewish means being a communist or vice versa. Similarly, Reha Oğuz Türkkan believed that communism was the output of the Jews and communists in Turkey, who were mostly Donmehs, Circassian, Arab, and so on (Önen, 2008). In Atsız view, there was no difference between Jews and Donmehs[129]. He believed that "Salonika Donmehs took secret measures for centuries in order not to become Turkic"[130]. Although Jews became Turkified, Atsız did not desire the Turkification of Jews:

> Because we do not want them to be Turkified as well as we do not forget they would be so. As the mud would not turn into iron no matter how long it was put into the oven, the Jew could not be Turkified no matter how much he tried. Being a Turk is a privilege; therefore, it is not granted to everyone, particularly the subjects like the Jew[131].

Unexpectedly, the systematic anger was converted into an appreciation while mentioning the struggle for the re-foundation of Israel under some circumstances. He stated that:

> The Jews gave the most noteworthy example of independence war. Being slaves for more than century and losing their language and homelands by getting scattered all

[128] Atsız, N.2012, "Komünist Yahudi Dalkavuk", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.188.

[129] Atsız, N. 2012, "Komünist Yahudi Dalkavuk", in Basılmayan Makaleler, pp.188-189.

[130] Atsız, N. 2011, "Türkçülüğün Önemli Meseleleri" in Türk ülküsü, p.79.

[131] Atsız, N. 2011, "Musa'nın Necip Evlatları Bilsinler ki" in Turancılık, Milli Değerler ve Gençlik, p.252.

> around the world, the Jews reached the first period of national goal after long and tiring struggles under the influence of independence instinct[132].

However the reason behind the appreciation for Jews did come up in his writing:

> Just like how the Jews created a Jewish majority in Palestine, which had been a Arab country, by banishing the Arabs from their land, we certainly have to Turkify the lands that belong to us by doing the same thing[133].

Moreover, Donmehs were the examples of "*Türkümsü*" (Turk-like) (Bora, 2006, p.93).The narrative of *Türkümsü* proves again his skepticism toward Jews. He defined *Türkümsü* as a foreigner and the most dangerous enemy of Turks.

> These [The Turk-like] could not be differentiated from the Turks since they speak Turkish well and, in most cases,, they do not know any language other than Turkish. However, they know or sense that their blood is different. That is why I call them "*Türkümsü*". They are sycophant and liars. They smile at faces. The ideas harmful for Turkism are in demand among them. Since they are not Turkish, they do not refrain themselves from getting connected to the ideas and organizations which secretly do evil to the Turk for their self-interests[134].

Moreover, the culprits of the deterioration of moral and ethical values in Turkish history were *Türkümsü*, Donmehs and Devshirmehs[135]. The narratives of Donmehs were not only located in Atsız's discourse, but they were frequently emphasized especially by conservative intellectuals such as Necip Fazıl Kısakürek. Furthermore, Atsız stated that Freemasonry, an instrument of Jews, was a foreigner organization of the enmity against Turkism.

> We consider the freemasonry as enemies. It is a secret fellowship with outside roots and an anti-Turkism organization where the ones not being satisfied with nationalism applied for. It was at first founded in order to protect the national interests of the Jews in secret, then turned into international in time[136].

It is understood that the enemy image of Jew intertwined with different enemy images namely Freemasonry, Donmehs or *Türkümsü* in his discourse. As Yaşlı

[132] Atsız, N. 2011, "Ülküler Saldırıcıdır", in Türk Ülküsü, pp.27-28.

[133] Atsız, N. 2011, "Türkçülüğün Önemli Meseleleri", in Türk Ülküsü, pp.85-86.

[134] Atsız, N. 2012, "Türk Irkı=Türk Milleti", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.118.

[135] Atsız, N. 2011, "Gençlik ve Ahlak", in Türk ülküsü, p.55.

[136] Atsız, N. 2018, "Veda", in Makaleler III, p.99.

(Yaşlı, 2009, p.147) stated the Jew's enmity of Turkism relied on the idea that Turkey was ruled by the secret Jews. Here, Yaşlı makes a generalization in terms of Turkism. It can be deduced that Atsız also followed a similar approach. He believed Turkish Hearts (*Türk Ocağı*) was managed by Freemasons[137]. However, in Atsız's discourse, there was no sufficient number of apparent examples or signifiers in this regard. In other words, he generally mentioned these conspiracies without any care or interest to prove them.

In Atsız's discourse, there was a contradiction between the visibility and secrecy of the enemy. He was disturbed by both the presence of the enemy and by enemies' hiding themselves with the means of Turkification. According to Atsız, Jews were sometimes hiding behind the Turkish identity in order to protect themselves and ruin the Turkish unity. Therefore, he regarded them as an enemy who must be removed from Turkish state. In order to prevent Jews from being concealed in Hitler's Germany, Jews had to carry Star of David visibly (Klemperer, 2018, p.188). With this disclosure policy, it would be clear that who was Jewish and who was not without any hesitation. With this example, it would be understood better Atsız's emphasis on the purification of Turkish race and why he was disturbed by those who acted and spoke as if they were Turkish but who were never Turkish. With pointing the enemy as a target is the main issue in order to determine the enemy, because the enemy can hide under the invisibility cloak. It is the insidiousness of the enemy which was needed to be fought.

4.3.3. Kurds as the Implied Enemy

With the Republican Regime, the legal entity of Kurds was ignored by the 1924 Constitution; and starting from the 1930s, the physical presence of Kurds was ignored: If briefly stated, there were no Kurds in Turkey in the country's official ideology (Yeğen, 2006, p.53). According to Yeğen, The Republicanism believed that Kurds could be Turkified. The process of Turkification led to the policy of assimilation towards Kurds. For Atsız, Kurds missed the opportunity of Turkification and unlike the official ideology; he accepted that there was a Kurdish

[137] Atsız, N. 2018, "Veda" in Makaleler III, p.100.

reality in Turkish state (Bora, 2006, p.94). However, he did not hesitate to guide Kurds who desired to establish a Kurdish state:

> Let them [The Kurds] go away before getting Turkish nation into trouble and getting evaporated themselves. Where? Let them go where they can see and where their hearts desire. Let them go to Iran, Pakistan, India, Barzani. Let them ask for country estate from Africa by applying to the United Nations. Let them learn by asking their race sake, the Armenians, that Turkish race is extremely patient; however, that when they run out of their patience, nobody could stand on their ways just like "Kağan Arslan"; and let them come to their senses[138].

For Atsız, the biggest threat apart from the political Islamists and communists was Kurds[139].The depiction of Jews as "stateless" was also seen here: Atsız stated that Kurds were an uncultured and underdeveloped community that had neither a state nor a civilization[140]. Therefore; he believed that Kurds did not have a state because they were not a nation, and also they were highlanders and a primitive branch of Persians[141]. In the words of Smith (1994), Kurdish people did not have a language and symbolism to be a nation because according to Atsız, Kurds were speaking a rudimentary language with four or five thousand words[142].

Rather than being an ethno-political problem, the Kurdish issue in the discourse of state was evaluated as reactionism (*irtica*), Kurds' being provocated by other states, the resistance of tribes and bandits to the government, and regional underdevelopment (Yeğen, 1999, p.20). Moreover, the general tendency of the literature regarding the Kurdish issue relied on two main roots: while in the first trend the Kurdish issue was evaluated as a problem of public order/security, the second one considered the Kurdish issue as a violation of Kurdish rights, especially the seizure of their unity (Yeğen, 2006, pp.30-31). According to Yeğen, the first narratives are concentrated on how the imperialists played a provocative role in the

[138] Atsız, N. 2012, "Konuşmalar I", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.603.

[139] Atsız, N. 2012, "Kürtler ve Komünistler", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.443.

[140] Atsız, N. 2012, "Konuşmalar I", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.601.

[141] Atsız, N. 2012, "Konuşmalar I", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.601.

[142] Atsız, N. 2012, "Konuşmalar I" in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.602.

Kurdish issue. As a racist thinker, the thought of Atsız was parallel to the discourse of the state and the first trend of literature. Accordingly, Atsız believed that

> Kurdish independence is the showpiece of the scene. Behind the scene, there are the interests of the foreign states and the Kurds are nothing but a cat's paw. Even if they became independent, the worse things than what happened to the Arabs having left the Turk by betraying him would befall on them. Being more crowded, civilized and having a long history than the Kurds, Arabs' situation should sharpen the Kurds' wits. The Arabs would not disappear even if they were defeated by the Jews. Primordial minority without a past, Kurds would disappear tomorrow in the face of modern and organized Armenians[143].

As it was stated by Yaşlı (2009), the best reflection of the image of Kurds in Atsız's thought was the comments regarding the picture of a Kurdish warrior girl that he saw in the *Yeni newspaper* (pp.152-153):

> From the statements under the photo of a young girl whose slanted eyes and protuberant cheekbones immediately reveal that she is Central Asian Turk, we learn that she is a Christian named Margaret and she showed a great example of hero during the wars. Nobody would believe that she is a Kurd even if they provided a notarial deed or Constitutional Court Decision reporting that she was a Kurd. Because she is a typical Uzbek girl or Kyrgyz girl. There could be no way such a Kurd, especially such a beautiful Kurd[144].

According to Baskın Oran (2010), racist articles in *Ötüken* periodical, which were published by Atsız, had an influence on the revival of Kurdish nationalism and led to *Doğu Mitingleri* (Eastern Meetings) in which Kurds expressed their demands in 1967 and 1969 (p.219). Atsız stated that he wrote these articles against the traitor Kurds i.e. red Kurds who had a desire to split the country in order to establish a Kurdish state[145]. Here, he was referring to the communist Kurds with the expression of "red" which was used in order to define communists as discussed in the communist image part.

As it is seen, his emphasis on Kurds resembles the official discourse of the state to some extent. His acceptance of Kurdish reality did not mean that he confirmed them as a nation; rather he saw them as minorities that needed to be ignored. Moreover, xenophobic statements about Kurdish language and appearance of Kurds were the

[143] Atsız, N. 2012, "Bağımsız Kürt Devleti Propagandası" in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.466.

[144] Atsız, N. 2012, "Bağımsız Kürt Devleti Propagandası" in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.466.

[145] Atsız, N. 2012, "Kızıl Kürtlerin Yaygarası" in Basılmayan Makaleler, pp.454-456.

reflections of his racist nature. Taking his racist nature into consideration, it is quite significant that he mentioned Kurds only a few times. Due to the governmental pressure which had forbidden writing or discussing on the Kurdish issue[146], he probably did not express his thought upon Kurds clearly. Thus, Atsız did not have an explicit emphasis on Kurds. Rather his discourse presented an implied enemy image for the Kurds. In other words, he ignored the Kurds in his approval of the state's policy of ignorance. Although Atsız did not have an explicit anti-Kurdish emphasis, in the later periods, the anti-Kurdish discourse would be more apparent in nationalist ideologies.

