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Abstract

Ziya Gökalp has been credited as the architect of Turkish nationalism, having provided the framework for social and cultural solidarity among Turks in the Turkish Republic through his writings *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (1918) and *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (1923). Scholars - notably Heyd, Parla, and Berkes – have examined and analyzed Gökalp’s non-fiction works in order to provide a greater understanding of the Turkish intellectual’s social and political thought. Yet Gökalp also left behind a large body of fictional works, including poetry, epics, and folk tales, that have been largely neglected in the scholarship. The aim of this work is to look at Gökalp’s fictional works alongside his political and social writings in order to better understand the purpose and views of such an influential and controversial figure.
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Introduction

Throughout the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire faced a series of external crises that threatened its stability and integrity. Meanwhile, the rise of ethnic-nationalism among minority Ottoman subjects was jeopardizing the integrity of the historically multi-ethnic and multi-confessional empire from within. Bureaucrats and intellectuals, struggling to maintain the empire, initiated a series of reforms known as the *Tanzimat*. Tanzimat reformers developed the idea of and advocated for *Osmanlılık* (Ottomanism) in an attempt to reverse internal splintering by fostering a sense of loyalty to the Ottoman state as well as a shared identity among peoples across ethnic, linguistic, and confessional lines. Ottoman subjects, Muslims and non-Muslims alike, were largely unreceptive to Ottomanism, which ultimately failed to slow the growth of nationalist sentiments among the empire’s non-Muslim and non-Turkish populations.

After the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 struck a final blow to Ottomanism, Ottoman intellectuals argued for alternative paths for developing a collective identity and social solidarity, a process widely understood as integral to modernization and necessary for preserving the empire. Westernism (frequently conflated with modernity), Islamism, and pan-Turkism emerged as the most promising concepts to achieve unity, although they were generally thought to be competing and incompatible schools of thought. It was in this contentious intellectual environment that Ziya Gökalp began to develop and put forth...
his ideas on Turkism, a concept that rejected the notion that Turkishness, Islam, and Westernism were conflicting identities and paths to modernity; to the contrary, he asserted that all three were not only complementary but crucial to the well-being and success of Ottoman society.

Although Gökalp’s Turkism could not save the Ottoman Empire, his social and political ideology survived the empire’s dissolution and helped to shape the national identity of the Turkish nation-state that subsequently emerged. Indeed, it is difficult to overstate Gökalp’s influence on modern Turkey - politically, economically, socially, and culturally – even if the fruit of his ideology is often subtle and indirect. Following Gökalp’s death in 1924, Turkish politician and intellectual Ruşen Eşref [Ünaydın] wrote that “in science and knowledge there are two Turkeys, before Gökalp and after Gökalp;”¹ his legacy is complex and contested, and numerous scholars have examined his life and works in an attempt to better understand his ideology and role in Turkish history.

The two major English-language works on Gökalp that have, for the most part, determined the dominant narratives regarding Gökalp are Uriel Heyd’s *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp* (1950) and Taha Parla’s *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp: 1876-1924* (1985). Heyd and Parla primarily examine Gökalp’s published political works to write intellectual histories that provide a deeper insight into his worldview, yet come to radically different conclusions on his role and abilities as an intellectual.

Heyd’s *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism* begins with a brief biography of Gökalp, followed by a breakdown of Gökalp’s philosophy and teachings based principally on his published non-fiction writings. Heyd’s purpose is to “describe Gökalp’s life and teachings systematically and critically,” being focused solely on his role “as the theorist of modern nationalism.” While Heyd’s work is sympathetic to Gökalp, the author makes it clear that he does not consider the Turkish intellectual to be a consistent and systematic thinker, noting that “[i]t has been necessary […] to sift all these [collections of writings] in order to discover his ideas and weave them as far as possible into a connected system of thought. This process reveals various changes of opinion and inner contradictions in different periods of his life.” He categorizes Gökalp’s thought not only as often inconsistent, but also unoriginal, insisting that the Turkish ideologue simply reframed the works of Durkheim and other prominent Western thinkers to fit the Turkish context. Furthermore, as a public intellectual, Gökalp should be recognized for his role in shaping the early development of Turkish nationalism but cannot claim any notable credit for affecting Kemalism or molding the Turkish Republic under Atatürk.

