

TÜRKLEŞMEK
İSLÂMLAŞMAK
MUASIRLAŞMAK



ZİYA GÖKALP



TOKER YAYINLARI

ZİYA GÖKALP

**TURKIFICATION,
ISLAMISATION,
MODERNISATION**

6TH EDITION

Simplified by
YALÇIN TOKER

TOKER "GENERAL SERIES" No: 211

"FROM EAST TO WEST

SERIES OF SESSIONS" No. 15

TOKER PUBLICATIONS

Cennet Mahallesi, Yavuz Selim Cad. 25

K. Çekmece - ISTANBUL Tel:

212 601 00 35

e-mail: tokeryayinlari@tokeryayinlari.com

Ministry of Culture Certificate No. 27421

ISBN - 978-975-445-005-7

o Typesetting : Toker

o Printing : Önde Printing

o Volume: Vebsan

o Istanbul - 2013

FROM THE PUBLISHER

Ziya Gökalp is the founder of modern Turkism.

For this reason, Turkish youth need the works of Ziya Gökalp in order to fully comprehend and learn Turkism.

We all know that the founder of the Republic, the great Atatürk, made the ideas of our great thinker his guide by saying "*If the FATHER of my flesh and bone is Ali RİZA Efendi, the FATHER of my idea is Ziya Gökalp*".

In that case, it should be our duty to teach today's youth these ideas that their ancestor guided them.

Most of the articles written by Ziya Gökalp in newspapers and magazines have been published as books. But unfortunately, the language used by the author at that time, although simple for the period in which they were written, is not easily comprehensible to today's youth. Some of the publishers of Gökalp's books still preserve the language he used years ago, while others try to simplify it and turn it into incomprehensible gibberish. For this reason, Turkish youth cannot benefit from these works, which are stuck between the extremes and the extremes, as they should.

For this reason, I have simplified all of Ziya Gökalp's works in a language that everyone can understand. I believe that I have done a great nationalist and cultural service by doing this. The way I have simplified the books has been to use the words known and used by the people. Whether the word is of Turkish origin, or whether it has entered our language from Arabic or Persian... As long as it is a word that everyone uses and knows its meaning, I thought.

The aim is to reflect Ziya Gökalp's ideas in the most appropriate way. If I need to give a few examples to what I said ,

I used the words "**language**" instead of "**lisan**", "**proverb**" instead of "**darb-ı mesel**", "**proverb**" instead of "**darb-ı mesel**", "**lineage**" instead of "**generation**". Sometimes I gave the meaning in parentheses next to the old word; as in the example of "**custom**" (*custom-custom, tradition*).

Sometimes I used both "**mefkûre**" and its equivalent "**ideal**", both "**hars**" and "**culture**", because I thought that these words should be learnt and not thrown away.

I have followed this path in the 10 works of Ziya Gökalp that I have simplified. I recommend these works to Turkish youth with confidence.

Yalçın Toker

- I - THREE CURRENTS

There are three intellectual movements in our country. If the history of these currents is analysed, it is seen that our thinkers first felt the need **to be modernised**⁽¹⁾.

This tendency, which started during the reign of **Sultan Selim III**⁽²⁾, was joined by the aim of **Islamisation** after the Revolution (*2nd Constitutional Monarchy*). More recently, the **Turkism** movement emerged.

Since the idea of modernisation is considered as a fundamental rule by thinkers, it does not have a specific disseminator. Every magazine, every newspaper is more or less a defender of this idea.

The disseminators and defenders of the idea of Islamisation are the magazines "**Sırat-ı Müstakim**"⁽³⁾ and **Sebil-ür Reşat**⁽⁴⁾.

The magazine that spread the idea of **Turkification** was **Türk Yurdu**⁽⁵⁾. If we pay attention, we can see that these three movements were born out of the same need.

Tarde⁽⁶⁾ argues that the idea of nationality begins with the newspaper and explains this idea as follows:

"The newspaper forms THE people, which gathers together PEOPLE who speak the SAME language and gives them a common conscience. APART from this unconscious effect, the newspaper, in order to ensure its circulation, is obliged to caress the FEELINGS of pride and patriotism of its READERS, to write words that REVIVE THEIR national traditions and proud national MEMORIES."

Once the feeling of nationality is awakened in a tribe, it easily spreads to neighbouring tribes. Because as soon as the feeling of nationality is awakened, it increases the feelings of solidarity, sacrifice and struggle in its owners and prepares their progress in the fields of morality, language, literature, economy and politics.

In neighbouring tribes that envy and covet this situation - if they have newspapers written in the people's language - the rapid spread of the feeling of nationality will be a very normal situation.

The Idea of Nationality (*ideal, ideal*) emerged first among non-Muslims, then among Albanians and Arabs, and finally among Turks. It is not without reason that the Turks came last. Because the Ottoman Empire was founded by Turks.

The state is the essence of an existing nation (*nation de fait*), and **the sense of nationality is the essence of the nation that is desired to exist** (*nation de volonté*). The Turks, with a cautious *intuitive* behaviour that thinks ahead,

They were afraid of jeopardising an existence for a cause.

That's why Turkish thinkers said, "***There is no Turkishness, there is Ottomanness.***"

They called it "modernisation".

While spreading the ideas of the Tanzimat, **those who adhered to the modernisation movement had** come to the belief that it was possible to create the **nation that was to be created from the existing nation** consisting of various elements and sects, and with this belief, they had attached a new meaning to the old word **Ottoman**, which was completely separate from the national colours. Bitter experiments have shown that this new meaning attached to the word Ottoman was adopted by none other than the pro-Tanzimat Turks.

The introduction of this new meaning was not only useless, but had very harmful consequences for the State and **its elements**⁽⁷⁾ and especially for the Turks.

Both the east and the west of the world clearly show us that this century **is the century of nationalism.**

Therefore, it is the most influential force on the consciences of the century, **is the ideal of nationality.**

A State, which is charged with the management of social consciences, cannot fulfil its duty if it ignores this important social factor.

If statesmen and party leaders do not have this feeling, it is not possible to govern the religious communities and various tribes that make up the Ottoman Empire in a spiritual (psychological) way.

An experiment of four years has shown us that the Turk, who had to say "***I am not a Turk, I am an Ottoman***" only for the purpose of fusing the elements with each other, has at last realised very painfully what kind of compromise the elements can say "yes" to.

A country dominated by a sense of nationality can only be governed by those who feel the taste of nationality in their very being. The Turks' abstention from the ideal of nationality was not only harmful for the state and disturbing for the elements, but also dangerous for the existence of Turkishness. Since the Turks perceived nationality in the same sense as the State, which means the existing nation, they did not realise that their social and economic existence was degenerating. As social and economic sovereignty passed into the hands of other elements living in the country, the Turks did not even realise that they were losing something. They did not attach any importance to the fact that they themselves were excluded from certain classes, even if they constituted the most important social strata of our time.

They considered the existence of the classes directing the economic and technical life in the country sufficient and did not consider it a danger for them to be excluded from these classes.

Because of this trend, there was no Turkishness left even in Anatolia, not even in the form of the people or the local population. Turks were found only in the classes of *civil servants* and *labourers*⁽⁸⁾. Since being a civil servant meant this kind of *INTELLECTUAL labourer*, Turkishness came to mean labourer in its social meaning. Since *farmers and shepherds* live by utilising the creative power of life, they are not themselves creative agents. Sheep multiply by the force of nature itself. Crops flourish by the God-given power hidden in the seeds.

Civil servants, on the other hand, have nothing to do with production. On the other hand, the development and evolution of mental faculties, willpower and character is brought about by work such as industry and building, commerce and self-employment. Therefore, to attempt to establish a State organisation from a people consisting of peasant and civil servant classes would be to take power away from them.

would mean eliminating the government. Because merchants, artisans and businessmen want the government to be strong only for their own benefit.

In any country where the government is based on the class of civil servants, the government is always weak, because the civil servants who are dismissed from their jobs always try to put the government in a difficult situation and bring it down in order to get back to work, and the civil servants who are in office always try to rise.

The absence of a national ideal has deprived the Turks of a national economy and has always prevented the simplification of their language and the emergence of national styles in fine arts. In addition to these, due to the absence of a national ideal, Turkish morality has remained dependent on the individual and the family. Emotions such as social solidarity, national honour and sacrifice have not gone beyond family, village and town circles. Since the Ummah ethos was too broad and the family ethos too narrow, the Turkish spirit remained alien to a strong and vital moral vision that would be the basis for the feelings of sacrifice and renunciation of self-interest.

The dissolution of our national institutions in the economic, religious and political fields is the result of this situation.

The Turkism movement, far from being the opposite of Ottomanism, is in fact its strongest supporter. However, as in every new movement, the Turkism movement also has its extremists consisting of a number of young people, who cause some misinterpretations. In fact, Turkishness is the real basis of Islam and Ottomanism against **cosmopolitanism**⁽⁹⁾.

Tarde, who explained that the idea of nationality begins with the newspaper, says that the "*feeling of unity among NATIONS*" is born from the "*book*". The newspaper uses the living words of the spoken language as it addresses the feelings of the people. The book, on the other hand, addresses the unique ideals of scholars and those who do science. For this reason, it needs scientific terms rather than spoken language.

It is a general rule that terms should not be made from words used in the colloquial language. Because words are just like living and natural beings. Terms, on the other hand, are *artificial (artificial)* and inanimate beings.

Since the *natural* words of the folk language carry living and emotional meanings, they do not accept and reject fabricated and abstract meanings.

For this reason, every tribe takes its terms from the language in which the book of religion was written. Since the European nations found the **Bible written in the** Greek language, they took the terms of science from Greek. Later, since the Latin language helped the Greek language in terms of Christianity, many terms from Latin passed into the languages of the Germanic and Slavic nations.

The Islamic tribes, on the other hand, generally took their terms from Arabic and some from Persian.

Even today, while transferring all the sciences of the century to our language, we use Arabic and Persian terms instead of Greek and Latin terms.

In a nation, religious books are written first. Then, as branches such as ethics, law, literature, science and philosophy become independent from religion, books belonging to them begin to be written.

Therefore, just as the newspaper gives birth to the ideal of nationality because it depicts the social and local feelings of the people in daily and emotional colours⁽¹⁰⁾, the book, by writing in an abstract and precise style the principles, rules and principles of religion and the branches of culture and sciences arising from religion, in other words, *of civilisation (CIVILISATION)*, creates a common life among nations, in other words, the spirit of unity among nations.

In the early times, it is a mistake to think that the sense of unity among nations existed in all people. For example, in the Middle Ages, there was a sense of unity among nations in Europe. However, if we analyse this feeling, we see that international aid and protection in Europe was directed exclusively towards Christian nations and international law was used as a tool for the privileged rights of Christian states.

The Balkan War showed that even today the European conscience is nothing but a Christian conscience. If the consciences of Turks are analysed, it will be seen that a Turk may marry his daughter to an Arab, an Albanian, a Kurd, a Circassian, but certainly not to a Finn or a Christian Hungarian. A Buddhist

He cannot take the daughter of a Mongol or a Tunguz of Shamanic religion without converting to Islam.

It was not Hungarians, Mongols and Manchus who participated in the disasters of the Turks during the Tripoli and Balkan Wars.

On the contrary, in those days, the Muslim tribes of China, India, Java, Sudan, whose names we do not even know, shared our pain and did not withhold their spiritual help. For this reason, although Turks belong to the Ural and Altai branch in terms of language, they consider themselves in the community of Islamic nations.

According to the science of *anthropology* (*anthropology*), people with the same *anatomical structure* (*body STRUCTURE*) are a race, and according to the science of *sociology* (*sociology*), nations within the same civilisation are an *international* (*INTER-NATIONAL*) unity.

The Turkish language, like the Turkish tribe, *became Islamic with its letters and terms* after entering the Islamic civilisation.

Therefore, what constitutes the spirit of international unity is the book and therefore civilisation. Therefore, there has never been any conflict between Turkishness and Islam, since one is a "*nationality*" and the other is an "*international unity*".

Turkish thinkers did not feel the need to **Islamise** when they did not care about Turkishness and envisaged an interfaith **Ottomanism**. However, as soon as **the idea of Turkification** was born, the need for Islamisation was felt. However, just as **nationality** was born from a "*newspaper*" and **international unity** from a "*book*", **modernity** (*modernism*) was born from an "*instrument*" (*outil*).

The contemporaries of a unit of time are those who can make and use all the instruments made and used by the most advanced nations in terms of *science* (*technique*) in that unit of time.