4.3.4. The Gypsies as Inferior Enemy

Gypsies were always been exposed to social exclusion and discrimination. This social exclusion was linked with their poverty and they are accepted as the lowest class of the society (Özateşler, 2011, p.72). The issue of discrimination was also common in Europe. For instance, During the Nazi Germany, the Nuremberg Laws were enacted in 1935. The Laws aimed to protect the purity of German blood, and thus prohibited Germans from marrying and having sexual relationship with non-Germans included not only Jews but also gypsies (Fraser, 2005, p.220).

Despite the fact that the discrimination against Gypsies relied on their ethnicity, they were not regarded as enemy unlike Kurds (Özateşler, 2011, p.72).Instead, their living space was also stigmatized and seen as dangerous spaces (Akkan, Deniz, & Ertan, 2011, p.34). Moreover, in Turkish language, there were negative statements and insulting idioms about Gypsies. For instance in the 1988 and 1998 printings of Turkish Language Association (*TDK*) dictionaries and 1995 and 2000 printings of Ministry of Education (*MEB*) dictionaries, Gypsies are defined as follows: dark skinned, stingy, impudent, and barefaced (Aksu, 2006, p.34). Even today, these definitions are also common in Turkish society and gypsies are depicted with pejorative adjectives such as thief, unreliable, godless, and shameless (Özateşler, 2011, p.74).

[146] For instance, sociologist İsmail Beşikçi was sentenced to imprisonment for 18 years because he mentioned the existence of Kurds (Çelikkan, 2009, p.198).

Similarly, in Atsız's discourse, there were two significant features of the gypsies: they were immoral and a threat to the purity of Turkish blood/race. According to Atsız, even if Gypsies spoke Turkish, it was obvious that they were still gypsy[147]. He said, in the same article, it was a murder to Turkify Gypsies and destroy the purity of Turkish blood. Their job was stealing and pick pocketing in Turkey. These descriptions about Gypsies were in common in Turkish society. Even Gypsies in some cases needed to emphasize that they were not like "the other gypsies". Here, "the other" means that gypsies who committed crimes such as stealing and pick pocketing (Kolukırık, 2006). According to Atsız;

> These gypsies are masterminds of anything that would disturb the social ethics. Causing troubles to Istanbul Police Department, Hacı HüsrevNeighbourhood is full of them. Their women and girls are composed of the professional cutpurses. The photos of their seven-years-old girls have appeared on the newspapers many times. Since seven-year-old child could not be punished, there is no limit on their impudence. The older having criminal liability practice this work while they are pregnant. The pregnant women cannot be arrested. In this way, Istanbul is and remains to be the sultanate of the gypsies. What is worse, child kidnapping by their pregnant women. How many of these kidnapping cases have appeared on the newspaper[148].

Atsız believed that Turkish society already developed a deep sense of reaction against the characteristics of gypsies: Turkish nation has always looked down on the gypsies and were extremely cautious and timid to the degree of fear while being mingled with them[149]. And he asked those who accused him for being a racist:

> Would you consider yourself equal to a Gypsy? Would you marry to a Gypsy? Would you accept a Gypsy as a daughter-in-law or a son-in-law? If they say yes, there is no problem. If they say no, then it means that they are doing race discrimination. We do the same thing, they do only against the Gypsies, against others as well[150].

Here, these racist questions of Atsız reminded the Nuremberg Law which was indicated above. Moreover, he also suggested that Gypsies should be sent an exile to

[147] Atsız, N. 1933, Çanakkale'ye Yürüyüş, p.7.

[148] Atsız, N. 2012, "Konuşmalar I", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.598.

[149] Atsız, N. 2012, "Konuşmalar I", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.597.

[150] Atsız, N. 2018, "Veda", in Makaleler III, p.91.

Hakkari, and in this way Gypsies and Kurds would wend together[151]. As Bora (2006) noted, this statement of Atsız illustrates that Kurds were regarded as rudimentary as Gypsies, and examining two different images together proves that how the enemy images in his discourse were intertwined with each other.

4.4. Concluding Remarks

As it was mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, enemies were various in Atsız discourse. Starting from communism, this chapter aimed to show how Atsız built a discourse full of enemies. From time to time, the enemy images in his discourse were intertwined. For this reason, in some cases he regarded enemies as a single entity, and was quite repetitive. Thinking about each enemy not only as separate bodies but also as a unified threat created ambiguity among the images. For example, his ideas about Jews were linked to the idea that Jews were communist, which was an argument commonly advocated in Europe, especially in Nazi Germany. This also shows how conspiracy mentality is functioning in the discourse of Atsız. Another significant example about his conspiracy mentality is *Türkümsü* elements who acted as Turks, but they were not real Turks. In the narrative of *Türkümsü*, Atsız shed light on how enemies were located within the Turks and how they had the possibility to betray due to the mixture of their blood.

In his thought, it was not surprising for a communist to be Jew, Kurd or the agent of red Muscovite. In this regard, it can be possible to claim that the image of communism functioned as a roof image containing Jews, Kurds and Donmehs. From this perspective, communists had the characteristics of being the greatest enemy of Atsız.

Although communist hatred was predominant in his discourse, other enemy images were also reflected in his racist discourse. The immorality and foreignness of enemies came to the forefront in the intersection of enemy images. Remembering his emphases on the superiority of Turkish race and eugenics, the immorality and foreignness of enemy became much more meaningful. For this reason, every non-

[151] Atsız, N. 2012, "Konuşmalar I", in Basılmayan Makaleler, p.599.

Turkish element or foreign entity were labeled by him as the enemy. On the one hand, the enemy images were represented as weak and miserable, and on the other hand, the images were formed as powerful and dangerous due to their capability of influencing and controlling the state.

In terms of Zizekian approach, dichotomies between us and the other illustrate the boundaries which are defined as the field of enjoyment. Therefore, the field of enjoyment is endangered by the existence of enemy who are the thieves of enjoyment. In Zizekian terms, the enemy images were the thieves of Atsız's enjoyment. By using Zizekian approach, Atsız's enemy images can be evaluated in terms of the protection the purity of the race against the degenerating effects of enemies. They would degenerate Turks with their hybridity and immorality. They were insidiously located within the Turks and hid themselves in order to steal the enjoyment of Turks. For this reason, the enemy was a thing that must be certainly destroyed. When the images of Muscovite, Jew and Gypsy are taken into consideration, Atsız's discourse shows similarities with Nazizm. These images in Atsız's discourse are also intertwined as in fascist ideology. The enemy images in Atsız's discourse exhibit fascist characteristics since his discourse contains crucial components of fascism such as xenophobia, racism and conspiracy theories.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Atsız has a significant position in Turkish nationalism due to his extreme and radical Turkist-Turanist discourse. The goal of this thesis was to examine the main themes in his racist discourse. The purpose was to investigate whether his discourse contains fascist characteristics or not. To this end, first of all, this study discussed the background of his Turkist ideology and the general characteristics of Turkish nationalism until the 1970s.

As I illustrated in the first chapter, during the early republican period there were two different lines within Turkism. The first line, which consisted of Yusuf Akçura, Ziya Gökalp, and Hamdullah Suphi, defined Turkishness through culture and language, and influenced the ideological basis of Kemalist nationalism. On the other hand, the second line which also includes Atsız, adopted Turkist-Turanist approach in a more radical way. Kemalist ideology defined Turkishness with the notions of culture and language until the 1930s. Although Kemalist nationalism gained ethnicist emphases in the 1930s with the influence of the fascist states and racism in Europe, it never implemented a systematic racism. This thesis intended to show in here that racist-Turkist circle and Kemalist nationalism were different from each other to some extent especially in the context of Turkishness, even though both were inspired by same intellectual background i.e., Ottoman period of Turkism. As the developments of the 1944 case demonstrated, Kemalists attitude toward Turkist-Turanist circle was not stable because of pragmatic political reasons. This chapter revealed that anti-communist discourse became the main emphasis of all nationalist circles due to the cold war atmosphere and they aimed to unify under the same nationalist organization against the communist threat after the 1950s. For this reason, the anti-communist discourse turned into a state policy in that time. This

chapter also shows the similar tendencies of anti-communism between the general characteristics of the period and Atsız's discourse.

Examining the general characteristics of Turkish nationalism from the rising of Turkism until the 1970s was crucial in order to shed light on Atsız's racist position within the Turkish nationalists. When the research questions of this study are taken into consideration, one of the critical themes in Atsız's discourse was fascism. Atsız and his circle were accused by many of the others to following a type of German fascism and racism. Atsız strongly opposed these criticisms for two reasons. First, German racism was a foreign ideology. As a Turkist-Turanist ideologue he believed that the only native ideology was Turkism and a real Turks only follow Turkist ideals. While he accepted his racist thought without any hesitation, he denied the idea that Turkish racism was inspired by German racism. He proposed Turkish racism as a necessity in order to protect the state from the treachery of non-Turkish people. Secondly, for Atsız German racism and Turkists racism were different things, since he emphasized that German racism mainly targeted the Jewish people. Contrary to German racism, Turkists racism targeted all nations. Thus, those who accused Turkists of being a fascist or German spy were Muscovites. In this regard, he also explained that he did not adopt fascism since fascism is an Italian nationalism i.e. foreign ideology. Here again, the emphasis is foreignness of fascism. He also idealized fascism as a way of discipline against the communist threat and he praised Hitler. Although he did not regard himself as a fascist, his discourse shows fascist characteristics as this thesis has discussed below. To understand his fascist characteristics, his discourse is mainly examined over three points: enemy images, the notion of race, and the notion of state.

In the nationalist thought, the world is considered within the dichotomy of "the other and us". In this thesis, the notion of "the other" was evaluated in the context of the enemy images. By analyzing Atsız's discourse over the enemy images through Muscovites, Jews, Kurds and Gypsies, it is shown that he considered the whole world within the friend and enemy duality. His anti-communist attitude, which parallels with the anti-communism of the period, is one of the constant elements of

his discourse until his death. The communist image formulated as an immoral, traitor, and red Muscovite. Moreover, he emphasized the foreignness of communist ideology and he always alerts against the communist threat. One of the significant findings is that communists, who are the most dangerous enemy of Atsız, are intertwined with other enemies in his discourse. In other words, the communist image is a joint image that contains also different enemies. This provides a better understanding of Atsız's emphasis on the issue of secret enemies based on conspiracy mentality. The image of Muscovite or communist, therefore, is the main enemy of Atsız.