Parla’s *Social and Political Thought*, however, aims to carry out a “systematic and critical analysis of the meaning and influence of Ziya Gökalp’s political theory.” In doing so, he argues against Heyd’s conclusions on a number of points. First, Parla

---

3 Heyd, 162.
4 Heyd, xi.
pointedly disagrees with Heyd’s characterization of Gökalp’s thought as illogical, though he does not disagree with Heyd’s assertion that Gökalp “should be considered at least as logical in his sociological theory as the European sociologists he emulated, in order for Heyd to be consistent himself.” Parla also takes issue with Heyd’s assertion that Gökalp had limited influence on post-war Turkey. To the contrary, Parla argues:

Gökalp’s corporatist thinking has provided the paradigmatic worldview for the several dominant political ideologies and public philosophies in Turkey; and that, more specifically, Unionism (1908-1918) and Kemalism (1923-1950) as singular official ideologies, as well as contemporary Kemalism(s) (1960-1980), are but programmatic and, in the narrow sense, ideological variations of his inclusive system. Indeed Gökalp’s corporatist model was the earliest, most articulate, and most democratic one in the Turkish Republic.  

At the very least, Parla remarks, Gökalp “provided the conceptual framework and the political terminology for both [Unionists and Kemalists]” and that “distortions of his thought, purposive or unwitting, were equal to, if not greater than, his direct influence and accepted proposals.” Parla goes on to claim that, despite his influence – regardless of how direct or indirect that was - Gökalp would have likely rejected the authoritarian bent of the Kemalist regime, an assertion that is very likely correct.

While the works of Heyd and Parla both provide impressive critical insight into Gökalp’s social and political theory, their arguments are both necessarily limited by the fact that they primarily take into account his non-fiction writings, thus providing an incomplete view of the Turkish thinker. As Erol Köröğlu notes, “all studies in the field of Turkism are devoid of historical context and are, in a way, free-floating, independent,

---

6 Parla, 9.
7 Parla, 7.
8 Parla, 15.
boxes of thought.” The modest hope of this work is to contribute to a more complete understanding of Gökalp by analyzing and historicizing his literary output alongside his social and political writings and, more specifically, to address the question of whether or not his thought on Turkish nationalism was racist and expansionist. Gökalp’s writings went beyond the social and political and he was, in fact, a prolific writer of folk tales and poetry – even if he was not a particularly talented one, by his own admission. Having sifted through his writings, I have selected a number of his poems and folk tales from different periods of his intellectual life that are, firstly, representative – in that they clearly articulate dominant ideas and themes present in his non-fiction writing – and second, that provide a fuller picture of Gökalp’s evolving ideas.

I argue that, while Gökalp no doubt held views that are understood as problematic in a twenty-first-century context, accusations that he promoted a racist and expansionist ideology are without solid foundation. Nationalism demands, in most if not all of its iterations, erasure of non-dominant identities and assimilation into a dominant identity. Nationalism based on a specific ethnicity, as with Gökalp’s emphasis on the shared language, culture, and religion of the nation, is inherently exclusionary. It would be remiss, however, to fail to acknowledge that Gökalp’s Turkism did not call for the establishment of a political and territorial Turkish nation or an expansionist Turanist nation. Instead, his works repeatedly emphasize the necessity of developing a shared cultural identity within the Ottoman context, a sense of cultural solidarity that was present among non-Turks and severely lacking among the Turks in the empire. He

---

sought to accomplish this through education and revival of traditional Turkish culture, not through the creation of an ethnically homogenous nation.
The Development of Competing Nationalisms in the Late Ottoman Empire, 1876-1908

By the end of the nineteenth century, nationalism was on the rise among the Ottoman Empire’s non-Turkish subjects. The millet system, which had historically been divided into Greek Orthodox, Armenian, Jewish, and Muslim identities, began to break down as communities – specifically, non-Turkish, non-Muslim communities - increasingly asserted specific ethnic identities (i.e. Albanian, Serbian, Bulgarian, etc.). Reformers inadvertently strengthened these identities through the reorganization of the millet system during Tanzimat, creating new charters which gave greater power to laypersons at the expense of the clergy. The primary aims of the reorganization were to diminish European intervention in the affairs of Ottoman Christians and improve the position of Christians in the empire, thus subduing antagonism against the Ottoman state. However, the increased political participation and secular education that resulted from the millet reorganization stimulated nationalist sentiments.

In response to the internal threat posed by the growth of nationalisms, Tanzimat reformers developed the idea of Osmanlılık, or Ottomanism, in order to create a shared identity among the empire’s varied ethnic and religious groups. Further, reformers

---


12 Davison, 132-133.
believed that by making all Ottoman subjects equal under the law and promoting a more inclusive system, nationalist sympathies among non-Turkish subjects would collapse. Şükrü Hanioğlu notes that prior to the Nationality Laws of 1864, the term Osmanlı had never been used as an identity marker for the sultan’s subjects and that “the very concept of unitary territorial state-nation made homogenous by common lay citizenship had no precedent in Ottoman or Islamic history.”