For us today, modernisation means being able to build and use armour, automobiles and planes like Europeans.

To *MODERNISE* does not mean to resemble Europeans in terms of form and life. When knowledge and

If we get rid of the obligation to buy industrial goods from Europe, then we will realise that we have become modernised.

We have already said that there is no conflict between our ideals of **Turkification** and **Islamisation**. There is no conflict between them and the ideal of modernisation.

The need **to be modern** orders us to transfer only scientific and practical instruments and techniques from Europe. In Europe, there are certain spiritual needs arising from religion and nation, which should be researched from these sources in our country, and these, like instruments and techniques, do not need to be transferred from the West.

Therefore, we should recognise all three of these needs by defining the limits of the spheres of influence of each of them. More precisely, we should create *a "Contemporary Islamic Turkism"* by realising that these are the forms of one need from three different points of view.

However, modern civilisation, which has been emerging for some time as a result of the development of new tools and technology, is creating a new international unity based on positive sciences. In our age, international unions based on religion are giving way to real international unions based on science.

Since the accession of Japan on the one hand and Turkey on the other to the European Union has given the European Union of Nations *a "non-religious"* character, as we shall show in the future, the spirit of international unity and the boundary of the community of nations are gradually being separated from each other. In other words, today the Turkish nation is a tribe belonging to the Ural-Altaic family, the Islamic Ummah and the European Union of Nations.

1 **Modernisation:** To modernise, to adapt to the age. To modernise.

2 **Sultan Selim III:** 28th Ottoman Sultan. He was a reformist Sultan. He stayed on the throne between 1789-1807. He was deposed at the end of the Kabakçı rebellion by the Janissaries after he established a modern army called *Nizam-ı Cedid*.

3 **Sırat-ı Müstakim:** Published by **Eşref Edib** and edited by **Mehmet Akif**, Sırat-ı Müstakim was the most powerful Islamist magazine of World War I and the War of Independence. The majority of the magazine's readers were in Turkish countries such as Azerbaijan, Crimea and West Turkistan.

4 **Sebil-ür Reşat:** It is a magazine published by the staff of Sırat-ı Müstakim, which was organised by the staff of Sırat-ı Müstakim, which was committed to the principle of Islamism, in order to continue and keep the same ideas alive, and which had an effect as a moral force especially in our War of Independence.

5 **Türk Yurdu:** The magazine, which was started to be published in 1911 and still continues to be published today in order to spread the principles of the Turkish Hearths, which were established with the aim of awakening the consciousness of Turkishness, spreading and adopting the idea of Turkish Nationalism and keeping Turkish cultural values alive. For many years, Türk Yurdu magazine was directed by **Yusuf Akçura**.

6 **Tarde** A famous French sociologist. His works include *LAWS of Imitation and Philosophy of Punishment*.

7 **Element:** The population of the Ottoman Empire consisted of people belonging to various nationalities, speaking different languages and belonging to different religions and sects. It was the principle of the State to unite these elements (*national COMMUNITIES*), regardless of whether they were Arab, Persian, Greek, Armenian, Serbian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Albanian, around the axis **of national unity**, within the Ottoman Empire. (**İttihad-ı Anâsır**)

8 **Rençber:** Labourer, worker, peasant. *Renc:* TROUBLE+ *ber:* suffering= suffering, doing very hard labour.

9 **Cosmopolitan:** Including people of various nationalities. Ottoman society was a cosmopolitan society consisting of people of various nationalities.

10 **To depict:** To describe in words, as if painting a picture.

- II - LANGUAGE

Just as objects have length, width and height, **social conscience** (*consciousness*) has three dimensions: **Nationalism, Ummahism, Modernity.**

To what extent this judgement is true, we will first look at language, which is one of the mirrors reflecting social consciousness.

Our language has been on the path of expansion for fifty-sixty years. As the significant innovations of our century come to our country, our eyes continue to see new things, our minds continue to see new concepts.

Since these concepts cannot remain nameless, new words are introduced into our language every day in response to these concepts and thus our language is enriched.

We translate the newspapers and books of the nations that are the representatives of the century. Thus, many meanings that are not found in our cultural and scientific life are waiting for our intellectuals to find and extract new words.

As our language encounters with developed languages, it begins to imitate them word by word. Sometimes, as in the case of the words *hurdebin* (*microscope*), *binoculars* (*telescope*), *şehkâ* (*masterpiece*), *chef d'oeuvres* (*chef d'oeuvres*), *mefkûre* (*idéal*), word-for-word copies are made. Sometimes, imitations are made in terms of meaning, as in the words "aeroplane" (*aéroplaine*), "evolution" (*évolution*), "constitution" (*constitution*), "beauty" (*esthétique*).

This tendency in our language shows us the following:

There will come a time when our Turkish will have the equivalents of all the words of French, English and German.

Since the name given to an object serves to describe its essence, in other words, since the spoken word expresses the soul of the speaker,

There is a language that expresses the concepts of our century, and every language has to conform to it. Since this is the case, Turkish will have completed its work.

New words entering our language are of three types:

1. *FOREIGN words.*
2. *Words made or taken from Arabic or Persian*⁽¹¹⁾.
3. *Words derived from Turkish or Turkishised.*

The first kind of words enter our language illegally. Our understanding of language requires that these words should be removed from our language and replaced with Arabic and Persian equivalents if they are "*terms*" and with Turkish equivalents if they are normal words.

The feature of not adopting foreign words by making the equivalents of terms from Arabic and Persian does not belong only to Turkish. This feature is common in the languages of all Islamic countries.

These languages, which are actually united in religious terms and terms of other sciences derived from religion, have to maintain their unity with new terms. Because, for example, if the Turks in Russia take their terms from Russian, the Turks in China from Chinese, and we, the Turks of Turkey, from French, our Turkish language will drift away from each other in time. On the contrary, if we all take our terms from Arabic, Persian or Turkish, that is, from a single place, we will come closer to each other.

Christian nations, on the other hand, have taken their terms from Greek and Latin.

Islamic languages are afraid of losing their "**ummah**" characteristic by taking these terms exactly as they are. There is no rule, however, that Islamic languages fulfil their duty of "**unity of the ummah**" by borrowing terms from Arabic and Persian.

If these terms are derived from different roots in each language, "**ummahism in language**" will be incomplete, since the unity that should exist will not be achieved. For this reason, it is necessary for us to search for the words that other Islamic languages have accepted or can accept, and to come up with terms. In order to achieve this , the Islamic ummah

Religious associations should be formed in each language, which are in charge of making terms, and these associations should convene "**term congresses**" at certain times to review the situation.

After all the terms of Islamic languages have reached a unity through these congresses, the development of our language in the direction of the ummah will be considered complete, in other words, "**Islamisation of the language**" will have been realised.

After our language has a "*Dictionary of Terms*", which is the general language of the Islamic Ummah, it will try to avoid Arabic and Persian. Because Arabic and Persian words entering Turkish are not terms. Many Arabic and Persian words have entered our language unnecessarily. So much so that the influence of these two languages on Turkish is not limited to giving words. Arabic and Persian phrases, prepositions and suffixes have also entered Turkish, and the rules of the Turkish language have become confused.

It is necessary **to modernise** our language in terms of meaning, to **Islamise** it in terms of terminology and to **Turkishise it** in grammar and spelling.

All words in Turkish, EXCEPT for terms, SHOULD BE Turkish or Turkishised if possible.

Arabic and Persian *phrases, plurals, prepositions, verb conjugations* should be **ELIMINATED** from our language, "**new poets**" instead of "*SHARAYI cedide*", "**Turkish Literature**" instead of "*Edebiyat-ı Türkiyye*", Instead of "**tâbiyet**" we should say "**tâbi'lik**", instead of "*serbestî*" we should say "*serbestlik*", instead of "*muciz bir muharrir*" we should say "**icazcı muharrir**" (*an original writer*), instead of "**mûciz bir ifadede**" we should say "*ICAZCI, an original expression*".

However, it is not correct to limit the Turkishisation only to words. If possible, we should make all scientific terms from Turkish words. But if this is not possible, it would be more appropriate for our terms to be in Arabic and Persian instead of French or Russian.

It is necessary that terms, like words, should be common among all Turks, if not among all Muslims, i.e. that all Turks should have a common language of literature and science.

Therefore, while Turkicising our language, we should not forget that we should gradually move towards a common Turkish language that all our cognates can understand.

To summarise our thoughts:

"New concepts" of the century, **"scientific terms"** of the ummah, **"words"**, on the other hand, is related to the nation's ability to speak properly.

Unless Turkish is a sensitive mirror of the social conscience (*consciousness*) that is completely suitable for these three stages of development, it cannot be considered a developed, or rather a completed language.

[11](#) **Persian:** Persian, the language of the Iranians.

- III - TRADITION AND RULE

Whichever aspect of our social life we look at, we see two currents clashing:

One of them is **punitiveness** (*belonging to the root, radicalisation, radicalism*) and the other is **conservatism** (*conservatism*).

These two currents, which are considered to be the exact opposites of each other, are in fact united on the same basis: **prescriptivism**.

Conservatives regard the rules in force as unchangeable truths and regard any change in them as blasphemy. *The radicals*, on the other hand, accept rational rules as immutable laws and accuse those who do not accept them of backwardness.

Neither of these two classes sees the need to search where these old or new rules originated, how they developed, and how they were later adapted to incompatible environments. This is because, for both sides, the rule is a "*kaim binnefs*" (*self-existent*) outside of time and place (*environment*). It is not a temporary and interdependent stage of the developments in the life of a society, but a rule with an unpredictable beginning and an unpredictable end, which is a realm independent of time and environment.

The elderly are generally conservative, since the observance of rules is habitual over and over again. Young people, on the other hand, are eager to imitate the advanced nations, whose civilisation is shining, because they attribute their progress to the correctness of the rules they follow. For this reason, young people join the ranks of radical revolutionaries.

Whether they are called *customs* or fashions, manners or labels, beliefs or **jurisprudence**⁽¹²⁾, articles of **fiqh**⁽¹³⁾ or laws of law, **the rule is** always the same.

is a thing. If development is not regarded as a discontinuous and unstable stopping point, but as something frozen and unchanging, it becomes a lifeless skeleton.

The essence of life is creative development. Non-developmental beings are inanimate. Prescriptivists confuse the cause with the effect and substitute the effect for the cause. The rule is a temporary result of development. They think it is the cause of development. Since the cause is clear, they no longer see the need to analyse the history of development.

Those with this mentality see the rule as the supreme ruler, and when they realise that no benefit can be obtained from its application, they put all the responsibility on the poor rule.

The radicals, on the other hand, immediately raise their voices and force the conservatives to keep silent. In this situation, the task is very easy. Abolish the old rules and replace them with new ones. However, the reign of these rules does not last long, because in practice again setbacks begin to appear. This time, those in favour of habit raise their heads. They call the imitators to withdraw from the centre.

This has always been the case with us. If the history of Turkishness is analysed;

It will be seen that we have lived through many periods of history that are not similar to each other. Our institutions have resembled the treasuries of the invading states, which were suddenly filled with the spoils of victory, but which were doomed to be emptied again suddenly because they did not derive their source from the national economy; and instead of making our new institutions, which were born as a result of development, into living traditions by establishing their historical ties, we have thrown them aside and copied institutions such as *"traditions and rules without history"* from every country.

The British nation is a nation without rules. But its historical ties and forward-looking entrepreneurial traditions are characteristic of this nation. It is this traditionalism that has enabled the British to progress.

We, the Turks, are a nation of rules, but not of traditions. We do not seek the historical sequence and characteristics of our Turkish and Islamic traditions, nor do we feel the need to investigate the sources and developments of the advances that have marked our century. Because we only need results.

After the successive ups and downs of Turkishness and Islam, European civilisation, which had left us some sediments **of scientific and religious rules**, appeared as scientific and practical rules after some of our revolutions.

Some of us use those sediments, others plunder those rules. Whether the rule is established by habit or imitation, it lacks the characteristic of creativity and development. Because intermittent imitations cannot be all together, and they have no history. Rules, each of which is an independent and absolute realm, remain where they are and cannot create a future.

Tradition, on the other hand, means creative and progressive. Because tradition has a past that has fused various times together and a historical current that pushes it forward like a moving force from behind. This means that new developments and new orientations are constantly being created.

Tradition is creative and productive in its own right, but the foreign innovations infused into it are also revitalised by the water of life in its veins and do not decay and fall as in the case of simple imitation.

Bergson⁽¹⁴⁾ defines the soul as "*the totality of one's memories*" and the body as "*the totality of their habits*".