Anti-Semitic emphases in his discourse are linked with the communist image in terms of the immorality and materialism. From his perspective, if someone is Jewish it means that he/she would also be communist or vice versa. Unsurprisingly, the words that he preferred to define Jews such as sneaky, coward, and opportunist was almost the same as the Nazi examples of Jewish description. At first sight, it seems like Jewish image did not take place in his discourse as much as conservative-nationalist intellectuals did, but he emphasized the actions of some groups which were considered as crypto-Jews namely Donmehs, Devshirmehs, Freemasons and *Türkümsü* elements. He also strongly opposed the Turkification of the Jews to protect the state from their secret attempts. As a consequence of his conspiracy mindset, he believed that critical positions and organization were captured by secret Jews.

To the contrary of Jewish image, Kurds were examined as an implicit image that missed the opportunity of Turkification. Kurds were defined not as a nation, but as an underdeveloped and a stateless “community”, and Kurdish issue was evaluated as a security problem in parallel with the official state discourse. In some of his writings, he defined the “traitor Kurds”, who aimed to establish a separate state, as red Kurds. By this definition, he created a linkage between communist image and traitor Kurds. On the one hand, Atsız clearly threatened Kurds, on the other hand, he implicitly refer Kurds in some cases. Surprisingly, the Kurds took place in his

writings only a few times. A possible explanation of this finding is that the state pressure not expressing and writing about the Kurdish issue at that time.

Atsız had a similar understanding to European countries regarding the Gypsies. They were considered as immoral and a threat to the purity of Turkish race. He saw Gypsies as rudimentary as Kurds. As might be expected, he opposed Turkification of Gypsies. He also attracted attention to the fact that considering Gypsies with pejorative adjectives are in prevalent in Turkish society. It is necessary to note that his statements about the fear of interfering with Gypsies resembled the Nuremberg Laws in Nazi Germany.

Focusing on the enemy images, what we have found is that common points in his discourse regarding the all enemy images are immorality, foreignness, and treachery. In his discourse, referring to Eco's (1995) own description, there is a two "rhetorical shifting" (p.7). As Eco (1995) emphasized in his famous Ur-fascism, fascist thought stressed both the weakness of enemy and power of enemy in order to keep the followers' motivation alive on overcoming the enemies. Secondly, the enemy is a thing that both desires to be visible and to be secrecy at the same time. This vague position of the enemy in Atsız's discourse demonstrates that the enemy can be located neither in the group nor outside of the group. As Zizek (2008) notes that the out-group existence of the enemy led to paranoid conspiracy theories in the racists' mentality. Atsız's perception of the enemy shows parallelism with this Zizekian approach. When Atsız's emphasis on crypto-Jews is taken into consideration, the enemy is a thing that can hide under the invisibility cloak. In other words, the enemy can perform his existence under different identities. In this way, the enemy can insidiously locate within the Turks in order to degenerate the superior characteristics of Turks with their hybridity and immorality. As Muskovici (1996) states, conspiracy mentality is based on the idea that there are hidden connections among the enemies. Similarly, Atsız believes that there are secret connections among Jews, Muscovites and Kurds in the context of communism. In his discourse, the enemy is in charge of all cases of trouble and the enemy cannot be tolerated. Therefore the enemy appears as an image that must be destroyed.

As it is illustrated, Atsız constructs his discourse in the context of superiority of Turkish race, purity of Turkish blood, racial hygiene and the idea of eugenics. From his perspective Turkishness was about blood and race. It is argued that his racist understanding of Turkishness was more radical than both the first period of Turkists and also Kemalists. By analyzing the core of his racism and main themes, it is shown that his understanding of race was similar to European racism and the general characteristics of the WWII period that aimed to construct homogeneous and healthy societies.

As it is discussed, the notion of eugenics was a remarkable component of racist approaches. In Nazizm, eugenics was constructed as a type of racial hygiene/ race health. Eugenics mainly focuses on the protection of race health by controlling the reproduction of the population and by sterilizing unhealthy people. The idea of eugenics appeared in Atsız's thought in a similar vein. He noted that the superior characteristics of Turkish race degenerated when being mingled with the lower race. He also emphasized the significance of race health by stating there are many people in Turkey who are disabled, idiot and have hereditary psychological problems. Therefore, he believed that in order to raise healthy generations, the one who have hereditary health problems must be sterilized. The idea of eugenics was also against the existence of women's in professional life in order to preserve the family protector and housewife characteristics of women. Surprisingly, Atsız was not against women to take part in professional life or education. On the other hand, as in Nazizm, Atsız supported to the idea that the main role of women is rising healthy future generations and protecting the family life. Similarly, the young Turkish girls should also be raised in accordance with hereditary motherhood qualifications and Turkish traditions.

A similar approach can be seen in his discourse about the peasants. Atsız regarded the peasants as the purest form of Turkish race. Therefore, the peasant image appears in his discourse as the epitomes of virtue and morality. The villages were also romanticized and regarded as the core of national development and defense. On the other hand, cities depicts as the most dangerous and unnecessary places in

regards to morality, defense, and health. These examples show that his perception about villages and cities is the evidence of his anti-modernist approach. When considering the anti-modernist emphases of fascism, Atsız's perception on cities and villages gained meaning.

His radical understandings about race and racism caused to disagreements in the Turkist movement. Literature indicates that although the actual reason behind the split up in the Turkist movement was a power struggle, the concept of race was the sharpest point of the breaking up between Atsız and Türkkan. Since they accused each other of not being a real Turk, this study attracted attention to the fact that even being a Turkist and supporting the ideals of Turkism was not enough to be accepted as a Turk. This skeptical manner is also the origin of his paranoid conspiracy mindset which frequently appears in the enemy images. As previous studies examined Atsız was not only in dispute with Türkkan but also with Kemalists. The main reason behind this antagonism between Atsız and Kemalist circle was ideological. His negative perception toward Kemalists went further and considered the RPP as an enemy since he believed that the RPP was the nest of non-Turks i.e., Muscovites, Devshirmehs, and Masons.

As it is mentioned before, the notion of race and Turkishness is above all of the matters. This discussion has to do with the notion of religion. For Atsız, being a Turk is above the being a Muslim. Since his perception of religion was based on secularism, he opposed political Islam, pan-Islam, and Islamic movements. On the other hand, proposing religion as a protector against the communist threat showed that in his discourse the notion of religion was in inconsistency position due to tactical reason. Another significant finding is that he distinguished religion and religious movements because of the fact that he considered religious movements as hazardous as communism.

This study aimed to show that in his discourse almost all themes to do with the notion of race. National defense and historical consciousness, for instance, were also the components of his racist thought. The rationale behind this emphasis was the belief that throughout history Turkish states were weakened and betrayed by the

foreign blood that captured the critical positions in the state. Here, it seems that racism is legitimized as a necessity for protecting the state from the treachery of "aliens" i.e. non-Turkish. These findings demonstrate parallelism with the enemy images in his discourse.

This study has also focused on his perception of the state, democracy, leader, nation, and citizenship in order to delineate the characteristics of his ideology**.** Predominantly, he stressed the necessity of protecting the state from the actions of enemies i.e., non-Turkish. One of the emphases is that Turks as a glorious nation had always deep-rooted state tradition. It is shown that the narratives of the state and the nation constructed in the context of race, discipline, and authority. From his perspective, the nation is the core of the state and vice versa. Moreover, his emphasis on a well-disciplined and militarized nation emerged as a remarkable indicator in terms of the convergence between his discourse and the fascist understanding. Supporting the warrior characteristics of Turks with historical narratives and emphasizing the state is needy to military discipline were prominent components of his discourse. As in fascist ideology, he believed that life itself was a war. When the romanticization of death and the extolling of the leader image are taken into consideration, similarities between fascism and his thought are more apparent. According to his perspective, fascist regimes emerged as a necessity to protect the state, since enemies were tolerated by democracy. In this way, fascism was also legitimized as a remedy for communist threat. As I have examined he had a great desire to change the name of state from *Türkiye* to *Türkeli* and replacing Turkish education system with the more disciplined one. He also proposed a nine-point national development program and aimed to transform the social and political order of the state. After his all the negative statements about democracy, it is surprising that democracy was one of the principles of this program. However, by considering Atsız's interpretation on democracy, it is illustrated that democracy was added to the program due to tactical reasons. After these evaluations, the findings of this thesis show that he desired anti-democratic, authoritarian, militarized, and well-disciplined state mechanism.

As stated at the beginning of the thesis, fascism is a form of ultra-nationalism mainly glorifies the leader myth, militarism, war and death, and national unity to create a homogenous society. When considering the Atsız's emphasis on these notions, his discourse apparently shows parallelism with fascism. The enemy images also are an important component of the Nazizm. As it was discussed, the enemy image in fascism meant that the minorities and mixed-blood people who are threat to national unity and the purity of superior race. The way to protect the cultural and moral codes of the nation is to be constantly alert against the threat of the enemy. This also reveals the intersection of enemy images and racist emphasis. As stated before, all fascisms may not be racist, but racism was an essential component of the Nazizm. Similarly, as it is shown before, Atsız's racism and enemy images reproduced each other again and again. In other words, racism in Atsız's discourse functions as a complementary notion of the enemy image with regard to fascist understanding. This thesis reveals that Atsız's enemy images show fascist characteristics since they contain racism, xenophobia, and conspiracy theories. This thesis also demonstrates that his discourse shares similarities with Nazism in the context of the enemy images, anti-communism, eugenics, state, leader and democracy. To conclude, apart from his emphases on racism and enemy images, other themes such as state, authority, democracy, militarism, and discipline in his discourse exhibit fascist characteristics.

As mentioned beginning in the thesis, radical nationalism and racism are still alive and continue to be effective on world politics. Needless to say, populist right-wing parties, authoritarianism, and racist discourses have been gaining popularity all over the world. It is a fact that racism and fascism are more than a ghost of the 20th century. Therefore, examining the sources of fascism, like Atsız's discourse, would be useful to develop a better understanding of today's politics.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, F. (1993). *The Making of Modern Turkey*. London&new York: Routledge.

Akçura, Y. (1976). *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Akkan, B. E., Deniz, M. B., & Ertan, M. (2011). Sosyal Dışlanmanın Roman Halleri. İstanbul.

Aksu, M. (2006). *Türkiye'de Çingene Olmak.* Istanbul: Kesit.

Akşin, S. (1999). The Nature of the Kemalist Revolution . D. Shakland in, *The Turkish Republic at Seventy – Five Years* (pp. 14-28). Huntingdon: The Eothen.

Alemdaroğlu, A. (2008). Öjeni Düşüncesi. T. Bora (Ed.) in, *Modern Türkiye' de Siyasi Düşünce IV: Milliyetçilik* (pp. 414-421). İstanbul: İletişim.