The state aggressively promoted Ottomanism through press organs, referring to the empire as an ittihad-i Osmani (Ottoman Union), encouraged coverage of stories that demonstrated Muslim and Christian unity, and championed Ottomanism as a bulwark against the pan-Slavic threat.

Despite enthusiastic attempts by Tanzimat statesmen and writers to create pan-national social solidarity and prevent further internal fracturing, there was little realistic chance that Ottomanism would ever succeed. The Ottoman identity was imposed from above “without grounding in any organic, psychological and cultural roots shared commonly among the entire population.” Moreover, the empire lacked the ability to foster such roots among its population. Having no centralized system of education to instill Ottomanism among the people, the government could not compete with the ethno-religious schools that served to inculcate national identities among non-Muslims. Print media were ineffective for spreading propaganda among a predominantly illiterate

---

15 Karpat, 316.
population, and low newspaper circulation during this period ensured that Ottomanism had a limited impact even among the literate elite.\textsuperscript{16}

Ottomanism was also unsuccessful due to the fact that Tanzimat reforms often failed to materialize from theory into practice. Despite superficial efforts to include non-Muslims in government, Kemal Karpat asserts that “parliamentary debates were monopolized by the Muslim deputies, who acted as the ‘true representative of the nation’ and did not miss any opportunity to affirm the Islamic character of the state and the ‘sacred’ rights of the sultan-caliph.”\textsuperscript{17} Ottomanism was not able to create a shared sense of nationhood among the empire’s Muslim, Christian, and Jewish populations; to the contrary, by the end of the nineteenth century, Christians had become “almost totally estranged from the Empire, as they regarded Ottomanism as a Muslim ideology of unity.”\textsuperscript{18} However, the failure of Ottomanism to take root “prompted the Turks to focus inwardly on their own identity” although they had not yet embraced the concept of Turkish nationalism.\textsuperscript{19} By and large, Ottoman elites rejected the idea of Turkism until the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 and the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913, and even then they only selectively considered the promotion of a Turkish identity within an Ottomanist framework. For the most part, Turkish intellectuals and elites adhered to the belief that the empire could still be saved and feared that Turkish nationalism would encourage nationalist sentiments among non-Turkish communities.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{16} Hanioğlu, 85-86.  
\textsuperscript{17} Karpat, 316.  
\textsuperscript{18} Karpat, 320.  
\textsuperscript{19} Hanioğlu, 86.  
\textsuperscript{20} Hanioğlu, 86.
Ottomanism had unintentionally served to reify the shared sense of identity among the empire’s Muslims. Sultan Abdülhamid II, who had ascended to the throne in 1876, rejected the notion that Ottomanism and Tanzimat reforms alone could hold the empire together. Instead, he embraced the revitalized Muslim solidarity and promoted a synthesis of Ottomanism and Islamism – another prominent solidarity movement that had arisen in response to Christian separatist movements. By 1878, the empire’s loss of Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro, and Serbia meant that it had also lost a significant portion of its Christian population, increasing the empire’s Muslim majority. While Tanzimat reformers sought to create an ittihad-i Osmani, after 1878 many Islamist intellectuals and bureaucrats were working increasingly towards an ittihad-i İslam, a political conception of Muslim unity that went beyond the traditional concept of a spiritual ümmet to expand the sultan-caliph’s influence beyond Ottoman borders.  

Although by all accounts Abdülhamid was sincere in his beliefs and duties as a Muslim and the caliph, he appeared to have understood that Islamism was also politically advantageous for the empire and sultanate. The sultan feared that the Arab separatist movement would result in the loss of Arab territories much as Balkan separatist movements had resulted in the independence of Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro, and Serbia in the late nineteenth century. Abdülhamid reached out to Arab notables and, as a result, “many Arabs considered themselves bona fide Ottomans.”  

Significantly, Karpat

---

21 Findley, 149.
22 Karpat, 321.
argues, Abdulhamid placed the ümmeť “above the state and [gave] the caliphate priority over the sultanate in its relationship with the [Muslim] community.”

By the early twentieth century, ethno-nationalist consciousness had reached fever pitch amongst the various Ottoman communities in the Balkans and was a growing concern elsewhere within the empire, “both despite and because of Ottomanism-Islamism.” For many Ottoman intellectuals, it was becoming increasingly clear that neither Ottomanism nor Islamism would be able to provide a national identity and sense of unity among the Ottoman population. Yusuf Akçura, Tatar intellectual and early advocate of Turkish nationalism, laid bare the deficiencies of both Ottomanism and Islamism in his 1904 article, “Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset” (“Three Styles of Policy”).