A nation's memories are its traditions. Its habits are its rules. That is to say, traditions constitute the soul of a nation and rules constitute its body. A nation that adheres to its traditions looks for its fulcrum in its soul, while a nation that follows rules looks for it in its body. The first shows the meanings of life, the second its words. The former lives in historical freedom, the latter in geographical captivity.

When we fought the Bulgarians in the Balkan War, they fought with the strength and direction of their fiery traditions and we fought with the strength and direction of our dull rules. As a result, history triumphed over geography. (*In other words, traditions triumphed over rules, and the Bulgarians triumphed over the Turks.*)

In other words, both the paths of conservatism and the path of innovation that we have been travelling so far were dead ends. Our new life **m u s t** avoid both of these. First of all, first of all, the Turkishness

We must study the traditions and development history of our institutions. Turkish literature begins neither with **Aşık Pasha** nor with **Nevaî (Ali Şir Nevaî)**.

We should look for the sources of our literature on the one hand in stone inscriptions (**Orkhon Monuments**) and gazelle skins, and on the other hand in the folk songs and epics.

Our national metre is **the finger metre (i.e. syllabic metre)**. Our national language is the only one based on Turkish grammar.

Our national literature should draw its subjects and sources from Turkish life, Turkish social structure, Turkish *legends (mythology)* and Turkish lore.

We must eliminate foreign phrases from our language, **foreign metres (aruz metre)** from our poetry and foreign arts from our literature. If we start our language and literature from the first point of its tradition, we will realise that the temporary occupations they have suffered are short periods of illness.

We must also revive the history of Turkish law by unearthing *the "derivatives", "laws" and "statutes"*.

Even if Turkish architecture and Turkish painting are to be sought in the buildings and artefacts of the *"ummah period" (OTTOMAN period)*, Turkish music, like our national poetry and literature, must be researched only in the oral traditions and memory of the people.

Turkishness has a vision, the traces of which remain in words, proverbs, idioms, tales and epics. It is our greatest duty to find and unearth this horizon among the scattered debris and to discover our prehistoric national values hidden in it.

Secondly, we must study thoroughly the traditions and history of our Muslim institutions. We must know the history of **theology (the science of God and religion)**, **Sufism** and **fiqh (religious law)**.

If we learn how these institutions developed, only then can we recognise the progress they will make in our century and in the future.

Tradition not only provides a connection and harmony between the forms of an institution at various times. It links them all together by showing how all these institutions have emerged from the same root.

According to Durkheim, institutions such as morality, law, politics, logic, art and economy all originated from religion. By taking their roots from a religious source, these branches attain a lively productivity and a strong vitality⁽¹⁵⁾.

Since tradition is a unifier and a provider of social harmony, it can create a Turkish-Islamic Philosophy of History by fusing the essence of Turkish history and religion.

Thirdly, in order to benefit from the technical knowledge, science, methods and philosophy of the century, we must investigate the history of their development and their adaptation to time and society.

The history of civilisation shows us that when industry begins to develop in a country, sciences and techniques also develop.

Science (*technique*) is born from industry.

Industry: It deals with management and direction. In our country, science education is considered as a goal, not a means. Our science scholars only know how to talk about science, they do not know how to apply science. In other words, we have neither science nor science scholars in the true sense of the word.

As science is born from technique, philosophy is born from method.

Philosophy: Philosophers are not people who combine and organise the facts found by others. Real philosophers are those who search for the truth, those who know the method of searching for the truth and those who can apply it.

Today, philosophy cannot be seen as a collection of newly discovered knowledge. Philosophy is the methodology that constantly reveals and corrects this knowledge. Again, it is understood that we have neither philosophy nor philosophers in the true sense of the word.

Therefore, on the one hand, we should endeavour to be a nation that is loyal to its history and traditions, and on the other hand, we should endeavour to create applied sciences based on industry and to create philosophies that take their direction from scientific methods.

If we infuse the sciences, philosophy, technology and methods of the century into our national and religious traditions in the way we have explained and fuse them with each other, we can create **a modern Turkish Islamic civilisation.**

It is when we attain this promised homeland, which the people's spirit seeks as **the Red Apple**, that we will be free in the true sense of the word in terms of slavery and independent in terms of civilisation.

[12](#) **Ijtihad:** Legal opinion, legal interpretation.

[13](#) **Fiqh:** Law based on religion. The rules and judgements of this law.

[14](#) **Bergson** French philosopher (1859-1941). In his philosophy, he argues that the human soul has a structure separate from matter. He explains the phenomena of "consciousness and freedom" in an immaterial way.

[15](#) **Durkheim:** French sociologist (1858-1917). He is one of the scholars who influenced **Ziya Gökalp** the most. In his works, he mostly focused on *morality and spiritual values*. According to him, social events exist objectively, outside the individual.

- IV - HARS (*CULTURE*) SOCIETY, CIVILISED SOCIETY

The reason why sociological researchers come to conflicting conclusions is that some of them look for social life *in the society of culture*, while others look *for it in the society of civilisation*.

This difference of opinion first emerged in the definition of social events. Tarde defines social EVENTS as "*personal phenomena generalised through imitation*".

Durkheim says: "*An event is not a social event just because it is generalised through imitation. Perhaps it is generalised by imitation because it is in fact a social phenomenon.*" Durkheim opposes Tarde's ideas.

According to Durkheim, *personal events* are needs such as "*being HUNGRY, thirsty, sleeping*" which manifest themselves with an inner pressure, that is to say, with an inner pressure. *Social events*, on the other hand, **are concepts** such as "*religious BELIEFS*", "*moral duties*", "*RULES of law*", "*political and social ideals*" **which manifest themselves through an external pressure on** the souls of individuals.

These definitions show that Durkheim looked for social life in cultural societies and Tarde in civilised societies.

If we pay attention, we can see that both the *needs* mentioned above and the *senses* such as *hearing, smelling, tasting and hearing*, which are called *personal events*, are events specific to life and the human species. *It is not correct to call them personal events.*

As for the events that fall outside of these and are called **social events**, they can be divided into two categories: the concepts of *the soul* (*personal, subjective*) and the concepts of *the thing* (*objective, objective*).

Beliefs, ethical duties, forms of beauty, and all ideas that have a subjective character are the beliefs of a culture (hars) community.

Objective scientific facts, rules pertaining to health, economy and public works, tools of agriculture and trade, and all concepts of mathematics and logic are the views of a civilised society.

The external pressure exerted on the souls of individuals by the designs of a cultural society is called **sanction** (*sanction-sanction*), and the external compatibility to which the concepts of civilised societies are subjected is called **objectivity** (*thingiyyet, objectivity*).

When we do not follow the rules of health, we become ill. This disease is the natural result of disobeying the laws of life.

When we neglect the laws of economy, we fall into material distress and hardship. This result is also a necessary consequence of not obeying the laws of economy.

When we do not obey the rules of religion, ethics, aesthetics and national ideals, the moral penalties that the courts of conscience or the consciences of the courts of conscience may impose on us, or the penalties that social taste may impose on us in the form of "*ridicule*" or "*laughter*" are not a natural and necessary consequence of this non-compliance.

These punishments are the result of the above-mentioned rules being recognised as "*valuable*" in the conscience of the cultural society, and therefore being "*SANCTIONING*".

Cultural events have created in individuals **the faculty of conscience**⁽¹⁶⁾ (*faculty of consciousness*) in charge of evaluating and classifying **constructive** notions (*concepts related to wishes*), i.e. values, and civilisational events have created the faculty of reason (*faculty*) in charge of investigating and combining facts, i.e. notions *related to reporting*.

The "person in the nation" is obliged to consider the wishes of the social conscience as valuable ideals and to turn them into laws that must be obeyed, whereas *the "person in civilisation"* is obliged to think them within the logic of the social mind.

The scientific concepts, technical instruments and economic products of a civilisation pass from one people to another through imitation and exchange. In this way, a civilised society first appears in a regional form, but gradually it spreads to countries, continents and finally to whole countries.

embraces humanity. At this point, however, both **Tarde** and sociologists such as **Karl Marx** and **Edmond Demolins**, who favour "**Historical Materialism**" ⁽¹⁷⁾, are right.

If humanity were a community of civilisation consisting only of individuals, it might be correct to attribute the generalisation of events only to imitation and to value only technique and tools in social life. However, humanity is not a community of civilisation consisting only of individuals.

Individuals have been moulded in many cultural societies such as "*family*", "*tribe*", "*nahiye*" (*district-commune*), "*hearth*" (*corporation*), "*CLASS*", "*religious community*", "*tribe*", "*ummah*", "*state*" and eventually lost their characteristics of being a person.

If we liken social events to material ones, we can say the following:

The gathering together of people, who are considered to be parts of the society, is not only in the form of a mixture based on rules, but, as in chemical combinations, the individuals who are part of the society are turned into combined molecules, and these molecules and their combined state remain in the middle.

In the meantime, the fact that organisms of various shapes and characteristics are formed from cells and that their existence depends on these social beings can be explained in this way.

Because social conventions or institutions prevent people from freely associating, the imitation and exchanges required by civilised society cannot continue without interruption.

States, in order to protect and develop their own industries, impose high customs duties to prevent free foreign trade and commerce.

Tribes, in order to preserve the purity of their national languages, try not to introduce foreign words into their languages, and in order to nationalise their literature, they abandon the international "*classical literature*" and take their themes and principles from folk literature.

The nations, considering their religion as the basis for international law and morality - as Europe has always done, especially after the Balkan War

they recognise the rights of sanctity and inviolability belonging to humanity only to their own co-religionists.

By establishing special relationships such as "*wife AND husband*", "*mother AND father*", "*sonship AND brotherhood*", the **family** gives the appearance of a community that has formed a complete unity in terms of ownership and coexistence.

A **tribe (clan)** is a community of shepherds, a **district** is a village or town, a **hearth** is a group of people from one art, a **corporation** is a group of colleagues from one profession, a **congregation** is a group of people from the same sect in a region, a family united against outsiders.

The individual lives in the society of civilisation in the state resulting from the conscience of each of these communities. **Durkheim** was recognised as the most influential sociologist because he considered communities as natural parts of the social structure.

Communal consciences, which are of a cultural nature, are in a constant state of conflict with the reason and logic belonging to society. The individual cannot think logically because he is captive to his conscience from time to time. At other times, because he gives too much authority to his reason, he suffocates the feelings of his conscience.

This conflict between conscience and reason, or between *culture (hars)* and civilisation, is not an unavoidable necessity. For *the duty of CONSCIENCE is to evaluate the VALUES that have social appeal, while the duty of REASON is to scrutinise the objective facts about THINGS.*

The first (*i.e. conscience*) answers the question "*Why live?*" with "*For a goal and an ideal*".

The second (*i.e. reason*) answers our question "*HOW SHOULD we live?*" with "*In accordance with reason*".

Conscience directs our will with its *constructive* judgements. **Reason**, on the other hand, enables us to be cautious with its judgements of *denunciation (related to notification)*. In short, conscience shows us the ends, reason the means (*i.e. conscience the ENDS, REASON the MEANS to ACHIEVE them*).

According to **Edmond Demolins**, the aim of education and politics is to change pro-cultural individuals into pro-civilisation individuals.

Because he, **the Anglo-Saxons** (18) their development He attributes the decline of the eastern nations to *their individualism (civilisationalism, as we call it)*.

On the other hand, he attributes the decline of the Eastern nations to their collectivist, communitarian (*in our terms, culturalist*) nature. However, it cannot be scientific to attribute the backwardness and development of nations to a single cause.

Furthermore, the claim that Anglo-Saxons are not communitarian but individualistic is also not true. Although Anglo-Saxons are not statist like us. However, a cultural society is not an institution consisting only of the state.

In England, the effectiveness and power of local administrations, national sectarian organisations and nobility organisations, which are cultural communities, are greater than in many other countries. The fact that the Anglo-Saxons are a traditionalist society is also a proof that they are culturalists. However, despite its strength and solidity, cultural life there has not been able to prevent the development of civilised life.

Not only can there be *an unnatural war BETWEEN culture and civilisation*, but there can also be unhealthy divisions between the consciences of various groups within a cultural society. For example, in some cases, excessive fondness for family loyalty may even weaken national unity. In other cases, excessive devotion to religion may lead to the destruction of national unity.

Sometimes they try to destroy the feeling of nationality, common homeland and state. In Europe, this situation gives rise to classism, patriotism, and enmity against soldiers, which are considered unhealthy for social life.