Alkan, M. Ö. (2013). Cumhuriyet Kurulurken Kürt Meselesi Asimilasyon-Asayiş–Medeniyet. *Birikim* , pp.104-112.

Alpkaya, F. (2008). Rıza Nur. T. Bora (Ed.) in, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce IV: Milliyetçilik* (pp. 374-377). İstanbul: İletişim.

Arıkan, Z. (1999). Halk Evlerinin Kuruluşu ve Tarihsel Gelişimi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkilap Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi* (23), pp.261-281.

Arpacı, M. (2014). Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinde Kamu Sağlığı Siyaseti ve Öjenik (1923-1946). *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar* , pp. 129-154.

Aslan, Ö. (2014). A Turkish Muslim Between Islamisn and Turkish Nationalism: Seyyid Ahmed Arvasi(1932-88). *Turkish Studies , 15* (3), pp. 519-535.

Atsız, H. N. (2012). *Basılmayan Makaleler.* Istanbul: Togan.

Atsız, N. (1933). *Çanakkale'ye Yürüyüş.* istanbul: Arkadaş.

Atsız, N. (1935). *Komünist Don Kişotu Proleter Burjuva Nazım Hikmetof Yoldaş'a.* İstanbul: Arkadaş.

Atsız, N. (1943). *En Sinsi Tehlike.* Istanbul: Arkadaş.

Atsız, N. (1943). *Hesap Böyle Verilir.* Istanbul: Arkadas.

Atsız, N. (1997). *Makaleler IV.* İstanbul: İrfan.

Atsız, N. (2011). *Turancılık, Milli Değerler ve Gençlik.* İstanbul: Ötüken.

Atsız, N. (2011). *Türk Ülküsü.* İstanbul: Ötüken.

Atsız, N. (2014). *Türk Tarihinde Meseleler.* Istanbul: Ötüken.

Atsız, N. (2016). *Türk Ülküsü.* İstanbul: İrfan.

Atsız, N. (2018). *Makaleler I.* İstanbul: İrfan.

Atsız, N. (2018). *Makaleler III.* İstanbul: İrfan.

Atsız, N. (2018). *Türkçülüğe Karşı Haçlı Seferleri ve Çektiklerimiz.* İstanbul: Ötüken.

Aydın, S. (2009). Cumhuriyet'in İdeolojik Şekillenmesinde Antropolojinin Rolü. A. İnsel (Ed.) in, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce II: Kemalizm* (pp.344-369). İstanbul: İletişim.

Aytürk, İ. (2011). The Racist Critics of Atatürk and Kemalism, from the 1930s and the 1960s. *Journal of Contemporary History* , pp. 308-335.

Aytürk, İ. (2014). Nationalism and Islam in Cold War Turkey, 1944-69. *Middle Eastern Studies , 50* (5), pp. 693-719.

Ayvazoğlu, B. (2008). Tanrıdağ'dan Hira Dağı'na Uzun İnce Yollar. T. Bora& M. Gültekingil (Ed.) in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce IV: Milliyetçilik*, (pp. 544-578). İstanbul: İletişim.

Bakiler, Y. B. (2010). *1944-1945 ırkçılık-turancılık Davasında Sorgular Savunmalar*. İstanbul: Türk Edebiyatı Vakfı.

Bali, R. N. (2006). Politics of Turkification During the Single Party Period. H. Lukas-Kieser (Ed.) in, *Turkey beyond Nationalism* (pp. 43-50). London: I. B. Taurus.

Bali, R. N. (2008). "The 1934 Thrace events: continuity and change within Turkish state policies regarding non-Muslim minorities. Interview with Rıfat Bali", *European Journel of Turkish Studies*, Thematic issue No.7. Retrieved on 10 April, 2019 from http://www.ejts.org/document2903.html

Bali, R. N. (2013). *Toplu Makaleler-II Türkiye'de Antisemitizm ve Komplo Kültürü.* İstanbul: Libra.

Bali, R. N. (2016). *Komplo Teorileri: Cehaletin ve Antisemitizmin Resm-i Geçidi.* İstanbul: Libra.

Berkes, N. (1998). *The Development of Secularism in Turkey.* London: C. Hurst & Co.

Biddiss, M. D. (1966). Gobineau and the Origins of European Racism. *Race* , pp. 255-270.

Boesch, E. E. (2007). The Enigmatic Other. L. M. Simão, & J. Valsiner (Ed.) in, *Otherness in Question : Labyrinths of the Self.* North Carolina: Information Age.

Bora, T. (1995). *Milliyetçiliğin Kara Baharı.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Bora, T. (2006). *Medeniyet Kaybı.* İstanbul: Birikim.

Bora, T. (2015). *Türk Sağının Üç Hali.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Bora, T. (2017). *Cereyanlar.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Bora, T., & Can, K. (1991). *Devlet, Ocak, Dergah: 12 Eylül'den 1990'lara Ülkücü Hareket.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Bora, T., & Ünüvar, K. (2015). Ellili Yıllarda Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce Hayatı. M. K. Kaynar (Ed.) in, *Türkiye'nin 1950'li Yılları* (pp.159-175). İstanbul: İletişim.

Brons, L. (2015). Othering, An Analysis. *Transcience: a Journal of Global Studies* , *6* (1), pp. 69-90.

Cagaptay, S. (2002). Reconfiguring the Turkish Nation in the 1930's. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics , 8* (2), pp. 67-82.

Cizre, Ü. (1992). The ideology and politics of the Nationalist Action Party of Turkey. pp. 141-164.

Clair, M., & Denis, J. S. (2015). Sociology of Racism. *The International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences , 19* , pp. 857-863.

Coady, D. (2006). *Conspiracy Theories: The Philosophical Debate.* Cornwall: Routladge.

Copeaux, E. (2008). Türk Milliyetçiliği: Sözcükler, Tarihler İşaretler. T. Bora (Ed.) in, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce IV: Milliyetçilik* (pp. 44-52). İstanbul: İletişim.

Cowen, T. (1997, January 1). *The Socialist Roots of Modern Anti-Semitism.* Retrieved on February 25, 2018 from The Independent Institute: http://www.independent.org/publications/article.asp?id=359

Çelik, N. B. (2009). Kemalizm: Hegemonik Bir Söylem. A. İnsel (Ed.) in, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce II: Kemalizm* (pp. 75-91). İstanbul: İletişim.

Çınar, M. (2013). *Anadoluculuk ve Tek Parti CHP'de Sağ Kanat.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Danişmend, İ. H. (1983). *Türklük Meseleleri.* İstanbul: İstanbul Kitabevi.

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

Demirağ, Y. (2006). Pan-İdeologies in the Ottoman Empire Against the West: From Pan-Ottomanism to Pan-Turkism. *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations , XXXVI*, pp. 139-158.

Draper, H. (1977). Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution. *State and Bureaucracy* , pp. 591-608.

Eco, U. (1995, June 22). *Ur-Fascism.* Retrived on May 10, 2019 from The New York review of Books: https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1995/06/22/ur-fascism/

Eligür, B. (2017). Ethnocultural nationalism and Turkey's non-Muslim minorities during the early republican period. *British journal of Middle Eastern Studies* , pp. 1-21.

Ercilasun, A. B. (2018, January 5). *Atsız'ın Atatürk ve Cumhuriyet hakkındaki görüşleri.* Retrived on April 10, 2019 from http://www.turkdevrimi.com/yazarlar/prof-dr-ahmet-bican-ercilasun/atsizin-ataturk-ve-cumhuriyet-hakkindaki-gorusleri/1817/

Erken, A. (2013). *The Construction of Nationalist Politics in Turkey: The MHP:1965-1980 (PHD Thesis).* UK: Oxford University.

Ertekin, O. (2002). Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkçülüğün Çatallanan Yolları. T. Bora (Ed.) in, *Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, IV: Milliyetçilik* (pp. 345-87). İstanbul: İletişim.

Finchelstein, F. (2019). *Faşizmden Popülizme.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Fontette, F. D. (1991). *Irkçılık.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Fraser, A. (2005). *Çingeneler.* İstanbul: Homer.

Georgeon, F. (1986). *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935).* Ankara: Yurt.

Georgeron, F. (2008). Türk Milliyetçiliği Üzerine Düşünceler: Suyu Arayan Adam'ı Yeniden Okurken. T. Bora (Ed.) in, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce IV: Milliyetçilik* (pp. 23-28). İstanbul: İletişim.

Gobineau, A. D. (1915). *The Inequality of Human Races.* London: William Heinemann.

Gökalp, Z. (2017). *Türkçülüğün Esasları.* İstanbul: Kapı.

Grand, A. J. (2004). *Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany: The "fascist" style of rule.* New York: Routledge.

Griffin, R. (2012). Studying Fascism in a Postfascist Age. From New Consensus to New Wave? *Fascism* , pp. 1-17.

Griffin, R. (2014). *Faşizmin Doğası.* Istanbul: Iletişim.

Güven, E., & Yılmazata, M. (2014). Milli Inkilap and The Thrace Incidents of 1934. *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies , 13* (2), pp. 190-211.

Heyd, U. (1950). *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp* . London: Luzac & Cy. Ltd. and The Harvill.

Hirsh, D. (2007). *Anti-Zionism and Antisemitism: Cosmopolitan Reflections.* New Heaven: Working Paper. Yale Initiative for the Interdisciplinary Study of Antisemitism (YIISA) Occasional Papers.

Kakışım, C. (2016). Nihal Atsız'ın Kemalizm Eleştirisi ve Bu Eleştirinin Nedensel Çözümlemesi. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi , 5* (8), pp. 2624-2639.

Karaca, K. (1971). *Milliyetçi Türkiye Milliyetçi-Toplumcu Düzen.* Ankara: Emel.

Karaer, İ. (1989). Türk Ocakları ve İnkilaplar (1912-1931). (*PHD Thesis).* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkilap Tarihi Enstitüsü.

Karaosmanoğlu, K. (2009). Bir Komplo Söyleminden Parçalar: Komplo Zihniyeti, Sıradan Faşizm ve New Age. *Culture&Communication , 12* (1), pp. 95-126.

Karpat, K. H. (2004). *Studies on Turkish Politcs and Society: Selected Articles and Essays.* Leiden: Brill.

Karpat, K. (2011). *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Kimlik ve İdeoloji.* İstanbul: Timaş.

Kleg, M. (1993). *Hate Prejudice and Racism.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Klemperer, V. (2018). *LTI Nasyonel Sosyalizmin Dili.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Kolukırık, S. (2006). Geçmişin Aynasında Lozan Çingeneleri: Göç, hatıra ve Deneyimler. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyolojik Araştırmalar E- Dergisi*.