Akçura argued that Muslims, most especially Ottoman Turks, did not want the mixing and assimilation (karișma ve uyuşmayı) of populations that Ottomanism sought to achieve “[b]ecause [Ottomanism] would end their six-hundred year domination and they would be reduced to equality with the reaya, whom they were used to seeing as dominated subjects.” Ottomanism would result in the reaya entering the military and government in positions that had previously been the exclusive domain of Ottoman Muslims and, likewise, Muslims would be forced to enter “servile” (hakir) trades and industry. Furthermore, Muslims of the empire simply could not accept legally equal status with Ottoman Christians and Jews.

23 Karpat, 322.
24 Karpat, 325.
25 “Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset” was originally published in 1904 in the Cairo-based opposition newspaper, Türk, and republished as a pamphlet in 1912 in Istanbul.
27 Akçura, 28.
Equally as important, Akçura continued, non-Muslims had no desire for Ottoman unity:

Muslims, and especially Turks, had ended their independence and ruined their governments. Under Ottoman rule, they asserted, they had seen not justice but cruelty, not equality but contempt, not comfort but torment. […] The nineteenth century on the one hand, taught them their past, their rights, and their nationality; on the other hand, it weakened their rulers, the Ottoman state. To a degree, some of their ruled over brethren were able to win their independence.\(^{28}\)

Non-Muslims within the empire, Akçura concluded, were now understandably wary of the fact that the state was “extending its hand” to them and did not trust the government’s sincerity.\(^{29}\) International pressures, too, made Ottomanism a weak policy. The Russian Empire would not allow Ottoman unity, as it would interfere with Russia’s political, economic, national, and religious objectives. Europeans, he asserted, still viewed communal relations within the empire as warfare between Christians and Muslims, and hoped to save Ottoman Christians from the “Turkish yoke.”\(^{30}\)

Although Akçura roundly dismissed Ottomanism as a viable policy for national unity, he was less condemnatory towards Islamism. Political and social unity based upon a shared Muslim identity would “create an Islamic community stronger and more secure” than an Ottoman nation.\(^{31}\) More significantly, such a community would be larger and more able to endure against the Anglo-Saxon, German, Slav, Latin, and Chinese unions. Yet, he went on, external obstacles would prevent the success of Islamism: “On the one hand, all Islamic states are under the influence of Christian states, with one or two

---

\(^{28}\) Akçura, 29.
\(^{29}\) Akçura, 29.
\(^{30}\) Akçura, 29.
\(^{31}\) Akçura, 31.
exceptions. On the other hand, all Christian states rule over Muslim subjects, with one or two exceptions.\textsuperscript{32} In short, foreign powers would not allow their subjects to give allegiance to a politically powerful caliphate.

Still, he concluded, Islam remained a powerful identity marker and source of political and social unity for Turks. Although Akçura noted that Turkish nationalism as a policy of unification faces many obstacles and was in its infancy at the time of his writing, it faced significantly fewer obstacles than Ottomanism and Islamism. Most significantly for the author, he believed that Turkish nationalism would not be viewed as a threat to foreign powers, except for Russia. Indeed, European powers might support Turkish nationalism \textit{because} it would be perceived as a threat to Russia.\textsuperscript{33}

When Akçura published his article, Turkish nationalism was not yet the powerful movement it would become. Indeed, Akçura and Gökalp would be the chief intellectuals to mold Turkish nationalism, though their opinions diverged in a number of crucial ways that will be explored further on.

At the turn of the twentieth century, opposition to Sultan Abdülhamid II had gained steam in the form of the Young Turk movement. Members of the Young Turk movement began to come together in the late nineteenth century; they shared no cohesive ideology, aside from opposition to the autocratic sultan and the goal of a parliamentary government. It wasn’t until the decade preceding the Young Turk Revolution that their ideas began to take on a more coherent form with credible objectives and “shift[ed] from grand theories aimed at reshaping the world order to simpler and more narrowly political

\textsuperscript{32} Akçura, 33.
\textsuperscript{33} Akçura, 34-35.
It was at this time that the Young Turks began adopting more Turkist positions.

Hanioğlu argues, however, that Young Turks were motivated by political opportunism rather than genuine belief in Turkism, seeing Turkism as an instrument to make their goals appealing to certain audiences, particularly as they became a more overtly political organization. Indeed, their propaganda was inconsistent in its views and alternatively played Turkist, Islamist, and Ottomanist cards, depending on their audience and aims. Still, Turkism was quickly becoming a dominant ideological current prior to the 1908 Revolution, even changing the central principals of Ottomanism. Initially, Ottomanism had extolled the importance of legal equality among the various ethnicities and religions under the Ottoman state. Abdülhamid continued to support this ideology, but raised the role of Muslims within the empire, resulting in Muslims being akin to something like first among equals.35 Under the Young Turks, Turks and their language, culture, and religion often took the place of Islam in Abdülhamid’s Ottomanism-Islamism in that Turks were proclaimed “the dominant nation.”36