The task of sociology is to transform these unnatural war situations into social peace. For example, when necessary, the family should be able to sacrifice itself for the sake of its craft, and the craft should be able to sacrifice itself for the sake of the state. Likewise, the family and the state should value the religious and linguistic communities within the society, and the nation, which should be superior to all social groups, should be superior to the linguistic community (*i.e.*

community of PEOPLE who speak the SAME language), and that the international community is made up of a community of civilisation.

It should also be noted that a community of civilisation begins as a "bazaar community". In the bazaar, members of professions such as tailors, shoemakers, bakers and haberdashers work only for their own benefit. However, "**public interest**" **emerges** from their self-interested endeavours.

Similarly, each of the various nations within a community of civilisation has entered into a division of labour in order to produce a superior culture. Just as regional division of labour arises from different personal abilities, different cultures emerge among nations as a result of different national abilities.

The peoples, who started to get closer to each other at first, entered into mutual relations in the fields of trade, culture and technique. In time, the circle of these relations expands. Even in the early ages, *we see that the tribes living in the Mediterranean region were EXCHANGING with each other, exchanging information and techniques.*

The discovery of the Cape of Good Hope, the discovery of America, the invention of the book printing technique and the printing press, the opening of the Suez Canal, the establishment of railways, telegraph and postal organisations increased the relations between nations and gradually created a universal situation.

Cultural communities first emerge as a *sect (clan)* that considers themselves descendants of the same grandfather. This means that the first cultural community *is related to religion and family.*

This family is a *religious community* because *it LIVES only a religious life.*

From this *religious community (i.e. family)*, all other social groups, *clan, tribe, village, town, CLASS, hearth, community, parish, parish, tribe, ummah and state* begin to derive respectively.

In this case, the social rule to which **the civilised society** adheres is the gradual expansion of its framework, while the social rule to which the cultural society adheres is the gradual expansion of its framework.

The rule, on the other hand, is the division and diversification of individuals according to their various duties within the society.

It is clear from the foregoing that the meaning of the word "modernisation" is to attain a superior position in the ever-developing scientific and technical level of the modern civilised community, which will not lag behind any other nation.

Wanting and living on a common level of life in a civilised society is not contrary to the characteristics of family and state life, or even to the cultural solidarities inherent in the community of nations and ummahs.

We Turks, armed with the reason and science of the civilisation of our time, must strive to create a **Turkish-Islamic culture**.

[16](#) **Conscience:** The French word Conscience has different meanings in psychology and sociology. We adopt the word "*consciousness*" in psychology and "*conscience*" in sociology. (Z. G.)

[17](#) **"Historical Materialism":** This is a part of Marxist philosophy which is based on dialectical materialism (materialism). According to this view, the causes of historical events and social developments are material. Material causes bring about class conflict, etc.

[18](#) **Anglo-Saxon:** The name given to three of the Germanic tribes (*Angels, Jutes, Saxons*) living in the British Isles and forming the basis of the people of the Kingdom of Great Britain. Along with the English-speaking British, North Americans are also recognised as Anglo-Saxon.

- V - WHAT HAPPENED TO TURKEY

A cosmopolitan⁽¹⁹⁾ class was formed in Byzantium, which officials from various tribes had once considered as *the "Kaaba of ikbal" (the GATE of fortune and happiness)*.

They looked for a name for themselves. Finally, they *called themselves urbanites*.

they agreed on his word. Shahrî had no nationality.

Sururi's⁽²⁰⁾ words to Refii Ahmadi:

**I and you, we are not from the city,
because I am a Turk and you are Kurdish.**

As can be understood from his verses, Shahrî was neither Turkish, Kurdish, Arab, nor Albanian, in other words, he was hostile to all nationalities. This community disliked the Arabs, underestimated the Kurds, made fun of the Laz and insulted the Turks.

Ahmet Vefik Pasha's⁽²¹⁾ If you open his *Müntehabat-ı Durub-ı Emsal (Selections from Proverbs)*, you will come across some disrespectful statements about these tribes.

These words uttered by Shahrîs are documents that clearly show the mental structure of those who uttered them. Let us see what is said about the Turks:

*When a Turk gets on his horse, he thinks he
has become a bey. The city becomes a
dungeon for a Turk.*

*The Turk loves flattery, Persia loves pehpeh.
Turkish work is borrowed.*

*The Turk becomes danişmend (knowledgeable), not
a man. What does the Turk know about the feast,
he drinks ayran. Turk and Tosun because he was
born from his mother*

/He took advice from the donkey and the calf. The Turkish mind comes later. There can't be a Turkish association.

They gave a beylik to the Turk, He killed his father first.

In the history books of these shahids, the names of the tribes were always written as follows:

Etrak-ı bî idrak (*Etrak = Turks, bî idrak = WITHOUT perception, without UNDERSTANDING*)

That is to say, **Turks without realisation or understanding.**

Ekrad-ı bed-nihad (*Ekrad= Kurds, bed-nihad= bad descendants*)

This situation did not attract so much attention when *the feeling of nationality* was not yet heard much. However, since the sense of nationality has gained importance in recent times, no tribe other than the Turks has been able to endure these insults.

On the one hand, Christian tribes were striving for independence, and on the other hand, Muslim tribes were beginning to boast of their nationality and not to allow any word to be spoken against their tribes.

Arabs and Albanians WERE the first to bring the idea of nationality to the Islamic world.

In Egypt, **Abdullah Nedim** was trying to revive *Arab nationalism* and in Istanbul, **Naim Bey Frasheri** (*brother of Şemseddin Sami, the AUTHOR of KAAMUS-ı Türkî*) was trying to revive *Albanian nationalism*.

In order for a cause to grow stronger, it needs the help of two emotions:

1. Love for the nation. This feeling arises from the occasions of national pride and traditions.

2. National hatred... arises from the awakening of resentment and enmity against any oppression and oppression.

We observe that both Abdullah Nedim and Naim Frasheri spread "*TURKOPHOBIA*" in order to arouse this national hatred.

One of the principles of Abdullah Nedim, the disciple of **Arabi Pasha**⁽²²⁾, was the phrase "*üttürüküttürük*" (*abandon the Turk*). The ideas that the Albanian nationalist Naim Frasheri tried to instil,

Many of us are familiar with these ideas and their proponents, since they have found a place of influence in our country.

Seventeen or eighteen years ago I travelled to Istanbul in order to enter a school. An Albanian doctor, who later became famous in the field of politics, told me the following words:

"We Albanians are READY to HELP the Turks to overthrow the tyranny and OPPRESSION of the administration. But you should know well that we do not have an OPPRESSION of Abdul Hamid, we HAVE a Turkish OPPRESSION. The responsibility for the present administration lies squarely with the Turks. If you do not put an end to this tyrannical government, we will turn OUR weapons not against the person who rules you (Sultan Abdul Hamid), but against your chest."

Since then, I have noticed that the Albanian youth have been spreading their ideas of nationalism, reasoning that the Turks are not capable of progress and development, and that if they live in common with the Turks, they themselves will perish.

These ideas they tried to inculcate were not only for Albanian youth. They were also trying to spread these ideas to the Arab and Kurdish youth. They were even trying to convince Turks that Turks were barbarians and degenerates. For this reason, at that time, it was as if there was not a single servant of God who adopted the Turkish name.

While the people of Istanbul called themselves *Şehrî*, the people from the provinces were called *Albanians*, *Arabs*, *Kurds*, *Laz*, depending on their geographical location.

Accordingly, *those living in Rumelia were generally REGARDED as Albanians, those on the Black Sea COAST as Laz, and those from Eastern Anatolia as Kurds.*

Those who could not achieve *this kind of tribalism due to geography* voluntarily accepted to belong to one of the tribes they considered brighter and superior to themselves. That is why *many young people, despite their Turkish ancestry, BOASTED of being Albanian or Kurdish. It was as if there was not a single person who was proud of his Turkishness.* No one used the name Turk as if it were a title to be ashamed of.

did not want to take it upon himself. *Turk* meant "*KIZILBAŞ*" in Eastern Anatolia and "*rude peasant*" in Istanbul.

Two of the most ardent friends of the Albanian nationalist Naim Bey (*Fraşeri*) were Turks compared to others.

Because of the ideas inculcated by them, *SOME doctors from DIYARBAKIR and Harput, whose Turkishness was never in doubt, THOUGHT that they were Kurds*. There is no second example in history of this pathetic situation.

Outside, Europe blamed only the Turks for the outrages in Turkey, and inside, all Muslim and non-Muslim tribes blamed the Turks for the oppression of the Palace, the persecution of the civil servants and the corruption of the Government.

The Turkish tribe could not come out and say, "***I exist!***".

There WAS a burden of responsibility placed on the Turks, but
There was no shoulder to shoulder!

The Turks consisted of individuals who were left TO themselves, who were not burdened with a national duty!

It is futile to expect morality, national unity and sacrifice from a community that does not have a national consciousness and a national mission. The social degeneration of the Turks, who had a noble personality in terms of creation, could only arise from the mistakes of "***not recognising their own self***" and "***not knowing their national responsibilities***".

Yes, Europe was right. It was the Turks who had to answer for the oppression and tyranny of the Abdülhamid regime. After the Second Constitutional Monarchy, no matter which party was in power, Turks were responsible for their actions. The Turks would also be the ones who would suffer as a result of the developments. As a matter of fact, when the Albanians revolted, they expelled all Turkish officials regardless of party. They also killed the Turkish officers and soldiers they captured.

The Tanzimatists had wanted to draw a deceptive veil over Turkishness in this way:

"There is no national Turkish language! THERE is a common OTTOMAN language belonging to all elements! All these elements FUSED with each other to form a new model tribe, a historical lineage, an "OSMANLI Nation".

This nation HAD its own language as well as its own history." (23)

Of course, no element believed this lie. Each tribe taught its own history in its schools. It taught its own language.

After the Second Constitutional Monarchy, when too much importance was attached to this *"BLINDFOLDING"* initiated by the **Tanzimatists**, the *MINORITY* elements began to cry out, *"You want to Turkify us!"*.

Indeed, this policy *of "Ottomanisation"* was nothing but a secret prelude to *"Turkisation"*. If the aim of Ottomanisation was the state, then every Ottoman subject (*national*) was already an individual of this state. If, on the other hand, the aim was to create a new nation whose language was Ottoman Turkish, this new nation would of course be a **Turkish nation** under a different name, since there was no language other than Turkish, which they called Ottoman Turkish.

The elements understood this very well and started to give more importance and order to their material and spiritual organisations in order to protect their nationality.

It was only the Turks who fell into this trap of the Tanzimat. The Turks, believing that their language was really Ottoman Turkish, composed of three languages (*Arabic, Persian, Turkish*), considered it *reactionary and conservative* to speak and write in *the vernacular*.

Although the spirit of Tanzimat, with the 2nd Constitutional Monarchy, gave the people a sovereignty they were NOT READY to use, it did not give THEM their own language. Naturally, it COULD not tolerate him talking about his nationality and national history.

The Turkish youth soon realised that unless the language and literature were simplified, unless the national ideal gained an efficacy that would inspire the soul and lead to sacrifice, unless the national economic life was free from foreigners and satisfying in its struggle, **Turkishness** and at the same time Ottomanism and Islam would perish.

On the other hand, he realised that he could not make any element believe in his sincerity unless he threw away the lying veil that obscured the eyes, and therefore the goal of the integration of minorities could not be achieved.

Furthermore, he did not lose sight of the fact that *the failure to mention the GLORIOUS SOURCES of Turkish pride when all nationalities had already been formed* would lead to the danger that Turkish youth would be represented by other tribes. Finally, the driving force of these three reasons led **to the ignition (as a reaction) of the Idea of Turkishness.**

The emergence of this new nation (i.e. *the Turkish Nation*) was welcomed with joy by the nationalists of all minority tribes. *Those who were not happy about this event were ONLY the urbanites and Tanzimatists.*

Was the awakening of the feeling of nationality among the Turks beneficial or harmful?

On this point, no harm was claimed by anyone.
But the benefits were too many to be counted:

*"(By this means) **Turkish has become simpler and more naturalised.** The LIBERATION of our grammar from FOREIGN rules.*

The WRITING of our poetry in national metre (syllabic metre).

The purification of our LITERATURE from Greek and Persian tales and the adornment of our national stories and TALES.

*National awakening together from him
SEPARATION impossible which is the
BEGINNING of the religious AWAKENING.*

*CONNECTED where we were found
"ummah" with, INTERNATIONAL the
determination of unity..*

*National
economy..*

National sport..

and

The development of national morality.