Köker, L. (2007). *Modernleşme, Kemalizm ve Demokrasi.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Kurt, Ü. (2012). *Türk'ün Büyük Biçare Irkı Türk Yurdu'nda Milliyetçiliğin Esasları(1911-1916).* İstanbul: İletişim.

Landau, J. M. (1995). *Pan-Turkism From Irredentism to Cooperation.* Indiana: Indiana University.

Levi, A. (1996). *Türkiye Cumhuriyetinde Yahudiler.* İstanbul: İletişim.

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

Macciocchi, M.-A. (2000). Gramsci ve Faşizm Sorunu. *Faşizmin Analizi* (pp. 13-40). Istanbul: Payel.

Mann, M. (2004). *Fascists.* New York: Cambridge.

Meşe, E. (2017). *Komünizmle Mücadele Dernekleri.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Moore, J. H. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Race and Racism.* Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA/ Thomson Gale.

Moralı, S. S. (1969). Hamdullah Suphi ve Türk Ocakları. *Tarih Mecmuası* , pp. 71-77.

Moses, R. (2010). Düşman Algısı: Psikolojik Bir Analiz. *Tarih Okulu , 7*, pp. 99-108.

Mosse, G. L. (1966). Introduction: The Genesis of Fascism. *Journal of Contemporary History , 1* (1), pp. 14-26.

Mosse, G. L. (1996). *The Image of New Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity.* New York: Oxford University.

Mumcu, U. (1994). *40'ların Cadı Kazanı.* Tekin.

Muskovici, S. (1996). Yabancı Parmağı,Komplo Zihniyeti. *Birikim* (90), pp. 45-59.

Müftüoğlu, M. (2005). *: Milli şef döneminde Çankaya'da Kabus(1944 Turncılık Davası).* İstanbul: Başak.

Newman, S. (2013). *Bakunin'den Lacan'a.* İstanbul: Ayrıntı.

Nur, D. R. (1967). *Hayat ve Hatıratım* (Volume 4). İstanbul: Altındağ.

Oba, A. E. (1995). *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu.* Ankara: İmge.

Oliver, J. E., & Wood, T. J. (2014). Conspiracy Theories and the Paranoid Style(s) of Mass Opinion. *American Journal of Political Science , 58* (4), pp. 952-966.

Oran, B. (1990). *Atatürk Milliyetçiliği.* Ankara: Bilgi.

Oran, B. (2010). *Türkiyeli Kürtler Üzerine Yazılar.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Önen, N. (2008). Reha Oğuz Türkkan. T. Bora(Ed.) in, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce IV: Milliyetçilik* (pp. 362-369). İstanbul: İletişim.

Özakman, T. (1995). *Dr. Rıza Nur Dosyası.* Ankara: Bilgi.

Özateşler, G. (2011). The Forced Dislocation of Gypsy People From the Town of Bayramic, Canakkale in 1970. *PHD Thesis* . Leiden University and Boğaziçi University.

Özdoğan, G. G. (2008). Dünya'da ve Türkiye'de Turancılık. T. Bora (Ed.) in, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce IV: Milliyetçilik* (pp. 388-405). İstanbul: İletişim.

Özdoğan, G. G. (2015). *Turan'dan Bozkurt'a Tek Parti Döneminde Türkçülük (1931-1946).* İstanbul: İletişim.

Öztan, G. G. (2012). Ezeli Düşman ile Hesaplaşmak: Türk Sağında "Moskof" İmgesi. İ. Ö. Kerestecioğlu, & G. G. Öztan (Ed.) in, *Türk Sağı Mitler Fetişler Düşman İmgeleri*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Öztan, T. (2012). Öfkeyi Çizmek: Milliyetçi Tahayyülde Düşman Portreleri. İ. Ö. Kerestecioğlu, & G. G. Öztan (Ed.) in, *Türk Sağı Mitler, Fetişler, Düşman İmgeleri*. Istanbul: Iletisim.

Parla, T. (1985). *Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp 1876-1924.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Passmore, K. (2002). *Fascism A Very Short Introduction.* New York: Oxford.

Paxton, R. O. (1998). The Five Stages of Fascism. *The Journal of Modern History* (70), pp. 1-23.

Paxton, R. O. (2004). *Anatomy of Fascism.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Payne, S. G. (1980). *Fascism: Comparison and Definition.* Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin.

Poulton, H. (1997). *The Top Hat Gray Wolve and Crescent.* London: Hurst&Co.

Sarınay, Y. (1994). *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Tarihi Gelişimi ve Türk Ocakları 1912-1931*. İstanbul: Ötüken.

Sarıtaş, M. (2006). Nurettin Topçu. T. Bora, & M. Gültekingil (Ed.) in, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce V: Muhafazakarlık* (pp. 261-266). İstanbul: İletişim.

Schmitt, C. (2007). *The Concept of The Political*. USA: The University of Chicago.

Schnapper, D. (1995). *Yurttaşlar Cemaati: Modern Ulus Fikrine Dair.* İstanbul: Kesit.

Schnapper, D. (2005). *Sosyoloji Düşüncesinin Özünde Öteki İle ilişki.* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Soner, B. A. (2005). Citizenship and the Minority Question in Turkey. E. F. Keyman, & A. İçduygu (Ed.) in, *Citizenship in a Global World: European Questions and Turkish Experiences* (pp. 289-311). New York: Routledge.

Soysal, A. G. (2008). Rusya Kökenli Aydınların Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliğinin İnşasına Katkısı. *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce IV:Milliyetçilik* (pp. 483-504). İstanbul: İletişim.

Sternhell, Z. (2008). How to Think about Fascism and Its Ideology. *Constellations:* (15), pp. 280-290.

Şanlı, F. S. (2010). Türkçülük Akımında Din Olgusu Üzerine Aykırı Bir Yaklaşım: Hüseyin Nihal Atsız ve Fikirleri. *Unpublished Master Thesis* . Ankara: T.C. Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkilâp Tarihi Enstitüsü.

Teber, S. (2001). *İnsanın Hiçleşme Serüvenine Giriş: Politik-Psikoloji Notları.* İstanbul: Papirüs.

Türkkan, R. O. (1975). *Tabutluktan Gurbete.* İstanbul: Boğaziçi.

Uzer, U. (2002). Racism in Turkey: The Case of Hüseyin Nihal Atsız. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs , 22* (1), pp. 119-130.

Üstel, F. (2004a). *İmparatorluktan Ulus Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği: Türk Ocakları(1912-1931).* İstanbul: İletişim.

Üstel, F. (2004b). *Makbul Vatandaş'ın Peşinde: II. Meşrutiyet'ten Bugüne Vatandaşlık Eğitimi.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Volkan, V. D. (2010). *Politik Psikoloji.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü.

Weber, M. (2004). *Sosyoloji Yazıları.* İstanbul: İletişim .

Woodroffe, M. (1981). Racial Theories of History and Politics: the Example of Houston Stewart Chamberlain. P. Kennedy, & A. Nicholls (Ed.) in, *Nationalist and Racialist Movements in Britain and Germany Before 1914* (pp. 143-153). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Yanık, A., & Bora, T. (2017). Altmışlı Yıllarda Türkiye'nin Siyasi Düşünce Hayatı. M. K. Kaynar (Ed.) in, *Türkiye'nin 1960'lı Yılları* (pp. 275-300). İstanbul: İletişim.

Yaşlı, F. (2009). *Kinimiz Dinimizdir Türkçü Faşizm Üzerine Bir İnceleme.* Ankara: Tan.

Yeğen, M. (1999). *Devlet Söyleminde Kürt Sorunu.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Yeğen, M. (2006). *Müstakbel Kürtten Sözde Vatandaşa: Cumhuriyet ve Kürtler.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Yıldız, A. (2009). Kemalist Mlliyetçilik. A. İnsel (Ed.) in, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce II: Kemalizm* (pp. 210-234). İstanbul: İletişim.

Zenkovsky, S. A. (1983). *Rusya'da Pan-Türkizm ve Müslümanlık.* İstanbul: Üçdal.

Zizek, S. (1998). *Tarrying With the Negative.* USA: Duke University Press.

Zizek, S. (2008). *The Plague of Fantasies.* London New York: Verso.

Zurcher, E. J. (2004). *Turkey: Modern History.* London: I. B. Tauris.

Zurcher, E. J. (2009). Kemalist Düşüncenin Osmanlı Kaynakları. A. İnsel (Ed.) in, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce II: Kemalizm* (pp. 44-55). İstanbul: İletişim.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bu tez Türkiye siyasi tarihinde Türkçü düşüncenin en önemli isimlerinden biri olan Nihal Atsız'ın (1905-1975) söyleminde öne çıkan kavramları eleştirel bir yaklaşım ile analiz etmektedir. Bu tez Atsız'ın söyleminin düşman imgesi ve ırkçı düşünce üzerinden temellendiğini ortaya koyar. Bu doğrultuda Atsız'ın ırkçı düşüncesindeki düşman imgeleri ve ırkçı söylemiyle bağlantılı olarak demokrasi, devlet, militarizm, disiplin ve öjeni gibi kavramlar analiz edilmektedir. Bu tez de temel olarak Atsız'ın radikal söylemindeki düşman imgelerinin ve incelenen diğer kavramların faşist özellikler taşıdığı iddia edilmiştir. Bu iddiayı temellendirebilmek için Atsız'ın söyleminin özellikle Nazizm ile benzer noktaları ortaya koyulmuştur.