The Committee of Union and Progress’ (CUP) emphasis on Turks as the dominant nation in their Ottomanist framework and the policies they implemented as a result led to heightened tensions among non-Turkish communities following the 1908 revolution. The CUP sought to implement strong centralization policies and assert control over the empire which often meant, as Erol Ülker notes, bulldozing over any

34 Hanioğlu, 289.
35 Hanioğlu, 298-301.
36 Hanioğlu, 300.
ethnic and cultural privileges that might stand in the way of their goal. The CUP’s emphasis on Turkish dominance in an Ottomanist framework in conjunction with their centralizing policies led to accusations by non-Turkish communities that the CUP was, indeed, attempting to assimilate and “Turkify” the empire’s varied communities. Ülker goes on to persuasively argue that, in fact, the CUP’s ultimate aim “was by no means the cultural assimilation of sundry communities into Turkishness” but rather to establish control over peripheral regions of the empire through the carrying out of a “civilizing mission” among peripheral populations. As an example, the CUP allowed the establishment of Kurdish schools to advance Kurdish language and literature, a fact clearly at odds with accusations of a mission of Turkification. The CUP’s centralization policies did, however, lead to increased tensions between the regime and the empire’s non-Turkish communities, ultimately resulting in a collapse in relations in 1913. It wasn’t until the Balkan Wars that the Young Turk government began to pursue Turkification in earnest.

Following the loss of the empire’s Balkan territories, Anatolia and the Arab provinces – and thus largely Turkish and Muslim demographics – were what remained of the Ottoman Empire, bolstering claims of Turkish domination. The Albanian revolt in particular was a shock to the Young Turks, as the Albanians were viewed as a trusted Muslim community who had a long and respected history within the empire’s military and government. Subsequently, the CUP decided that “it was impossible to reconcile

38 Ülker, 619. 
39 Ülker, 619-621.
different interests and attain a unified empire through an Ottomanist policy.\textsuperscript{40} Although the CUP stepped back from their centralization policies in the Arab provinces in the hopes of strengthening loyalty to the empire among the Arab periphery, Anatolia was repositioned as the heart of the empire and became the focus of the government’s Turkification efforts. The Young Turks’ post-1913 Turkification policies were an “attempt to create a Turkish national core at the heart of the imperial conglomerate.”\textsuperscript{41}

Between 1913 and 1918, the CUP set out to nationalize Anatolia in earnest by implementing economic, demographic, and territorial nationalization policies. Ülker gives the example of the Ottoman government forbidding the use of foreign languages in commercial transactions in order to unseat the Armenian and Greek bourgeoisies and replace them with a Turkish commercial class. Most notable of the CUP’s nationalization policies was the disastrous forced migrations of non-Muslim populations from Anatolia and the relocation and assimilation of non-Turkish Muslims into Anatolia. Meanwhile, the CUP continued to appeal to its Arab population outside of Anatolia through use of rhetoric of Muslim unity and conceding some political and cultural autonomy to its Arab provinces, with the goal of lessening separatist sentiments. Ülker also points to a more practical issue that encouraged CUP concessions to Ottoman Arab territories, specifically that the regime simply lacked the ability to impose its full will on the far-flung regions of the empire.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{40} Ülker, 622.
\textsuperscript{41} Ülker, 631.
\textsuperscript{42} Ülker, 622-624.
It was in this milieu that Ziya Gökalp began formulating and publishing his ideas about Turkish national consciousness and cultural solidarity. As a young man, Gökalp struggled personally with the tensions between Western ideas of modernity, traditional Islamic values, and the rising importance of ethnic identity that were being argued over in Istanbul. Coming of age in this environment had a profound impact in shaping his worldview and his bourgeoning ideas on national identity.
The Early Life of and Intellectual Influences on Ziya Gökalp

Born in 1875 or 1876, during the advent of Abdülhamid II’s reign and the First Constitutional period, Mehmet Ziya [Gökalp] came of age during what was perhaps one of the most politically turbulent periods in the history of the Ottoman Empire. He would live to see the collapse of the empire, the founding of the Turkish republic, and radical transformations in political, cultural, and social institutions – many changes that he directly or indirectly influenced, despite his insistence on remaining behind the scenes in politics. Like many of his prominent Young Turk and Unionist contemporaries, Gökalp was born far from the cosmopolitan imperial center. He grew up in Diyarbakır, a provincial town and cultural frontier heavily populated by Kurds and Armenians as well as Turks, “amidst conflicting national traditions.”