*The BIRTH of a sense of **dying for a national ideal** in young people.*

*Minorities one in between life emotion
THEREFORE to make it EASIER to get along with each
other.*

A sense of national responsibility must be felt and assumed by everyone..."

Today, every Turk who loves his nation must restrain himself from harming his tribe by his actions and endeavour to glorify his nation.

to fulfil its obligations. Therefore, it endeavours to keep its duties always in mind.

The Turkish youth have realised very well that the most sacred task for today is the unification of the Turks, leaving aside all differences of political parties and all social currents. When this unification is realised, the unity of Islam and the integrity of the Ottoman Empire will become more reliable.

As soon as the Turkish tribe realised its own existence, it saw in the light of this new feeling what the Arabs and other minorities needed in order to advance.

In the preceding chapter we have said that the Turks were held responsible for the actions of the government and the political parties, and were chastised for it. Of course, as a natural consequence of this situation, some positive developments in favour of the Turks were to follow. For example, when the government granted some permits to the Arabs, this result was called "*Turkish-Arab RAPPROCHEMENT*". It was not called the rapprochement between the Government and the Arabs or between **the Party of Union and Progress** and the Arabs.

It can be seen that **the Turkish tribe**, after saying "*I exist too!*", is better able to realise the importance and necessity of its responsibility and to find ways of getting along better with those belonging to the same religion and state, who today cannot be estranged **from their feelings of nationality**.

The minorities, who yesterday could not trust the promises of any Government on reforms because they did not believe that they would last for a long time, will tomorrow, when they find an immortal Turkish tribe who know their duties and responsibilities, see the possibility of coming to an agreement with these permanent people and will not be in favour of foreign control as they do now.

Once the Turk has begun to RESPECT his own EXISTENCE, he will also RESPECT the nationalities of MINORITIES and will not REFRAIN from recognising the rights and duties of MINORITIES as he RECOGNISES his own rights and duties.

Men arefe nafsahu faqad arefe gayrehu

(He who knows himself KNOWS everyone)

Although some of them considered the "*sense of nationality*" justified and natural for all the tribes constituting the population element of the Ottoman Empire, they kept the Turks separate from this.

They said:

"Since the Turks ARE sovereign, they already possess ALL national RIGHTS. THEY do not have any RIGHTS which were previously TAKEN away from them by force through the feeling of nationality and which they would now want to take back."

If such people had said, "*The OTTOMAN State is a Turkish State*", they might have been justified.

However, they believed that this State, under the Ottoman name, was ruled by a government composed of various elements.

Since this state was not governed by a Turkish Constitution, Turks had no different political rights. This being the case, it should not be strange that Turks, like other elements, needed a national consciousness and national organisation.

When the sense of nationality began to awaken among the Turks, the word Turk was attacked in other ways:

As if there was a relationship between Turkism and the savage atrocities committed by Hülagu⁽²⁴⁾, attack tricks began to be used. On the other hand, Turkism was accused of being contrary to Islam.

However, the goal of the Turkists was "*a modern Islamic Turkism*". Because if Turks' **nationality is** Turkishness, their ummah is Islam.

In my opinion, the Turkists should also have an ummah programme. And it should include the following principles:

1. To use the Arabic script, which is common among all Islamic tribes, without changing it.
2. To organise congresses to define terms among Islamic tribes in order to bring scientific terms to a common state in all Islamic tribes, and to translate terms from Turkish, Arabic and Persian.

(To realise this AIM, an agreement was MADE in Paris BETWEEN Turkish, EGYPTIAN, Indian and PERSIAN students).

3. To organise educational congresses for the realisation of a common education in all Islamic tribes.

4. To establish a permanent link between the Muftiates of all Islamic tribes.

5. Islam of the ummah icon which is Crescent. (month)

To act together in order to protect its sanctity.

It is clear from these principles that Turkism is also Islamism.

However, Turkists distinguish themselves from Islamic nationalists by being Islamic ummahists.

Because today, neither Turks, nor Arabs, nor Indians (*Pakistanis*), nor Afghans, nor Berbers⁽²⁵⁾, nor Persians can accept such an unnatural unity which destroys the sense of nationality among Islamic tribes.

In order to strengthen their national ideal, the Turks did not TRY to INSTIL "national hatred" AGAINST any of their co-religionists and COMPATRIOTS. They did not follow the PATHS of Abdullah Nedims and Naims of Frasier, who, acting on the basis of Islamic ummahism, later became involved in this BEHAVIOUR.

It is conceivable that the presence of Christian Egyptians and Albanians in Egypt and Albania and their coexistence with Muslims led them to these ideas.

On the other hand, since almost all Turks belonged to the Muslim religion, the Turkists would never harbour a feeling contrary to Islamic ummahism.

In addition, since the Turkists also embrace the necessity of modernisation, they will maintain the respectful attitude towards non-Muslim tribes required by this century of civilisation.

¹⁹ **Cosmopolitan:** Including people of various nationalities.

²⁰ **Sürurî:** 18th century Divan Literature poet and historian. He has a Divan. His histories were collected by Ahmet Cevdet Pasha in a book called *Sürurî Mecmuası*.

21 **Ahmet Vefik Pasha:** (1823-1891). One of the statesmen and literary figures of the Ottoman period, a great Turkist. He served as the President of the Parliament, Minister of Education and Grand Vizier in the Ottoman Empire. He pioneered the Turkism movement during the Tanzimat period. He adapted theatre works from Moliere. He translated the work **Şecere-i Türki** (*Genealogy of Turks*) from Chagatai into Turkish. He prepared a dictionary called **Lehçe-i Osmanî**. See **Ahmet Vefik Paşa/Yalçın Toker**, *Toker YAYINLARI 100 Büyük Edip ve Şairi Dizisi no. 50*

22 **Murshid:** Enlightening, guiding, giving wisdom.

23 **Elements:** Each of the tribes such as Arabs, Greeks, Albanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, Albanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, etc., together with the Turks, who provided the formation of the Ottoman Empire, are called elements. These are minorities against the Turkish element. **The view that envisages** the elements to come together and **form a whole called Ottoman** is "**ittihad-ı anasır**" (*unification of elements*).

24 **Hülagu:** (1217-1265) Grandson of Genghis Khan, founder of the Ilkhanid State. He was known for his extreme bloodshed and cruelty. He made great conquests. *He TOOK BAGHDAD*, had the Abbasid Caliph Muttasim Billah killed, *conquered Aleppo and founded the great ILKHANID State of his TIME*.

25 **Berbers:** They were originally a Turkic tribe from the community of hegemonic races spread in North Africa. They were later Arabised to a great extent. However, their customs and traditions are different from Arabs. They travelled to Spain together with the Arabs. **Tariq bin Ziyad**, the conqueror of Andalusia, was a famous Berber.

- VI - EDUCATION

When it comes to *Muslim education*, two thoughts come to mind: Firstly, the methods applied by Islam in education.

Secondly, the children to be raised should be educated according to the Islamic creed⁽²⁶⁾

The study of the educational methods of Islam is the subject of the history of education. Here we will not speak of history, but of life as it is lived, and we will show that Islam is one of the ideals of education.

If we examine a school programme, we see that the knowledge we teach our children is grouped into three categories:

Firstly, **we teach our national language and literature, our national history**, which is Turkish language and literature and Turkish history.

Secondly, religion courses such as **the Holy Quran, tawhid**⁽²⁷⁾, **ilmihal**⁽²⁸⁾, Islamic history and Islamic languages.

Thirdly, sciences such as mathematics, physics, natural sciences and foreign languages used to teach these sciences, as well as skills such as handicrafts and sports.

In short, this situation, which we will review, shows that the goals to be implemented in education are three:

1. Turkishness

2. Islam

3. Modernity.

A Turkish father can never accept that his child does not speak Turkish, does not read and write Turkish, does not know Turkish history and is ignorant of Islamic history.

Every father not only wants his child to grow up as a Turk and a Muslim, but also wants him to grow up as a modern person.

That is to say, complete education for us must be tripartite:

- 1. Turkish education,**
- 2. Islamic education,**
- 3. Contemporary education.**

Before the Tanzimat, only Islamic education was given to our children. The Tanzimatists tried to bring a modern education system to our country. In the beginning, there were great conflicts between these two educations (*i.e. Islamic and modern education*).

The establishment of "*Nizam-ı Cedit*" instead of the Janissary Corps was considered blasphemy, which meant irreligion and separation from religion. Wearing clothes like Europeans was also seen as blasphemy. The introduction of subjects such as painting and French in schools was also opposed.

It was claimed that facts such as the roundness of the earth and that the sun revolves around it were contrary to **nâkil**· ⁽²⁹⁾

In order to verify these facts, which had been proved by experiment and reason, it was necessary to look for evidence related to nakil.

In spite of all this, modern education gradually became established and widespread in the society. Over time, as modern education gained value, Islamic education lost its importance. Although religious education still occupied an important place in school programmes, the decline of Islamic education was not in terms of quantity but in terms of quality. Religious lessons were not taught in a lively manner. Teachers who taught religion classes lost the trust of the students because they viewed scientific facts as **bid'ah**⁽³⁰⁾. In addition, the application of scientific methods in religious education had not yet begun.

It was at such a time that the Turkish-Islamic world fell into The upheavals and the disasters that followed them led to the emergence of two vibrant ideas, namely **Turkish Nationalism** and **Islamic Ummahism**. Today, young minds, awakened by the impact of these disasters, attribute the responsibility for the defeat we have suffered to the lack of a vision in our education. In this regard, they say the following:

"We wanted to give our youth neither national education nor religious education, whereas it is the feelings of religion and nationality that make PEOPLE willingly die for holy causes. We did not give our CHILDREN Turkish and Islamic upbringing, nor did we give them modern education. ¶ Because the goal of modern education is that we should be able to make and use the techniques and tools MADE and USED by the most advanced nations. However, we have shown that we are UNABLE to use the tools (WEAPONS) OF our AGE in the military field as well as in the economic field.

The measure of science is work. With our FAILURE in the FIELD of work, we have also PROVED our BACKWARDNESS in science. Therefore, neither our higher SCHOOLS, which train specialists and scholars, nor our AUXILIARY SCHOOLS, which TRY to train normal CITIZENS, have BEEN of any use."

On such grounds, the press, which valued the new order of life, declared that Tanzimat education was bankrupt. Now the community of thinkers is trying to establish the foundations of our new educational organisation.

While Turkish education and educationists are investigating how national ideals will play a role in the new life, modern educators are trying to determine which methods should be applied in teaching in order to obtain practical and economic benefits from the positive sciences.

In this period of intensive studies, it is also necessary to investigate the foundations of Islamic education.

These **three types of education** (*Turkish, modern and Islamic education*) should help, complement and guide each other. However, if the circle of their authority and the boundaries of this circle are not determined rationally and accurately, they may oppose each other and become enemies.

If the modern system of upbringing does not remain in the material sphere and starts to be effective in spiritual matters, it will be considered as attacking the rights of Turkish and Islamic upbringing. It is even more difficult to determine the boundaries of national and religious upbringing. **It is even more difficult** to determine which of the Islamic traditions are directly related to Islam, **and** which are Arab, Persian or

To determine that it belongs to the national traditions of the Turks requires very detailed analyses.

Therefore, Islamic Education, while accepting the Turkish and modern education systems, will endeavour to prevent attacks on its own field by these systems and at the same time will endeavour to separate the true Islamic rules and traditions from the customs and bid'ahs that were first passed down from the Arabs and later taken from other tribes.

26 **Akaid:** Religious beliefs and the book that teaches these beliefs.

27 **Tawhid:** The science of reading the Holy Qur'an properly and the book that teaches this reading.

28 **Ilmihal:** A book written to teach the rules of religion.

29 **Nâkil:** A c c e p t i n g the reality of a situation not through reason, but because it is revealed by God. For example, the Prophet's miraculous ascension is not an intellectual but a narrative fact.

30 **Bid'at:** After the Prophet, new judgements and superstitions mixed with religious beliefs and principles.

-VII- MEFKERE (*IDEAL*)

The germination of a seed is divided into two periods, the first instantaneous and the second over time. These periods are: *Fertilisation and germination*.

Fertilisation is a creative event for seeds. Without this, the seed cannot sprout.

Just as a sprouted seed sprouts, takes shape and grows, we see the same periods in the work of a poet and in the formation of the ideas put forward by a philosopher. We can call the poet's inspiration *the fertilisation of his imagination*.

In the philosopher, the birth of "*intuition*" is the fertilisation of the idea. After this fertilisation takes place, the poet's imagination and the philosopher's power of thought become pregnant. Finally, a new work is born for the field of literature and philosophy.