Nihal Atsız hayatı boyunca ırkçı-Türkçü çizgisini korumuş bir entelektüel olarak Atsız Mecmua, Orhun, Çınaraltı, Orkun ve Ötüken gibi pek çok dergi çıkarmış, şiirler ve romanlar kaleme almıştır. Türkçülüğün 1930'lu ve 40'lı yıllardaki yükselişinde rol oynayan en önemli isimlerden biri olan Atsız anti-kemalist, seküler ırkçı-Türkçü duruşu ile Türk milliyetçiliğinin marjinal ve özgül bir kanadını temsil eder. Atsız yalnızca yaşadığı dönem için de değil, romanları, şiirleri, makaleleri ve ideolojik duruşu ile kendisinden sonraki kuşakları da radikal Türkçü söyleminin etkisi altına almayı başarabilmiş bir figürdür. Bu sebeple Atsız'ın fikirleri pek çok araştırmacı tarafından ele alınmıştır. Bu çalışmaların bir kısmı Atsız'ın edebi kimliğine odaklanırken bir kısmı da söylemindeki temalara odaklanmıştır. Yazılarına ilişkin değerlendirmelerin büyük bölümü Atsız'ın taraftarları tarafından yapılsa da, Atsız'ın söylemine eleştirel bakış açısıyla ele alan çalışmalarda mevcuttur. Bu minvalde Tanıl Bora (2006; 2017) ve Fatih Yaşlı'nın (2009) değerlendirmeleri bu tezin dert edindiği meseleler bakımından oldukça önemlidir. Bu tez Tanıl Bora'nın, Atsız'ın Türk milliyetçiliği içinde ki pozisyonunu radikal, ırkçı, anti-komünist ve seküler olarak değerlendiren yorumlarını ve Fatih Yaşlı'nın İtalyan ve Alman faşizmlerinden etkilendiklerini iddia ettiği için Türkçü-faşist

olarak betimlediği Türkçü figürlerin metinlerinde yer alan düşman imgelerine dair yorumlarını takip ederek bu analizleri geliştirmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Faşist ideoloji bugüne kadar pek çok araştırmacı tarafından analiz edilmiş ve tanımlanmıştır. Bu çalışmalar arasında kimi araştırmacılar Nazizm'i faşizmin bir türü olarak değerlendirirken kimi araştırmacılar ise Nazizm'i faşist ideolojinin dışında tutmuşlardır. Bu durum faşist ideolojinin tanımlanmasının zorluğunu da beraberinde getirmiştir. Her ne kadar bazı tanımlar bir takım ortak özellikleri paylaşsa da, her faşist düşüncenin diğer faşizmlerle bire bir aynı özellikleri göstermesi beklenemez. Bu tez Nazizm'i faşizmin radikal bir türevi olarak gören çalışmalar ile paralel bir yaklaşım benimsemiştir. Bu tez de tanımlandığı biçimiyle faşizm genel hatlarıyla milletin düşmanları dışlanarak şeytanlaştırılırken liderin, ırkın, milli birliğin ve militarizmin yüceltildiği bir ultra milliyetçiliktir. Faşizmdeki düşman imgesi özellikle Alman faşizminde ki biçimiyle üstün ırkın saflığını yok etmek ve mili birliği bozmak isteyen etnik olarak saf olmayan unsurlara işaret eder. Her ne kadar bazı araştırmacılar faşizmi doğası gereği ırkçı olarak nitelendirse de, bazı araştırmacılar da ırkçılığın faşizmin gerekli bir unsuru olmadığına inanmışlardır. Nitekim İtalyan faşizmi 1930'ların ikinci yarısına kadar ırkçı değildi ve hareketin içinde Yahudiler de bulunuyordu. Faşizm hiçbir ırkçı vurguyu barındırmadan da toplumu anti-demokratik, otoriter ve militarist idealler yoluyla dönüştürmeyi amaçlar ve faşist ideolojinin sınırları dışında kalmak hususunda ısrarcı olanların özgürlük alanlarını kısıtlar. Bu açıdan bakıldığında faşizmin ırkçı olmayan türevlerinde de ırkçı mantığa benzer bir işleyiş görülebilir. Her ne kadar ırkçılık faşizm için tek başına belirleyici bir unsur olmasada, ırkçı vurgular ve düşman imgeleri faşist düşüncede iç içe geçmiştir. Nitekim Atsız'ın söyleminde de düşman imgeleri oldukça önemli bir yere sahiptir. Tamda bu nedenle, bu tez, Atsız'ın söylemindeki düşman imgelerinin faşist bir muhtevası olup olmadığını anlamayı amaçlamaktadır.

Atsız'ın Türkçü söylemindeki öne çıkan temaları analiz edebilmek ve onun Türk milliyetçiliğindeki konumunu ortaya koyabilmek için, Türkçü düşüncenin kaynakları ve Türk milliyetçiliğinin 1970'li yıllara kadar olan gelişimi ele

alınmıştır. Türkçü ideolojiye dair ilk tartışmalar Batılı araştırmacılar tarafından yapılan Türkoloji çalışmaları ile başlamıştır. Bu çalışmalar Türk milliyetçiliğine kültürel temel de yaklaşarak Türk diline ve kültürel imgelerine odaklanmışlardır. Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun son döneminde, Türkçülük akımı tıpkı İslamcılık ve Osmanlıcılık akımları gibi imparatorluğu ayakta tutmak için bir çözüm arayışı olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. 19. yüzyılda yükselen milliyetçilik akımlarının etkisi Osmanlı imparatorluğunda da kendini göstermiştir. Türkçü düşünce, Türk milliyetçiliğinin önemli entelektüelleri arasında yer alan Yusuf Akçura, Ziya Gökalp ve Ahmet Ağaoğlu gibi isimler ve bilhassa Rusya'dan göç eden aydınlar vesilesi ile etki alanını genişletmiş, Türkler arasında Türklük bilincinin yaratılmasına odaklanmıştır. Bu dönem de kurulan Türk Ocağı ve çeşitli Türkçü dergiler Türk kimliğinin ve Türklük bilincinin oluşturulmasında önemli rol oynamıştır. Batı medeniyeti etkisinde kalan erken dönem Türk milliyetçiliği, özellikle Türk milliyetçiliğinin babası olarak kabul edilen Gökalp'in hars ve medeniyet yaklaşımından beslenmiştir. Gökalp milleti; dilde, dinde, ahlakta ve estetikte birlik üzerinden inşaa ederken etnik temelli vurgulardan kaçınmıştır. Gökalp'in kültür temelli milliyetçiliği Modern Türkiye'nin kuruluşu ile birlikte Kemalist milliyetçiliği de etkilemiştir. Kemalist milliyetçilik özellikle Türklüğün sınırlarının belirlenmesi ve Türk kimliğinin yaratılması hususlarını kendine mesele edinmiştir. Osmanlı döneminde millet kavramı etnik bir tanımlama olmaktan ziyade dini kimlikleri betimlemek amacıyla kullanılıyordu. Yeni kurulan ulus devlette ise başlangıçta Gökalp'in etkisiyle kültür ve dil kavramları Türklüğü belirlemede temel unsurlar olarak ortaya çıkarken özellikle 1930'lı yıllardaki Güneş Dil Teorisi ve Türk Tarih Tezi gibi yaklaşımlar Türklük tanımına etnik bir veçhe kazandırmış, Türklüğün tanımı aynı kültürel değerleri ve idealleri taşımanın ötesine geçmiştir. Türk Tarih Tezi bütün medeniyetlerin Türk medeniyetinden temellendiği fikrine dayanmaktaydı. Bu iddia ile birlikte Tez, Türklerin de tıpkı Avrupalı halklar gibi medeniyetin kurucu unsurlarından biri olduğunu ortaya koymayı amaçlamıştı. Benzer şekilde Güneş Dil Teorisi de Türkçenin tüm dillerin kaynağı olduğunu iddia etmekteydi.

Literatürün belirttiği üzere erken Cumhuriyet döneminde Türkçü akım temel olarak iki ana hattan oluşmaktaydı. İlk grup Türkçüler olarak anılan Ziya Gökalp, Yusuf Akçura, Hamdullah Suphi, Ferit Cansever, Ömer Seyfettin gibi entelektüeller Osmanlı geleneğinden beslenmişler, Cumhuriyetin kurucu ilkelerini de etkilemişlerdi. Ayrıca ırk konunda daha kapsayıcı yaklaşımlar benimsemişlerdi. Öte yandan Nihal Atsız, Reha Oğuz Türkkan, Fethi Tevetoğlu ve İsmet Tümtürk gibi isimlerin yer aldığı ikinci grup Türkçüler her ne kadar ilk grup Türkçülerin fikri kaynaklarından beslenselerde radikal söylemleri ve militarizmi de içeren ırkçı-Turancı idealleri benimsemeleri sebebiyle ilk grup Türkçülerden kendilerini ayırmışlardır. Özellikle ikinci Türkçü kuşak ve Kemalistler arasında oluşan ideolojik farklılıklar bazı Türkçü entelektüellerin Kemalist ideolojiye dönük sert eleştirilerini beraberinde getirmiştir. Bu dönemde Kemalist ideolojinin Türk Tarih Tezi ve Güneş Dil Teorisi Zeki Veledi Togan, Fuad Köprülü, Rıza Nur ve Nihal Atsız gibi bazı Türkçü entelektüeller tarafından eleştirilmiştir. Yine literatürün işaret ettiği gibi Kemalist elitler ise özellikle ırkçı-Türkçü entelektüelleri irredentist idealleri sebebiyle maceracı olarak görmüştür. Bu dönem de pek çok Türkçü dergi çıkarılmış, Kemalizme yönelik eleştirileri ve ideolojik duruşları sebebiyle defalarca kapatılmışlardır. İkinci Dünya Savaşı döneminde Kemalist rejimin ırkçı-Türkçü çevrelere karşı tutumu savaşın seyriyle ilintili olarak değişkenlik göstermiş, Almanların savaşta yenileceğinin anlaşılması ve Sovyet tehdidi sebebiyle Türkçü çevrelere yönelik tavır sertleşmiştir. Bu tavrın sonucu olarak Nihal Atsız, Reha Oğuz Türkkan, Alparslan Türkeş gibi isimlerin de aralarında olduğu Türkçüler 1944 ırkçılık-Turancılık davasında yargılanmış, işkence görmüş ve hapis cezasına çarptırılmıştır. Irkçılık-Turancılık davası Türkçülerde derin bir travmanın sebebi olurken yaşadıkları parlak günler de geride kalmıştır. Bu dava Atsız'ın hayatında da unutulmaz bir kavşak olmuş, yazılarında bu konu sık sık yer bulmuştur.

Soğuk savaş dönemiyle birlikte artan Sovyet korkusu anti-komünizmi bir devlet politikası haline getirmiştir. Bu dönemde farklı milliyetçi cepheler de komünizm tehdidine karşı birlik olarak Milliyetçiler Federasyonu, Türk Milliyetçiler Derneği, Komünizmle Mücadele Dernekleri'ni kurmuşlardı. 1965 yılına gelindiğinde Milli Birlik Komitesinden tasfiye edilen subaylardan ve tıpkı Atsız gibi 1944 davasının

sanıklarından biri olan Alparslan Türkeş Cumhuriyetçi Köylü Millet Partisi'ne katıldı. 1969 yılında Adana'da yapılan genel kongrede partinin ismi Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi olarak değişirken partinin Bozkurt olan eski amblemi de üç hilal amblemi ile değiştirildi. Partinin muhafazakâr-İslamcı terkibe yanaşan tavrı Atsız ve seküler Türkçülerin parti ile bağlarının kopması ile sonuçlanmıştı. Zira Atsız ve çevresi seküler temellere dayanan bir Türkçü geleneği temsil etmekteydi. Yaşanan bu kopuş Atsız'ı daha radikal ve dar bir milliyetçiliğin temsilcisi haline getirirken, MHP'yi ise Türk milliyetçiliğinin önde gelen temsilcilerinden biri haline dönüştürdü.