The son of a provincial bureaucrat, Gökalp received a relatively privileged education that would play a profound role in shaping his views. In his article, “Babamın Vasiyeti” (“My Father’s Testament”), Gökalp related an anecdote regarding his father’s uncertainty over how his son should be educated: “If I send him to Europe, he might...”

43 Parla, Social and Political Thought, 10. As Parla and others have noted, the possibility of Gökalp being of Kurdish heritage was used by his opponents to discredit him and his ideas regarding Turkish nationalism. Nationalists have argued that the town of his family’s origins, Çermik, was historically Turkish. As for Gökalp, he understood race and ethnicity to be irrelevant to one’s national identity, instead regarding language, culture, and self-identification to be the most important factors in determining national belonging. However, he does note that the uncertainty of his ethnic identity was a major impetus in leading him to examine national identity. See also Heyd, Foundations of Turkish Nationalism, 21.
become a gâvur [unbeliever], but if he stays here, he will become an ass."

It was decided that Gökalp would receive both a traditional Islamic education at home under the tutelage of his uncle Hasip Efendi, a Muslim scholar, and later a modern European education at the local military secondary school. Under Hasip Efendi, Gökalp learned Arabic and Persian and became familiar with the works of significant Muslim (particularly Sufi) scholars, most notably those of Al-Ghazāli, Ibn Sīnā, Ibn ‘Arabī, and Jalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī. Gökalp’s father, “an ardent patriot who knew how to blend his religious beliefs with liberal and progressive opinions,” also made it a point to expose him to the writings of Namik Kemal.

Following the completion of his primary school education under Hasip Efendi, Gökalp went on to study at the Diyarbakır askeri rüştiye (military middle school). During this period, he voraciously consumed novels, poetry, and folk stories – a habit that would influence his own writing in the future. However, after losing his father at the age of fourteen or fifteen, Gökalp was forced to complete his education at the local idadiye. It was here that Gökalp was initially exposed to revolutionary ideas and European philosophies by progressive teachers, many of whom had been exiled from Istanbul to Diyarbakır by Abdülhamid for their revolutionary views. Abdullah Cevdet, who was a strong advocate of modernization via Westernism and would later play a key role in founding the CUP at the Military Medical Academy in Istanbul, first introduced Gökalp to European organicist sociology and the materialist philosophy of Herbert Spencer, Gustave Le Bon, Gabriel Tarde, and Ernst Haeckel alongside the writings of

---

44 Parla, 11.
45 Heyd, 22-23.
Ziya Pasha and Ahmet Midhat Efendi. Most significantly, Cevdet would ultimately be responsible for bringing Gökalp into the CUP’s fold.\textsuperscript{46}

At eighteen or nineteen years old, after graduating from the \textit{idadiye}, Gökalp attempted suicide.\textsuperscript{47} In his article “\textit{Hocamın Vasiyeti}” (“My Teacher’s Testament”), he portrayed his attempted suicide as having been triggered by inner conflict and severe depression brought on by his inability to reconcile rationalist (European) and mystical (Islamic) philosophies. Referring to the event using the Durkheimian term “anomic suicide,” he asserted that he was driven to despair by “the contradictory ideas that had seized him: mysticism vs. natural sciences, ideals vs. positive facts and objective conditions, mind vs. matter, emotion vs. reason, necessity of natural law vs. freedom of will.”\textsuperscript{48} Parla speculates that Gökalp’s explanation of his suicide attempt as a philosophical conflict was a later reframing of the event, and the more likely cause was anxiety over direction in life,\textsuperscript{49} while Heyd asserts that the suicide attempt was likely in response to family and financial problems.\textsuperscript{50} Still, Parla argues that there was “a definite social dimension” to the attempt, which “took place in the larger context of Gökalp’s search for social and political anchorage in a period of despotic rule and many local social problems to which he was sensitized.”\textsuperscript{51}

At any rate, Gökalp’s brother, Nihat, saw his depression and resolved to bring his brother back to Istanbul with him. Having arrived in Istanbul around 1896 without the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{46} Parla, \textit{Social and Political Thought}, 11.  \\
\textsuperscript{47} Gökalp attempted suicide by shooting himself and, although he survived, the bullet would remain lodged in his brain until his death.  \\
\textsuperscript{48} Parla, 12.  \\
\textsuperscript{49} Parla, 12.  \\
\textsuperscript{50} Heyd, 26.  \\
\textsuperscript{51} Parla, 12.
\end{flushright}
knowledge of the rest of his family and with no financial support, Gökalp was forced to enroll in the Veterinary College (Mülliye Baytar Mekteb-i Alisi), the only college where he was not charged for tuition or room and board.\textsuperscript{52} He would never graduate, however, as his political activities quickly took priority over his academic duties. He became involved in the secret anti-Hamidian society, then known as the Committee of Ottoman Union (later the Committee of Union and Progress), through his connection to Cevdet. As a consequence of his oppositional political activities, he was imprisoned for ten months during his first or second year at college and subsequently sent back to Diyarbakır.