The people without a national personality is just like the essence of an organism. We can liken it to the imagination of a poet and the thinking power of a philosopher. Therefore, nations must also have periods of fertilisation, germination and growth.

When a nation suffers a great catastrophe, when it faces a terrible danger, the personalities of the individuals who make it up disappear. Then only one national personality lives in the social soul. In the hearts of the individuals who make up the society, there is no emotion other than the desire to maintain this "*national personality*".

In this period of confusion, *individuals* think *not of their own freedom, but of the INDEPENDENCE OF their nation*.

This sacred thought mixed with sacred feeling is **called mefkûre (*ideal*)**. it is called.

Depressive times are the days of the creation of ideals. When national catastrophes unite all hearts into a single heart, ideals are born from this united heart. Then, during the sprouting period, they gradually blossom into flowers and new social institutions.

The Germanic (Germanic) Idea: *In the disastrous days when PRUSSIA was trampled BY Napoleon's army, the idea of Germanism was BORN.* Even the philosopher Fichte⁽³¹⁾, who until then had said, "*My nation is all MANKIND and my HOMELAND is the whole earth*", felt at that moment that he was German to the bone and declared it.

The Idea of Japan: At the time when Japan was being dangerously and humiliatingly oppressed by the Americans and Europeans, it almost exploded.

The French Nation: When it was about to perish under the British invasion, national consciousness sprang from a mentally ill peasant girl and made her its saviour.

Judaism and Christianity: The extermination of the Israelites in Egypt gave birth to Judaism, and the persecution of Judaism under the Roman Empire gave birth to Christianity.

The birth of Islam: Islam was born in a deadly period when Arabia was subjected to political and religious invasions from three sides.

When a nation is in danger, individuals cannot save it.

The nation becomes its own saviour. At that moment, we see that individuals are bewitched by a superhuman spirit, the will of the people disappears, and the general will becomes "*the unity of the souls*".

The nation appears to individuals in the form of a sacred and social ideal, calling them to a promised victory, a heralded paradise. From the selfish, it brings forth the mujahideen who sacrifice their lives for the sake of the nation, and from the cowards, heroes who do not give up in the face of danger. It gives intelligence to the stupid, diligence to the lazy and zeal to the indifferent.

After the period of disaster and depression has passed, the sun of this vision, which was born in the souls, is no longer extinguished. It continues all the endeavours of the nation like an inner ring without stopping.

Just as the egg receives the life impulse necessary for fertilisation from the fertilisation of the sperm, the institutions that make up the nation also receive the creative power that enables them to develop from the idea. A **nation's heritage (*culture*) and civilisation** are thus formed.

In times of disaster, the real ideals that suddenly spring out of the crisis sensitivity of a nation that melts its members in its own soul become the creators of the nation's future. We do not have material instruments to observe the future of the nation. For this we have spiritual instruments of observation, which are **our "national ideals"**.

Once a nation has a creative ideal, it no longer moves towards an uncertain future, but an existing, joyful irem (*garden of paradise*) appears more clearly and vividly every day, calling it to itself.

States without ideals are waiting for an apocalypse to break out at any moment. However, nations with ideals, even if they have politically gone to the hereafter and passed away, are certainly heralded with a "*resurrection after death*" (*bas ü badelmeyt*).

In other words, a state with a revitalising and creative vision is immortal, it cannot die.

"The psychologists who endeavour to determine *WHETHER individuals (individuals) have the will power to overcome their desires with an effect from the top down or not*, are arguing in vain. It is individuals with willpower that make up nations with a vision. It is difficult to find individuals with willpower in nations without goals. Extraordinary sacrifices and great renunciations (*renunciations*), which show the existence of a superior will power, can emerge in periods of crisis that give birth to a vision.

At the beginning of *the* French Revolution, during a heated meeting of the National Assembly, all nobles renounced their nobility rights.

Under the influence of the national impulse of the war of 1870, the small German states renounced their right to independence. With Prussia as the leader

and became loyal to him.

At a time when Japan had to "*live with honour or die with honour!*", the Shogun's reign and the noble class voluntarily sacrificed their great lands for their country. Mikado also voluntarily renounced the monarchy and declared that sovereignty belonged to the nation.

The old "***Jabriye sect***" ⁽³²⁾, which attributes this will to a superhuman power, is also right. This is because it is the ideology that creates the will of individuals and directs it towards good or evil.

The individual thinks that the directions of this national harmony are his personal wishes. He cannot think that these are the work of the national spirit.

Idea, that is, ideal, shows its power in two ways:

Attractiveness (*prestige*) and ***sanction*** (*sanction*): Attractiveness is the direct reflection of the ideal on the soul. Individuals' souls are filled with a violent ecstasy (*enthusiasm*) when they are motivated. At that moment, they plunge into a crazy excitement and live a tense dream in a state of frenzy. The feeling that appears in the hearts of individuals at that moment is the feeling of "*HOLINESS*". While these overflowing spirits sanctify and glorify their ideals and everything that helps them, they also curse those who oppose them.

They not only sacrifice their lives, interests and happiness for the sake of their ideals, but also glorify and exalt those who promote them. They want to destroy those who oppose it and everything.

With this power of attraction, their ideals turn individuals into social robots, ecstatic sleepwalkers. They achieve superhuman successes from these people, whom they have driven into ecstasy with the enthusiasm they give to their souls.

As for the sanctioning power of the aspiration, this is a consequence of the power of attraction. Those who are not bewitched by a holy love for the realisation of the goal feel its power indirectly. They realise that actions that are in conformity with or contrary to the goal will be met with a reaction by the society attached to the goal. This reaction of the society with a vision, in the form of approval or disapproval, is the sanctioning power of the vision, which first, without determining

because it lacks the form of "*custom*". Then it developed and took shape. It takes the form of "*law*".

Attractiveness is the beauty attribute of the goal, while sanctioning is its compelling attribute.

With these two attributes or powers, the goal unites individuals in the same spiritual crucible and makes them all into a soul of the same kind.

A child lives with impersonal feelings until the day he/she feels the sense of "*I*". After hearing the feeling of "*I*", his personality, which had remained in a vague sense of being until that moment, explodes. What it is for a child to feel the sense of "*I*", it is for a nation to achieve its goal.

However, as explained above, a nation can feel its sense of self only during great disasters. In times of bad situations, the national crisis is a social Jibril (*Gabriel: Angel*), who begins to sense and understand who he is, where he came from, where he is going, and what kind of historical duty he will do.

EK:

There are also those who call the ideal *a* dream, a goal, an ambition, a wish. As can be understood from the above explanations, an ideal is neither a spiritual life actually lived by a nation during a period of crisis in the past, nor a goal to be lived in the future.

Mefkûre is the breeder of the present time and the creator of the future, but it is also a reality of the past. It is the driving intellectual impulse that comes from the nation's past and directs it towards the future.

Therefore, like "*ideal*" derived from "*idée*", it is derived from "*idea*".

It is more appropriate to use "*mefkûre*" in this sense.

[31](#) **Fichte:** (1762-1814) Famous German philosopher. Like **Schelling** and **Hegel**, he adopted Kant's philosophy based on the supremacy of morality and ethics and tried to realise it. He continued to be a professor of philosophy at the University of Jena.

[32](#) "**Jabriye sect**": Fatalism. Believing that everything good and bad is from Allah. The sect which believes that it is not possible for human beings to change what God has written in their destiny by their own will.

- VIII - TURKISH NATION AND TURAN

No matter how clear explanations are made about Turkism, some minds and thoughts cannot get rid of hesitations and uncertainties.

Since ideas are surrounded by a circle of sacredness, they cannot be easily analysed and solved. Their power of persuasion derives more from their spiritual appeal than from the logical clarity of their meaning. But as time passes, the initial dazzle begins to fade and the need for clarity increases.

Therefore, today;

"Is there a Turkish nation?

Or can such a nation be made?"

we should not be surprised if we hear the question.

Really, From Kazan one Turkish young person, this one here He asked a question in this sense to one of the pioneers of Turkism.

Everyone should think and say something on this important issue which concerns the whole Turkish nation.

For this reason, I am putting this issue, which I believe should be analysed in depth, in the field of discussion.

The youth from Kazan says:

"Is my nation Turkishness which includes Uzbeks, KIRGHIZ, Turkmens, SARTARS, OSMANLI, Tatars, AZERBAIJANIS?

Or is my nation ONLY TATARISM, since each of THESE is a nation in its own right?

In other words, will Turkishness remain as a single nation or will it become a community comprising many nations?"

Although he himself did not give a definite and clear answer to this question, he put forward two evidences that the second option will be realised in the future

continues:

First argument: Since the above-mentioned Turkic nations are distant from each other and have little contact with each other, they will gradually diverge from each other in terms of language, and the fact that they have independent literatures will accelerate this differentiation.

Second evidence: While the Northern Turks are brought up in Russian culture, the Ottoman Turks are nourished by French or German culture. Thus, Turkishness is divided into two different parts in terms of culture and civilisation.

ANSWER TO THE FIRST EVIDENCE: Turkish nations could have diverged from each other in terms of language and literature in the days when there were no means of communication such as post, telegraph and press.

Just as **Seljuk** and **Chagatai** Turks had created their own separate literatures from the 13th century onwards, in the same period of time and without being aware of each other. In addition, the fact that the Turks, unaware of each other before Islam, entered into various religions and adopted various scripts was the result of this distance and lack of contact with each other. Nevertheless, this distance did not prevent all Turks from accepting Islam together with the inspiration of the feeling of **tribalism** (*being brotherly tribes*).

However, there came a time when, again under the influence of distance and lack of relations, some Turks followed the Persians and turned towards Shiism. Today, however, we see that the feeling of tribalism has made it impossible to emphasise sectarian differences. Yes, if the period of ignorance had continued for a few more centuries, the Turks would have been divided into many tribes in terms of language and tribalism.

Just as the Slavs, Latins and Kurds have been divided into many different tribes since ancient times. (Today, the Kurds consist of five tribes that do not understand each other's language). (See: ***Sociological Studies on Kurdish Tribes/Ziya Gökalp, Toker YAYINLARI, Istanbul.***)

Turks did not undergo such a separation in the past because they lived a nomadic life. Arab tribes settled in large territories

Although they were nomadic, they managed to preserve the unity of the Arabic language as they were in constant contact with each other due to nomadism.

For the Turks, apart from the reasons such as nomadism, slavery and migration, there was a succession of great unifying and fusing periods such as the invasions of **Mete, Komene, Bilge Khan, Kashgar Kings, Seljuk, Genghis and Timur**. That is why today almost all Turks are tribes that understand each other's language. And since the era of acquaintance has begun, it is no longer possible for them to drift apart.

The circulation of Turkish books among the Turkic tribes is of great importance for the Turks not to drift apart from each other in terms of language. On the one hand, Divans written in Chagatai Turkish were read by Western Turks, while on the other hand, works written in Ottoman Turkish were taken to Crimea, Kazan, Caucasus and Turkestan in crates. The spread of Ottoman Turkish books increased especially after the Turks got to know each other. First, in Crimea and the Caucasus, Istanbul literature began to be imitated and the language began to approach Istanbul Turkish. Later, this movement spread to Kazan and Turkestan.

However, a great enemy emerged at this time and tried to prevent this "language unification" movement in three ways.

These were

1. Socialism: If there is an idea that is not favourable for the national interests of Turks, it is undoubtedly socialism. Because socialism is the enemy of the idea of nationality.

However, the factor that will save the Turks from all kinds of extinction is the idea of nationality.

Moreover, socialism naturally arises from big industry. The Turks, on the other hand, have not yet progressed in the field of industry to the extent that would lead to socialism.

The idea of socialism, which began to burn unnaturally among the Northern Turks, led to the formation of regional literatures. However, in every tribe that has a single language, the folk dialogues

are different from each other. It is a great danger for national unity to turn regional dialects into written languages and to create a literature from each of them. For example, in Turkey, if literature were to be produced in the vernacular of each region, hundreds of different Turkish languages would emerge. The implementation of this situation is the most terrible death for all nations.

2. Despair European newspapers constantly spoke of Turkey's weakness and inability to survive. The European press agencies always spread news to this effect. Some of the Turkish newspapers in the north also published these malicious false reports without thinking.

Thus, the Turks began to lose hope in their civilised abilities. As a result, the idea of creating an artificial Tatar civilisation was born.