Türk milliyetçiliğine ilişkin bu değerlendirmeler Atsız'ı daha radikal bir pozisyona hapseden söyleminin arka planını anlamak açısından önemlidir. Atsız'ın politik kimliğini ortaya koyan ırk, öjeni, devlet ve millet gibi kavramların yanı sıra, Kemalizm ile çatışması, din ve faşizme dair fikirleri tezin kapsamı bakımından kritik bir öneme sahiptir.

Atsız, Türkçülüğün Türk milliyetçiliği içindeki özgül konumunu yazılarında vurgularken ırkçılık ve Turancılığı Türkçülüğün ayrılmaz bileşenleri olarak değerlendirmiştir. Atsız'ın söyleminin en başat unsurlarından olan ırk ve ırkçılık kavramları Türk kanın üstünlüğü, kan saflığı, ırk hıfzıssıhhası/öjenik idealler çerçevesinde söyleminde geniş bir yer bulmaktadır. Bu bağlamda Türklük kan ve ırk üzerinden tanımlanmıştır. Türklüğü doğrudan ırk ve kan üzerinden tanımlaması Atsız'ın söylemini ilk dönem Türkçü düşünürlerden ve Kemalist milliyetçiliğin Türklük tanımından ayırmaktadır. Atsız'ın düşüncesinde ırkçılık ülkeyi yabancı kanlıların ihanetinden korumak için ortaya çıkan bir araç olarak meşrulaşır. Bu sebeple tarihi şuur ve ırk hıfzıssıhhası ırkçılık anlayışının önemli unsurlarıdır.

Avrupa düşünce dünyasından temellenen, homojen ve sağlıklı toplumlar yaratma fikirleriyle şekillenen ve İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nın genel atmosferini yansıtan yükselen ırkçı idealler Atsız'ın düşüncesiyle paralellik taşımaktadır. Fakat söylemlerinde dönemin antropolojik yaklaşımları görülmez. Özellikle Alman faşizminin ayrılmaz bir parçası olan öjenik yaklaşımlar temelinde ırk sağlığına odaklanarak nüfus üretiminin kontrol edilmesini ve sağlıksız nesillerin çoğalmasını

engellemeyi amaçlamaktaydı. Benzer biçimde Atsız Türklerin üstün özelliklerinin aşağı ırklarla karıştığında yok olduğuna inanmış, ülkede çok sayıda geri zekâlı, engelli ve kalıtsal hastalıklıları olan insanlar olduğuna değinerek ruhsal problemleri bulunanların kısırlaştırılmasının gerekliliğine değinmiştir. Yine benzer biçimde, Nazizm'de olduğu gibi Atsız'ın söylemlerinde kadınların en başat görevi gürbüz çocuklar/nesiller yetiştirmek ve aile hayatını korumaktır. Türk kızları ise kalıtsal annelik niteliklerine ve Türk geleneklerine uygun olarak yetiştirilmelidirler. Söyleminde Türk ırkının en saf halini Türk köylüleri oluşturur. Bu bağlamda köyler erdem ve ahlakın temsilcisi olarak değerlendirilmiş milli kalkınmanın temeli olarak romantize edilmiştir. Öte yandan şehirler ahlak ve sağlık bakımından tehlikeli yerler olarak nitelendirilmiştir. Atsız'ın söyleminde yer edinen bu vurgular faşizmin modernizm karşıtlığı ile de uyum içindedir.

Atsız'ın özellikle ırk hususundaki yaklaşımları Türkçü hareket nezdinde de fikir ayrılıkları yaşanmasına sebep olmuştur. O dönemde hareketin öne çıkan diğer bir figürü olan Reha Oğuz Türkkan ve Nihal Atsız arasındaki gerilimin temel nedeni literatürdeki çalışmalar tarafından da Türkçü hareketteki güç mücadelesi olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Irk kavramı ise iki figür arasındaki ayrılığın en keskin noktalarından biri niteliğindedir. Öyle ki Atsız ve Türkkan arasındaki bu çatışma birbirilerini gerçek Türk olmamak ile itham etmeye kadar varmıştır. Türkçü idealler için çabalayan Türkçü bir figürün dahi Türk olmamak ile itham edilmesi oldukça dikkat çekicidir. Nitekim bu şüpheci tavır özellikle düşman imgelerinde kendini komplo teorileri biçiminde göstermiştir. Yine literatürün işaret ettiği gibi Atsız aynı zamanda Kemalist ideoloji ve Kemalist çevreler ile de çatışma içindedir. Bu çatışma Atsız'ın Türk Tarih Tezi'ne muhalefetiyle başlamış, 1944 davası ile doruk noktasına ulaşmıştır. CHP'nin Türk olmayan Masonlar, Devşirmeler ve Moskoflar tarafından ele geçirildiğine inanması CHP'yi Türkçülüğe ve Türkçülere düşman bir parti olarak değerlendirmesine olanak tanımıştır. Atsız ve Kemalist çevreler arasındaki gerilimin en önemli nedenlerinden biri Türklüğün tanımı olduğu ölçüde temel çatışma nedenleri de ideolojiktir.

Atsız'ın din mevhumuna ilişki görüşleri de ırkçı- Türkçü ideolojik duruşuna göre şekillenmiştir. Bu bağlamda Atsız, Müslümanlığın Türklük sayesinde yüceldiğine inanmıştır. Atsız dini seküler bir bakış açısıyla ele alırken, ahlaki ve manevi açıdan da bir gereklilik olarak değerlendirmiştir. Bu bağlamda Kuran ve ezanın Türkleştirilmesini desteklemiştir. Öte yandan söylemi din konusunda bazı tutarsızlıklar göstermiş, CHP'yi gereğinden fazla seküler olduğu için eleştirmiştir. Nitekim bu tutarsızlığın sebebi taktiksel olarak dini komünizm tehdidine karşı koruyucu bir unsur olarak görmüş olmasıdır. Ayrıca siyasal İslam, cemaatler ve Pan-İslamcılık gibi hareketlere her zaman karşı olmuştur. Özellikle Nurculuk gibi İslami hareketlerin komünizm kadar tehlikeli olduğuna dikkat çekmiştir. Atsız'ın yazılarında İslam peygamberini eleştiren ve Kuran'ın Muhammed tarafından yazıldığını öne süren ifadeleri Atsız'ın MHP ile yollarının ayrılmasına sebep olan başat unsurlardan biri olmuştur.

Atsız'ın politik söylemini analiz edebilmek amacıyla bu tez de Atsız'ın devlet, millet, demokrasi, lider, vatandaşlık kavramlarına ilişkin algısı da incelenmiştir. Atsız'ın söyleminde devlet mevhumu nezdinde karşılaşılan ifadeler muktedir devlet algısına ve devletin yabancı kanlıların ihanetinden sakınılması hususlarına dayanmaktadır. Bu minvalde vurgulanan temel noktalardan biri Türklerin her zaman köklü devlet geleneğine sahip olduğu inanışıdır. Nitekim Kemalist ideolojinin aksine Türklerin tarih boyu tek bir devlet kurduğu ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin yüzyıllardır var olan eski Türk devletlerinin devamı olduğu dolayısıyla da değişenin yalnızca rejim olduğu fikri söylemine hâkimdir. Devlet ve millet kavramları söyleminde ayrılmaz bir bütünün parçaları olarak öne çıkarken disiplin, otorite ve ırk kavramları üzerinden inşa edilmiştir. Söylemindeki disiplinli ve militarize olmuş millet/devlet anlatısı özellikle faşist düşünce ile kurduğu bağ bakımından önemlidir. Bu bağlamda Türklerin savaşçı özelliklerini tarihi anlatılarla desteklemesi, hayatın kendisini savaş olarak görmesi ve Türkiye'nin sert bir askeri disipline ihtiyacı olduğunu vurgulaması söyleminin öne çıkan unsurlarındadır. Yine faşist düşünceye paralel biçimde ölüm ve savaşın romantikleştirilmesi ve yüceltilmesi söz konusudur. Benzer biçimde lider imajı yüceltilerek milletin gücü/varlığı devlet başkanının gücüne/varlığına dayandırılmıştır. Söyleminde liderin/devlet başkanının Türk

olmasının gerekliliği vurgulanmıştır. Ayrıca lidere otoriter, güçlü ve karizmatik bir imaj atfedilmiştir. Bu yönleriyle Nazizm'in lider imajı ile benzerlik taşıdığı ortaya koyulmuştur.

Söyleminin bir diğer önemli unsuru da reform yanlısı yaklaşımlarıdır. Ülkenin adının Türkeli olarak değiştirilmesinden yanadır. Ayrıca Türk eğitim sisteminin de daha disiplinli bir sistem ile takas edilmesi gerektiğine inanır. Yazdığı dokuz maddelik ulusal kalkınma planıyla da devletin sosyal ve politik bir dönüşümden geçmesi gerektiği fikrini yeniden ortaya koyarken, ekonomik bir kalkınma planı ya da teorik bir yaklaşım geliştirmemiştir. Planın en dikkat çeken maddelerinden biri milliyetçi halkçılık olarak tanımladığı toplumculuk ilkesi olmuştur. İkinci dikkat çekici ilke ise demokrasidir. Demokrasi karşıtı ifadeler Atsız'ın yazılarında pek çok kez yer alırken kalkınma programında demokrasi ilkesine yer veriyor oluşu dönemin politik atmosferiyle ilintili olsa da Atsız'ın programında yer alan demokrasi ilkesinin demokrasinin hakiki anlamıyla hiç bir ilgisi yoktur. Zira demokrasiyi disiplin ve ahlak kavramları üzerinden tanımlamıştır. Burada kritik olan bir diğer nokta Atsız'ın faşizmi ve komünizmi demokrasinin ülkeyi düşmanlara açık hale getirmesi sebebiyle güçlenen ideolojiler olarak görmesidir. Tüm bu değerlendirmeler ışığında Atsız'ın otoriter, anti-demokratik, militarist ve disiplinli bir devlet düzeni tahayyül ettiği ortaya koyulmuştur.

Bu araştırmanın cevap aradığı sorular düşünüldüğünde Atsız'ın faşizme ilişkin görüşlerine değinmek elzemdir. Atsız faşizmi İtalyan milliyetçiliği olarak değerlendirirken Nasyonal Sosyalizmi de Alman milliyetçiliği olarak tanımlamıştır. Atsız'ın düşüncesinde faşist rejimler komünizm tehdidine karşı koruyucu bir unsur olarak meşrulaştırılmış ve idealize edilmiştir. Bu dönemde Atsız ve Türkçü-ırkçı çevreler Alman ırkçılığını ve faşizmi takip etmek ile itham edilmişlerdir. Ona göre Türkçülere yönelik bu ithamların kaynağı komünistlerdir. Atsız'ın bu suçlamalara karşı çıkmasının sebebi Alman ırkçılığının ve faşizmin yabancı ideolojiler olmasıdır. Başka bir deyişle reddettiği şey faşizmin kendisi/tanımı değil, faşizmin yerli bir düşünce sistemi olmamasıydı. Atsız Türkçü bir ideolog olarak tek yerli ideolojinin Türkçülük olduğunu savunurken ırkçı olduğunu hiçbir zaman inkâr

etmemiştir. Nitekim Türkler hariç her milleti hedef alan Türkçü-ırkçı görüşün, yalnızca Yahudileri hedef aldığına inandığı Alman ırkçılığından daha eski olduğunu savunuyordu.