During his time at the Veterinary College and in prison, Gökalp became acquainted with the pivotal works on Turkish history and language by Ahmet Vefik Paşa, Süleyman Paşa, and Leon Cahun. Most significantly, he developed a strong friendship with Hüseyinzade Ali, the Azerbaijani intellectual and pan-Turkist ideologue from the Russian Empire, who was in Istanbul teaching at the School of Military Medicine (which was, much like the Military Academy, an incubator for revolutionary thought).\textsuperscript{53} The Turkist ideas brought from Russia by Hüseyinzade Ali – as well as his Turkic compatriots from the Russian Empire, Yusuf Akçura and Ahmet Agaoğlu – would profoundly shape Gökalp’s ideological development.

\textsuperscript{52} Heyd, 25-27.  
\textsuperscript{53} Parla, 12.
The Russian Roots of Turkish Nationalism

Pan-Turkism and Turkish nationalism in the Ottoman Empire and later Turkey have their origins in the Russian Empire. As multi-ethnic and multi-confessional empires, both the Ottoman Empire and Russian Empire were “shaken by the development of national ‘subjects’ and ‘aliens’” and experienced increasingly autocratic regimes towards the end of the nineteenth century.\(^5^4\) There were notable differences, however, that resulted in wildly different trajectories in the development of national identities among Muslim Turks in the two empires.

According to Karpat, “the rapid development of capitalism in Russia permitted the rise of a Russian entrepreneurial class in Azerbaycan and Kazan, the areas that played decisive leadership roles in the Muslim national revival.”\(^5^5\) Nineteenth-century Azerbaijan, in particular, felt the effects of social and ethnic anxieties following the discovery of oil in Baku and the city’s subsequent population explosion. The autocratic and anti-Ottoman policies of Alexander II alongside the spread of modern education (largely funded by the Muslim middle class) led to the blossoming of religious and national identities among Turkic Muslims within the empire.\(^5^6\) While the intellectuals of the Ottoman Empire during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were

\(^{54}\) Georgeon, 7.
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primarily concerned with maintaining the state and inspiring unity among its multi-ethnic, multi-religious peoples, Turkic intellectuals within the Russian Empire were focused on asserting their ethnic and religious identities against the state’s attempts at Russification. For many Ottoman intellectuals, Islam was viewed as a roadblock on the path to modernity, especially following the promotion of Islamism under the absolutist Abdülhamid and the rise of positivism. Such a view of Islam was not held by Turkic intellectuals in the Russian Empire; to the contrary, Islam was embraced as a crucial aspect of Turkic identity.

Ismail Gaspirali (Gaspirinskii), born to a middle-class Crimean family in 1851, was one of the earliest and most prominent Turkic intellectuals in Russia to push for a fusion of Islam, modernity, and ethnic nationalism, making him a forerunner to both Hüseyinzade Ali and Ziya Gökalp. His two major contributions to pan-Turkic, pan-Islamic nationalism within the Russian Empire were the opening of a modern school in Crimea (a model which spread rapidly through Muslim Turkic communities) and founding the nationalist newspaper Tercüman (Interpreter) which used simplified language based on Istanbul Turkish and incorporated words from other Turkic languages. Tercüman was “regularly smuggled in and easily obtained” in Istanbul between 1896 and 1908, a fact that made his ideas readily accessible to Turkish intellectuals in the Ottoman Empire.57

For Gaspirali, Islam was central to the identity of Turks. In other words, non-Muslim Turkic peoples such as the Gagauz, Chuvash, and Karaim were not included in
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his vision of a Turkish nation. However, he used the term “Tatar” rather than “Turk” until 1905, when he began advocating for a pan-Turkist, pan-Islamic identity to unite Muslim Turkic communities within Russia and opposed the fracturing of Turkic communities along ethno-nationalist lines (e.g. Crimeans, Kazans, and so on).

While Gökalp readily acknowledged the immense contributions Gaspirali made to the formation of modern Turkish nationalism, he credited the Azerbaijani intellectual Hüseyinzade Ali with bringing Turkism to Istanbul from Russia via his teachings at the Military Medical Academy and his poem, Turan. Hüseyinzade was born in Baku in 1864 and went to university in St. Petersburg, where he became a physician.