In reality, the word Tatar is a name given to a foreign tribe in ancient Turkic history, which has nothing to do with today's Northern Turks. Neither **Genghis** nor **Timur liked the Tatars**. *That is to say, the Tatars were NOT Turks, nor were they Mongols. Therefore, the Northern Turks should never accept this NAME, which was USED by THE Russians to both HUMILIATE and divide the Turks. Northern Turks are generally KIPCHAK Turks.*

3. School pressures: Some governments have begun to prevent the various Turkic nations from helping each other in teaching and education. The books of each nation were forbidden to be read in the schools of other nations (*e.g. Uzbek BOOKS were FORBIDDEN to be read in KIRGIZSTAN, Kazakh BOOKS in Azerbaijan, etc.*).

Furthermore, it was proposed that the native language of each region should be the language of instruction for Muslims. The aim of all these pressures and regulations was to divide the Turkish nation into various nations.

In order to swallow a tribe, it is first necessary to break it into pieces. In order to divide a nation, it is first necessary to divide and fragment its language. Some of those who do this do it knowingly, some unknowingly.

Turkish language started to be fragmented in these three ways and more than one literatures started to be created. Realising the danger of this situation, Turkists such as **Kadı Rızaeddin** and **Musa Begyif** continued to write in general Turkish.

Tercüman Newspaper, published in Crimea, maintained the traditional principle of *"unity in thought, unity in language, unity in work"*. The **journal Şelale**, published in Baku, directly advocated the old Ottoman Turkish.

In other words, there are two currents among Russian Turks:

The first is to value regional dialects. The second is to accept Istanbul Turkish as the national language and to try to make this language widespread.

Those who are caught up in the first trend are undoubtedly unknowingly playing into the hands of the enemies of Turks. Those who think with a true Turkish consciousness tend towards the second trend.

Since it would not be possible to create an artificial Turkish that would be formed by the unification of all Turkish dialects, a third one has not been added to these currents.

All existing languages consist of dialects and regional dialects. It is natural for every language to have some parts. However, a closer look reveals that there is a *"literary unity"* above this fragmented state. The language of the capital city of each nation, as a rule, has a political reputation and social appeal.

The famous French sociologist **Tarde** said;

"During the period of feudal rule, fame belongs TO the nobility. After the establishment of a KINGDOM, however, it is the capital city that becomes famous."

Fame and attractiveness are the basis and measure of a nation's social consciousness.

The nation evaluates all its values with this basis and measure.

The attractiveness of Istanbul as a capital city is not only related to the Ottoman Turks. Istanbul is the **Army-City** (*the capital city*) of the only Turkish Khanate.

For this reason, it is also considered as the Qibla of the whole World Turkishness. Istanbul is also the centre of the Islamic Caliphate. Therefore, besides its national attraction, Istanbul also has a religious sanctity.

This is the reason why **Istanbul Turkish is the national language for all Turks**, because this attractiveness and sanctity has been transferred to the language. Moreover, Istanbul Turkish is the most beautiful, the most processed and the richest in terms of literature and science among Turkish dialects.

Therefore, it is a national duty for all Turks to make Istanbul Turkish a literary language, despite the obstacles that may arise.

ANSWER TO THE SECOND EVIDENCE: The aim of Turkism is to create a Turkish *culture*. This culture will, of course, be common to the Turks of East, West, North and South. In this way, the destruction caused by the imitation of French culture by the Western Turks and Russian culture by the Northern Turks will be eliminated.

All Turks should have only one culture and this should be a culture created by themselves.

The Turk will disintegrate as he becomes Germanised or Frenchised or Russified.

To summarise, the adoption of the Istanbul language as the national language and the creation of a Turkish culture within European civilisation will be the basis for the establishment of a **Turkish nation**, and terms such as **Ottoman, Kipchak, Uzbek, Kyrgyz** will remain as regional names.

As for the word Tatar, at the end of scientific analyses, it will be understood that this word is a name given to the Northern Turks as a result of enmity, and thus the Tatarism movement will be bankrupt.

Then what is the homeland of the Turkish nation in general? In answer to this we say:

Homeland is neither Turkey nor Turkestan for the Turk; Homeland is a great and eternal country: Turan.

Turan is an *idealised* homeland that gathers all Turks together and does not allow foreigners to enter it.

Turan is the totality of all ideals where Turks live and Turkish is spoken.

- IX - NATION AND HOMELAND

The situation of man today in the face of nature is quite clear:

To reveal the laws of nature by analysing natural phenomena through observation and experimentation.

However, this was not the case a few centuries ago. Natural scientists did not need to observe and experiment on *reality*. In order to understand things, it was considered sufficient to know the principles of reason and to draw their logical conclusions through comparison. For example, they explained the formation of the four elements called earth, water, air and fire as follows:

"With coldness dryness from the merger soil, Water is formed from the union of cold and dampness, air from the union of heat and dampness, fire from the union of heat and dryness..." This means that **the four basic elements** (*HEAT, coldness, dryness, WETNESS*)

When this was achieved, it was very easy to establish natural science by syllogism. Moreover, this movement was not limited to theory. The same method was applied in works that should at least be based on a voluntary experiment:

"DISEASES are caused by THE predominance of either dampness or dryness, or coldness or HEAT. The MEDICINES USED were intended to UTILISE only these characteristics. For example, IF a DISEASE was caused by the coldness and dryness of the CREATION, the medicine to be given HAD to WARM and dry the CREATION."

Today, such a *"concept method"* cannot find a place in the field of natural sciences. In our country, those who deal with material and natural sciences attach importance only to observation and experimentation. They also try to derive concepts from facts.

Today, there were three concepts that were the subject of social debates in the press:

Turkism, Islamism, Ottomanism.

Unless these concepts become symbols of social beings, unless they derive their values from social realities, they cannot have any meaning. Even if wars of opinion are fought for years over these three words, no result can be achieved.

If we look at social realities, we see that there is an Islamic Ummah, an Ottoman State, a Turkish Nation, an Arab Nation. In order for these judgements to be true, it is quite natural that the word "**ummah**" should be used as an idiom for all people who have close ties with a religion, the word "**state**" for all people who are under the rule of a government, and the word "**nation**" for the totality of people who speak the same language. For those who accept the use of these words as idioms in these meanings, the above judgement is correct and true.

Therefore, those who do not accept that judgement abstain, not because the meaning is not in accordance with reality, but because they do not find it appropriate to accept these three words as idioms in those meanings.

On the one hand, **Islamists** say: *"The word 'nation' MEANS what you call 'ummah'. This word ALSO MEANS "sect" in Arabic."*

In response to these objections, it can be said that the greatness of language is possible only if every word has a meaning and every meaning has a single word, and especially if there are words that fulfil every meaning.

Even if people do not do this, language does it by itself.

It is for this reason that all people who adhere to a religion are called "**ummah**" and all people who adhere to a language are **called "nation"**.

Since the majority uses these words with these meanings, you will of course accept them. It is not right to create difficulties in the matter of idiom.

On the other hand, **Ottomanists** say:

"The word 'state' and the word 'nation' are synonymous." The totality of the subjects of a state constitutes the nation. If we look only at the relations between these concepts without giving importance to social reality, this idea must be correct.

Although the fact that all the subjects of a state speak the same language or that those who speak the same language constitute an independent state is more in line with reality and desire. But are all states like this in the face of the realities of sociology? Undoubtedly not.

When this is the case, how can it be appropriate to ignore what is and assume what should be?

After criticising these claims put forward by these two groups (***Islamists and Ottomanists***), **Turkists** draw the following two conclusions:

1. Ummah is one thing, nation is another.

2. The state is one thing, the nation is another.

These conclusions can also be challenged, but only in terms of whether they are in accordance with social realities or not.

We can fit our concepts to social realities. But we cannot fit reality to our concepts!

Similarly, the realities outside the concepts of "**Ummah-Nation-State**" are not entirely separate from each other.

The relationship between "**Ummah**" and "**Nation**", "**General**" and "**Special**" is like the relationship between the Ummah.

Ummah is the name given to all the nations of one religion. In other words, it is a very large community.

Furthermore, the people who make up the nation are not only those who speak its language. Those who will speak that language tomorrow are also in that society.

For example, although today the Pomaks speak Bulgarian and the Muslims in Crete speak Greek, tomorrow they will learn Turkish under the influence of Muslims and leave the languages they speak today. This means

The members of a nation are recognised not only by their language but also by their religion.

To a certain extent, there is a relationship between "*State*" and "*Nation*", between "*general*" and "*special*". For example, the Ottoman Empire is an Islamic State, i.e. a state based on Muslim nations. The two major elements that support it with its existence, culture and science are the Turkish and Arab nations. *Therefore, the Ottoman Empire can be called a Turkish-Arab state.*

It should not be forgotten that the Turkish and Arab nations are not only Turks and Arabs in the Ottoman lands. Those living in captivity and speaking the same language should also be considered within these nations. *(For example, Turkestan Turks UNDER the Russian yoke...)*

Now let us come to the concept of "**Homeland**". Homeland means a sacred country for which lives are sacrificed. How is it that all other countries are not "**sacred**", but the country we call "**Homeland**" is recognised as sacred? And how is it that those who recognise it as sacred can sacrifice their lives, their families, the things they love most for the sake of that country? Undoubtedly, that country has not gained this value just because of its material structure. It definitely derives its sanctity from a sacred being.

What could this sacred entity be? Is it the state?

We have seen above that the state is not a power that exists on its own. The state derives its power from the nation and the ummah:

"Honour ul-makhan bil mekin" *(The honour of the place is with the one who dwells there).*

In that case, there are only two things as sacred beings: **The nation** and **Ummah**.

When the sacred realities are two, the homeland, which is their symbol or headquarters, must also be two:

"the homeland of the Ummah", "the homeland of the nation".

There is indeed an "**Islamic Homeland**" which is the beloved homeland of all Muslim nations. The second is the "**National Homeland**", which the Turks call **Turan**.

The Ottoman country is an independent part of the Islamic Homeland. One part of it is the Turkish Homeland, which is also a part of Turan. The other part is the Arab Homeland, which is part of the Great Arab Homeland.

The Turks' adoption of the Turkish Homeland, i.e. Turan, with a special love does not require them to forget either the Ottoman country, which is the **"Small Islamic Homeland"**, or the **"Great Islamic Homeland"**. Because **"Nation Idea"**, **"State Idea"**, **"Ummah Idea"** are different ideals and all three are sacred.

- X - NATIONALITY IDEAL

Some young people ask:

"Since ideas are born out of historical TURMOIL and social CRISES, is it not to be expected THAT after a while a new idea, which will be born under the influence of other circumstances and CONDITIONS, will replace the love of nationality?"

For example in the near or distant future, the idea of "socialism" , Is it not possible that the "sense of nationality" SHOULD be favoured over the "sense of nationality"?"

I can answer this question as follows:

Mefkûre (ideal) is actually the feeling of a social community by its own people. Sunlight cannot show its burning characteristic unless it is focused on the focal point of a lens. Similarly, a community cannot show its sacredness without becoming an enthusiastic community.

But this holiness already existed unconsciously in the spiritual unity of the community before it took a conscious form. The task of an enthusiastic community is to take the community from a simple slave existence to a dense existence and to show this truth, which has been hidden in the *"hidden treasure"* until then, to the people together with the circle of holiness that it should be.

However, enthusiastic communities ensure the emergence of the idea by first bringing a disorganised community to a concentrated and concentrated state.

The emergence of a vision out of nothing indicates that the community has moved from an unconscious state to a state of conscious development.

The Ottoman Empire, the Islamic Ummah and the Turkish Nation existed even before the ideas of OTTOMANISM, ISLAMISM and Turkism were born.

Before the big industry in Europe brought the workers together and gave birth to the idea of socialism, the working class still existed, but in a disorganised state.

In other words, in order for a community to appear in people's consciousness at a time of crisis by saying "*I EXIST!*", it must already exist as a special organisation with some of its institutions.

An organisation, whether political, religious or linguistic, must of course already exist. Any enthusiastic community cannot give rise to a newly formed community with no history. It is not even possible for such a community to come into existence, let alone for a new idea to emerge from a community that is not based on an existing organisation. Because only something that has the ability to expand can expand.

The following conclusion follows from these words:

"A great community that will emerge in the future will necessarily be BASED on one of the communities that exist today. And a vision that will be born in the future will surely EMERGE from the unity of one of the present communities."

Therefore, whichever of the existing communities is the richest and the strongest in terms of organisation, and which is able to gather and dissolve other communities within its own organisation, the great vision must be born from its structure.

Let us now look for this gathering community:

Among the existing communities, the community that can fulfil this task is **the "language communities" or "nationality"**. Because the speakers of a language are generally people of the same lineage, a **"nation"** is also a **"tribe"**.