Atsız ırkçılığını ülkeyi yabancı kanlıların/Türk olmayanların ihanetinden korumayı amaçlayan bir gereklilik olarak sunduğu ölçüde söyleminin ana temalarından birini düşman imgesi oluşturmuştur. Milliyetçi düşünceler özleri itibariyle dünyayı biz ve onlar ikiliği üzerinden tanımlama eğilimindedir. Öteki/ötekilik kavramı ile ilgili çeşitli yaklaşımlar olsa da bu tez de öteki imgesi düşman imajı bağlamında ele alınmıştır. Düşman imgelemindeki bu ikilik aynı zamanda komplo zihniyetinin/ teorilerinin de temelini oluşturur. Komplo zihniyeti siyasi ve sosyal olayların arkasında gizli güçler olduğuna inanarak her durumda ötekiyi/azınlığı bütün kötülüklerin sorumlusu olarak görür. Buna ek olarak komplo zihniyetinde Yahudiler, Masonlar ve Komünistler arasında gizli bağlar olduğu ve yabancı güçlerin yararına ortak hareket ettikleri düşüncesi hâkimdir. Böylece komplo teorilerinin ötekinin kimliği, varlığı ve eylemlerine dair ürettiği senaryolar ırkçı düşünün önemli bir parçası haline gelir.

Atsız'ın düşman söylemi ile ilgili öne çıkan olgulardan biri oğluna bıraktığı varlığı tartışmalı vasiyette hemen tüm milletleri düşman olarak ilan etmesidir. Bu vasiyetin gerçekliği/gerçek dışılığı bir kenara bırakılarak, yazılarında Fransızlardan Rumlara pek çok milleti düşman olarak ilan eden ifadelerin vasiyetiyle örtüştüğü ortaya koyulmuştur. Dolayısıyla da Türklerin dışında kalan bütün dünya düşman olarak algılamıştır. Bu tezde Atsız'ın söyleminde öne çıkan Komünist/Moskof, Yahudi, Kürt, ve Çingene imgeleri ayrı başlıklar altında incelenmiştir.

Söyleminin en başat düşman imgesi komünistler/Moskoflardır ve dönemin adeta devlet politikası haline gelen anti-komünizmi ile paralellik içindedir. Komünist imgesi yazılarında ahlaksızlık, hainlik ve kızıllık üzerinden tanımlanmıştır. Ayrıca komünistler gayri Türk olarak değerlendirilmiş ve komünizm tehdidi vurgulanmıştır. Komünist/Moskof düşman imgesi söyleminde çatı imgesi görevi görerek farklı düşman imgeleriyle de iç içe geçmiştir. Bu aynı zamanda Atsız'ın

"gizli" düşmanlara yaptığı vurguyla ve komplo mantığı ile de yakından ilintilidir. Atsız'ın bakış açısına göre bir komünistin Yahudi ya da Kürt olması olağandır.

Yahudi imgesi ahlaksızlık ve materyalizm gibi özellikler üzerinden temellenerek komünist imgesiyle bağ kurmuştur. Yahudileri betimlerken kullanmayı tercih ettiği korkak, sinsi, fırsatçı gibi ifadeler Nazi Almanyası'ndaki ifadelerle benzerlik taşımaktadır. Yahudi imgesi, her ne kadar ilk bakışta muhafazakâr milliyetçi kanatta yoğun biçimde yer alan anti-semitik ifadeler kadar sık kullanılmamış gibi görünse de Dönme, Mason, Devşirme, Türkümsü gibi gizli Yahudi olarak tanımlanan bazı grupların gizli eylem ve amaçlarına dair ifadeler Atsız'ın söyleminde yer bulmuştur. Özellikli bazı kritik mevkilerin Yahudiler ve gizli Yahudiler tarafından ele geçirildiğini ifade ederek bu grupların gizli eylemlerinden ülkeyi koruyabilmek için Yahudilerin Türkleştirilmesine karşı çıkmıştır.

Yahudi imajının aksine Kürtler Türkleşme fırsatını kaçıran örtük bir imaj olarak ele alınmıştır. Şaşırtıcı biçimde yazılarında Kürtlere ilişkin değerlendirmeleri, dönemin Kürt gerçeğini dile getirmeme konusundaki baskıcı devlet politikalarının da bir sonucu olarak, kısıtlıdır. Kürtlere ilişkin radikal ifadeler de kullanan Atsız, Kürtleri millet olarak değil ilkel ve vatansız bir topluluk olarak değerlendirmiş, resmi devlet söylemine paralel olarak Kürt meselesini bir güvenlik sorunu olarak ele almıştır. Kimi yazılarında ise ayrı bir devlet kurma amacı taşıyan Kürtleri hain kızıl Kürtler olarak nitelemiştir. Bu yönüyle Kürtler ve komünist imgesi arasında bağ kurduğu görülmektedir.

Çingene imgesine ilişkin değerlendirmelerinde söyleminde öne çıkan özellikler ahlaksızlık ve Türk ırkının saflığına yönelik tehdit oluşturmasıdır. Bu minvalde Çingenelerin Türkleşmesine de karşı çıkmıştır. Çingeneler ile karışmaktan endişe etme hususundaki ifadeleri Nazi Almanyasının Nürnberg yasalarındaki Çingene karşıtı ilkelerin ardındaki mantık ile benzerlik taşımaktadır.

Bu değerlendirmeler ışığında düşman imgelerinin genel özellikleri ahlaksızlık, yabancılık ve ihanet etme potansiyeli olarak öne çıkmıştır. İmgeler arasında var olduğuna inandığı gizli bağlantılar komplo mantığının da bel kemiğidir. Atsız'ın Yahudi, Moskof, Kürt imgeleri arasında komünizm bağlamında kurduğu ilişki

bunun örneğidir. Söyleminde düşman kimi durumlarda iç içe geçerek tek bir olgu biçimini almıştır. Düşmanın yalnızca ayrı imgeler olarak değil aynı zamanda bir bütün olarak düşünülmesi, imgeler arasındaki geçişliliğin yanı sıra bir belirsizliğin varlığına da işaret etmektedir. Söyleminde düşmanın görünür olması ve gizli kalması bağlamında da bir çelişki söz konusudur. Zizekçi (2008) bir yaklaşımla ifade edilirse ırkçı zihniyette düşman, grup dışındaki varlığı ile komplo teorilerine yol açar. Benzer bir mantık Atsız'ın söyleminde gizli Yahudilere dair anlatısında ortaya çıkar. Türkleşerek asıl kimliğini gizleyen düşman melezliği ile Türklerin üstün özelliklerinin yozlaşmasına sebep olabilir. Söyleminde düşman hem zayıf ve alçak hem de devleti ele geçirme, ihanet etme ve Türk kanının saflığını bozabilme olasılıkları sebebiyle güçlü ve tehlikelidir. Tam da burada Eco'nun (1995) kök faşizminde ele aldığı haliyle faşist mantığın işlediği görülmektedir. Düşman, her türlü kötülüğün müsebbibi olduğu ölçüde, Atsız'ın söyleminde yalnızca varlığına işaret edilen bir olgu olmanın ötesinde aynı zamanda savaşılması ve yok edilmesi gereken bir şeydir.

Faşizm bir ultra milliyetçilik biçimi olarak esas olarak homojen bir toplum oluşturmak için lider mitinin, militarizmin, savaşın, ölümün ve ulusal birliğin yüceltildiği bir ideolojidir ve özellikle Nazizm'de düşman imgeleri kritik bir rol oynar. Faşizmdeki haliyle düşman imgesi, ulusal birliği ve üstün ırkın saflığını melezlikleriyle tehdit eden azınlıklar anlamına geliyordu. Atsız'ın söyleminde özellikle ahlaka ve başka ırklarla karışmanın Türklüğe olan olumsuz etkilerine dair yer alan vurgular Türklüğün kültürel ve ahlaki kodlarını korumanın önemine de dikkat çekmiştir. Türklüğü korumanın yolu ise düşman tehdidine karşı sürekli uyanık olmaktan geçer. Bu aynı zamanda düşman imgesinin ve ırkçı vurgunun kesiştiği noktadır. Başka bir deyişle Atsız'ın söylemindeki ırkçı vurgular ve düşman imgeleri birbirini karşılıklı olarak yeniden üreten ve tamamlayan unsurlardır. Ayrıca söylemindeki düşman imgeleri, faşizmin önemli bileşenlerinden olan yabancı düşmanlığı, ırkçılık ve komplo teorileri ile iç içe geçmiştir. Bu tez Atsız'ın söylemi ile Nazizm arasında düşman imgeleri, anti-komünizm, öjenik ve devlet bağlamında bazı benzerlikler olduğunu göstermiştir. Sonuç olarak, bu tez ırkçılık ve düşman

imgelerinin yanı sıra, Atsız'ın söylemindeki devlet, otorite, demokrasi, militarizm ve disiplin gibi diğer temaların faşist özellikler taşıdığını ortaya koymuştur.

Bugün radikal milliyetçilikler ve ırkçılık dünya siyasetinde etkili olmaya devam ediyor. Popülist sağcı partilerin, otoriterliğin ve ırkçı söylemlerin tüm dünyada ivme kazanıyor oluşu ırkçılık ve faşizmin 20. yüzyılın hayaleti olmaktan çok daha fazlası olduğunun kanıtıdır. Bu nedenle, tıpkı Atsız'ın politik söylemine odaklanan bu çalışmada olduğu gibi faşizmin kaynaklarını incelemek, günümüzün siyasi atmosferini daha iyi anlamak için faydalı olacaktır.

APPENDIX B: THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Social Sciences ■

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı/ Surname: SÜSLÜ

Adı / Name : Hazal Dilay

Bölümü / Department: Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi / Political Science and Public Administration

TEZİN ADI/ TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English) : THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF NİHAL ATSIZ

TEZİN TÜRÜ/ DEGREE**:Yüksek Lisans**/ Master ■ **Doktora** / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /**Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ■
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.**/ Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years. *** ☐
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. ***** ☐

Yazarın imzası / Signature **Tarih**/ Date