The concepts of language and tribe are so interconnected that today, when one speaks of "descent" outside the science of *HUMANITY*, the first thing that comes to mind is **"a family of tribes with a linguistic affinity between them"**.

Indo-Europeans, Semites, Bantus (*PEOPLES of southern Equatorial Africa*), Ural-Altaic peoples, etc., are tribes, that is to say, they share a language.

that are nothing more than families.

Among the Indo-Europeans there are even all three of the three general types of race from the point of view of anthropology, namely "**long-headed brunette**", "**long-headed brunette**" and "**round-headed brunette**". For example, **the Germans** are mostly "*TALL-HEADED brunettes*", **the Spaniards** and **Southern Europeans** "*TALL-HEADED brunettes*", and **the Slavs** "*ROUND-HEADED brunettes*".

However, whichever of the European nations we analyse, we find that all three of these types exist in various proportions.

Thus, it is understood that the word "**tribe**" means "*language family*" and the word "**race**" (*ancestry*) means "*types having similarities in STRUCTURE*".

In this case, a **tribe** means a nation that lived in ancient times as "**a community speaking the same language**", but then disintegrated.

As for **ancestry**, it consists of anatomical types, which are scattered among all nations, where not all of their descendants are found in one place and together.

Today, the lineage to which we are proud of belonging is, of course, understood not as an anatomical type, but as a "**tribe**", a community of people with the same language. But is not the community with unity of language, i.e. the nation, a part of this community called tribe?

Secondly, language has another function: Since it is the medium of expression of feelings and thoughts, the carrier of traditions and customs, it also undertakes the task of making the speakers have the same aspirations and education, the same conscience and understanding.

For these reasons, it is only natural that people with a common soul and the same feelings should tend to adopt the same religion.

Based on this, we also see that societies with the same language generally adopt the same religion. Although some special reasons prevented this religious unity at the beginning, history shows us that the speakers of the same language gradually entered into the same religion. For example, new

Latins converted to Catholicism, **Teutons** to Protestantism and **Slavs** to Orthodox religion.

The Mongols of the Ural-Altaians became Buddhists, **the Manchus** became Confucians and the **Finno-Ugurs** became Christians.

While some of **the Turks** were *Buddhist, Mani, Jewish and Christian* at first, later on, when the majority of them accepted Islam, almost all of them, except for about 200 thousand *Shamanist* Yakuts, converted to Islam.

The reason why the Yakuts remained outside Islam was that their homeland was far away from the Turkic World. They will either adopt Islam and remain Turks, or they will accept Christianity and become Russified.

Just as language has an effect on entering a religion, religion has an effect on entering a nationality. **The Protestant French**, who were expelled from France in the past, settled in Germany and **became Germanised** there. Former **Bulgarians** accepted Christianity and **became Slavs**.

Do we not see that some of the non-Turkish Muslim minorities migrating to our country in a scattered manner today have become Turkicised under the influence of unity in religion?

Therefore, there is an intimate relationship between communities with the same language and communities with the same religion.

Thirdly, after the principles of "**military obligation**" and "**national sovereignty**" were accepted, the defence of the homeland was left in the hands of the trained sipahi (*HORSE-DRAWN*) troops and the administration of the state was left in the hands of the ruling class, which was responsible only to the rulers.

Peasants who had no weapons other than the plough and townspeople who were used to resting became soldiers. The people, who had no experience in administration, became the controllers of the government.

In that case, it was necessary to educate these new soldiers with "**love of homeland**" and to teach this controlling public what their "**duty of choice**" **was**. In the course of educating the people, disseminating and generalising national education and training, it was necessary to determine the language of education.

This led to the emergence of disputes among the tribes subject to the state.

States started to promote the official language, while tribes started to put forward their own languages as a means of education and training to the state.

That is why, in the last century, it was considered impossible for both the State and the Homeland to be based on a single language, and two communities with the same language were relied on, as in Austria and Hungary. Today, in Europe, the future of the States formed by communities with the same language is trusted.

By defining at least the spiritual boundaries of the national homeland, they show what kind of future they hope for.

Today, everyone knows very well that the ideas of "**State and Homeland**" kept alive among the elements are doomed to remain as concepts without love, excitement, colour and spirituality.

As there can be no common lover, there can be no **common homeland**. A state that is not based on a common consciousness becomes only a place where people feed themselves.

A country which cannot be the homeland of a nation remains only an *almshouse*⁽³³⁾ where people feed themselves.

If institutions such as the state and the homeland are based on national ideals, their lives become eternal. If they are based only on individuals, they are doomed to collapse.

Since people without ideals are selfish and self-interested, hopeless and pessimistic, faithless and cowardly, they remain empty and wasted.

States must be based on national ideals and every piece of land must be the homeland of a state, so that it can be saved from being a piece of land and have the chance to live.

It can be seen that "*language societies*" also include the concepts of state and homeland.

Small communities such as family, class, professional centre, village, tribe, religious groups are also parts of the national society.

A family consists of people who adhere to a religion. It speaks the language of the nation to which it belongs.

Other communities, like the family, have religion and language in common. Therefore, all of these are special parts of the national society, i.e. the nation. To summarise... Whatever ideals belonging to the tribe, nation, state, homeland, family, class, profession, etc., all of them are national. are the helpers of the ideal.

As social development replaces material factors with mental and emotional factors, the value and effectiveness of language, which is the means of expressing these factors, will gradually increase, and thus **the "sense of nationality"** will become an eternal ideal.

In fact, after the establishment of big industry in Turkey, the ideal of socialism will also be born in our country. But this, like the other small ideals mentioned above, will remain as an auxiliary to the national ideal.

Although socialism is constantly growing stronger in European nations, it is usually replaced by the national ideal in times of war. Apart from political wars, and even in the field of economy alone, the class ideal is subordinated to the national ideal.

Furthermore, a closer look reveals that the only substance of all social activities such as religion, morality, law, economy and fine arts is **"language"**.

For all these activities to find value, language must gain importance.

Language is the base of social life, the fabric of spirituality, the foundation of culture and civilisation. Therefore, no matter which community and which field of activity they are related to, all social movements in the future, both directly and indirectly, will always intensify the language society, and the **"nationality ideal"** will surely emerge from the crisis in a more vigorous and powerful way.

[33](#) **Imaret:** Social welfare organisations that provide free food, drink, lodging and feeding of animals to the poor and travellers. These institutions, of which there are many examples in the Ottoman Empire, are foundation institutions in terms of their establishment and functioning.

- XI - NATIONALITY AND ISLAMISM

There is a spiritual germ that has been trying to disintegrate the Ottoman Empire, the last hope of the Islamic world, for a hundred years. This germ has been the enemy of the Ottoman Empire until now and has caused great damage to Islam. Today, however, it has turned in favour of Islam and is trying to eliminate its destructive effects. This germ is the idea of nationality.

Yes!... It is this terrible idea that gave birth to Romania, Serbia, Montenegro, Greece, Bulgaria, Samos and Crete Islands and caused the Ottoman Empire to disintegrate in every quarter of a century and finally caused Rumelia to fall from our hands.

This idea was not a disease germ but a social yeast. I regret to say that we have not been able to fully understand what it was until today.

It has always been a leaven against us in terms of language, literature, economy, upbringing and finally politics.

We thought that we could stop these creations, which are extremely important for the life of society, by making regulations, creating organisations and institutions, and we worked in vain. We did not understand that the century we are in is **the "century of nationalities"**.

We did not think of utilising this social power for the benefit of Islam and Ottomanism.

Anyway, what is done is done. The idea of nationality did whatever it was possible to do against Islam.

Finally it was the turn of the Islamic World to use this weapon. Until now, the basic thoughts of all Muslims were as follows:

"There is only one true State on earth and that is the Islamic State. In practice whichever state is under the rule of

The Caliph of Islam is the only power in whose justice all MUSLIMS can take REFUGE."

In practice, the nationalities are temporary and are nothing but coercion. Soon a master, a saviour, a guide will come and rescue them from this evil bondage.

The sermons read in the name of **the Caliph** during Friday and Eid prayers and the gatherings in Arafat on the days of Hajj are the harbingers of the political future.

This thought is undoubtedly a state of mind that fills the hearts of all of us with holy and sublime fervour. If a theoretical happiness could be sufficient for the lives of billions of people, a goal in the heart would be sufficient for us.

But if it is not enough for it to exist only in the theoretical sphere, but must be a real existence, we must first of all endeavour to climb the steps of progress necessary for its attainment, one by one.

It can be seen that the Muslim tribes, while looking forward to a future happiness, are content to be represented by the governments and nations in which they live, first in terms of language and economy, and then in terms of thought and morals.

It is good to wait for a great liberation. But there are some small, easy and step-by-step ways of salvation, and it is against **the Sunnah** (*the order established by ALLAH*) to reach the other without achieving them.

Yes!... Let us wait for a general and real saviour!

But in accordance with **the** miraculous declaration of **the Holy Qur'an**, "*Li kulli kavmin Had*" (*Every tribe HAS its own SAVIOUR*), why should we not look with hope for local and national saviours, for linguistic, educational, economic and moral institutions?

We have seen with our own eyes how Christian nations have achieved a progressive future. They began by nationalising their language.

Language independence is the first step towards national independence. When a tribe loves its national language and begins to build its national literature on that language, it has received the promise of salvation.

After **language comes "history"**. If a people reaches the earliest sources of its history and hears the first breakthroughs in the development of its national life, it will have found its lost soul again.

With the light it receives from history, it creates **the national spirit in** its entirety by adding the epics (*tales*), myths (*stories*) and narratives that the people extract from the depths. Then, it takes the subjects of poetry and art, literary arts such as **allegory**⁽³⁴⁾ and **telmih**⁽³⁵⁾ from these sources and gives personality to literature and fine arts.

These are followed by religion, education and economy. A free national education depends first on national language and national history, and then on the principles of economic independence. And it draws all its spiritual light from religion.

There is an important belief of the Naqshbandis which is summarised in the following idiom:

"Nazar ber kadem..." ⁽³⁶⁾

If a man's *kademi* (*FOOT*) is to be a man, his *NAZARI* (*eye, GAZE*) should be a general.

A private should endeavour to become a corporal, that is, he should be close to his echelon (foot).

In our country, we still turn a blind eye to fights and looting among the tribes of our religion.

It is a very strange thing to think that **"Islamic unity"** can be realised immediately just by asking for it. Islam has condemned and forbidden showing racism and racial discrimination as *"ignorance"*.

But what is meant by racial favouritism here is tribal nationalism, which is still going on among ourselves.

The expressions *"Beni Kahtan"* and *"Beni Adnan"* are also proof of the fact that these abuses and prohibitions belong to the tribes.

Just as Islam permits tribalism in the above-mentioned verse, it has also found it appropriate to divide into tribes and communities, i.e. tribes and nations, with the following verse, provided that there is an acquaintance and agreement between them.

"We have created you in nations and tribes so that you may know one another..."

It may be possible in the distant future for all Muslims to unite in a political union. However, it is certain that this will be impossible for a very long time.

In that case, will the Muslim tribes be deprived of their national awakening, their national struggle and therefore of their progress, or at least of their social independence?

We have already said that the weapon of nationality can henceforth be used only in favour of the Muslims. This is because the idea of nationality is a weapon which can be used only for the liberation of a captive people from this captivity and dependence. Now, there is no non-Muslim tribe left under the rule of Islamic governments. Nevertheless, today, most of the Muslim tribes are in a state of captivity and dependence on non-Muslims (*Turks in Russian and Chinese captivity*).

Since there are no such conditions of dependence and independence among the Muslim tribes, ***the ideas of "nationalism"*** do not lead to conflicts among Muslims.

On the contrary, as the ***idea of "nationality"*** grows stronger, the idea of ***"Islamic ummahism"*** will be cultivated to the same extent and will nourish and strengthen the existing culture.

- END

[34](#) **Allegory:** It actually means borrowing. In literature, it is called using the meaning of a word temporarily for another word. It is an incomplete art of analogy.

[35](#) **Telmih:** It is the art of deliberately using one or more words or phrases to remind a past event or a person, a famous work, word or anecdote known by everyone. On the arts of literature, see **Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Literary Knowledge/Osman Nuri Ekiz**, Toker Publications, Istanbul.

[36](#) **"Nazar ber kadem...":** An idiom meaning that a person who enters the Naqshbandi order does not pay attention to the environment and stays only on the path of the order in order not to deviate to other thoughts and paths.