Intellectually influenced by nationalist ideologues such as fellow Azerbaijani intellectual Ahunzade Mirza Feth Ali, Hüseyinzade developed his own form of Turkish nationalism. Turkish identity, he asserted, consisted of three crucial elements: Turkish, Islamic, and European, an argument he put forth in his work Türkleştirmek, İslamaştirmak, Avrupalılaştırılmak and which Gökalp would fully embrace. In his view, Turks should be united under the “spiritual guidance” of the Ottoman Empire based on their cultural and linguistic commonalities. He also advocated for unity of all Turanians although, like Gökalp, he appeared to advocate it as “a myth employed to mobilize and unite youth,
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59 One of Gökalp’s major works, Türkleştirmek, İslamaştırmak, Muasırlaştırmak, takes its title and ideas directly from Hüseyinzade’s work, Türkleştirmek, İslamaştırma, Avrupalılaştırma, only changing Europeanization (Avrupalılaştırma) to modernization (muasırlaştırma).

rather than a practical program for action.” Hüseyinzade came to Istanbul in 1889, where he taught at the Military Medical Academy and helped found the CUP. It was here that he met and befriended Gökalp.

Like Ismail Gaspirali and Hüseyinzade Ali, Yusuf Akçura came to Istanbul from the Russian Empire with his own vision of Turkism. François Georgeon notes that Akçura’s role in the development of Turkism in the Ottoman Empire has often been neglected, especially when compared to the attention paid to Gökalp. Georgeon attributes Akçura’s lesser status to the ideological shift of pan-Turkism throughout the twentieth century; while in the early twentieth century, pan-Turkism was “accompanied by a social and cultural program with largely progressive content. Only gradually, after the Russian Revolution and its condemnation by Mustafa Kemal, did pan-Turkism move to the ‘right’” and become associated with the more conservative elements of Turkish society. More practically, Akçura left few writings pertaining to his ideology; most of his books are works of history.

Much like his Turkist compatriots from the Russian Empire, Akçura came from a wealthy Turkic – in this case Tatar – family. Although Akçura was born in Simbirsk, Kazan in 1876, his family moved to Istanbul in his youth, where he attended the local rüşdiye before enrolling in the Harbiye Mektebi (Military Academy). A brief visit to Kazan as a young man sparked his interest in the power dynamics regarding ethnic nationalism:

---

61 Karpat, 375.
62 Georgeon, 3.
63 Georgeon, 3.
In the Ottoman capital Akçura lived in a modest house in Aksaray, the dilapidated quarter inhabited mostly by Muslim Turks. In contrast, he saw the cultivated, rich Christian bourgeoisie, protected by the European powers, living in the prosperous Pera section of Istanbul (today’s Beyoğlu). Then, during his visit to his native Kazan, Akçura met his wealthy, well-educated relatives, who were part of the local Tatar bourgeoisie and also enjoyed the respect of the Russian bureaucracy. They had fought for four hundred years to maintain their ethnic identity and Islamic faith under czarist rule and had managed to reform and modernize their society by remaining Tatar and Muslim. Akçura seems to have concluded that ethnic-racial purity, freedom from economic bondage, and a new, dynamic bourgeoisie were the ingredients necessary for a national revival and that the monarchy and Ottomanism were the main obstacles to it.64

Akçura’s vocal opposition to Abdülhamid resulted in his exile to Libya in 1897, but he managed to escape to Paris two years later where he studied at the École Libre des Sciences Politiques. Notably, this put him among the few Turkish intellectuals to receive a modern Western university education, where he absorbed the ideas of Tarde, Durkheim, and Sorel while “maintaining his identity as a Tatar-Turk and Muslim.”65 While in Paris, he worked closely with exiled members of the Young Turks, though he refused to officially join the CUP. After graduating from the École in 1903, he returned to Russia where he wrote his previously discussed manifesto on Turkish nationalism, Üç Tarz-i Siyaset, as well as a number of other articles on Muslim nationalist movements.

Akçura’s political activities, however, led to his being denounced as a traitor; he was forced to return to Istanbul. It was during this period that Akçura and Gökalp had a rather significant falling out. First, Akçura continued to refuse to join the CUP, a decision which led to the loss of his job at the University of Istanbul. Second, Akçura’s
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vision of Turkish nationalism as “a conceptual Turkism based on ethnicity-race,” was a source of contention between him and Gökalp.66

In Üç Tarz-i Siyaset, Akçura concluded that the solution to the empire’s identity crisis was not Ottomanism or Islamism, but an identity based on “race” (ırk) – specifically, the Turkish race. It is not entirely clear, though, how Akçura or his contemporaries viewed and understood race, and therefore it remains debatable as to how we should interpret his call for a national policy based upon the Turkish race. François Georgeon, in an attempt to shed some light on this question, examines the terms used by Akçura in discussing identity. The term Akçura most commonly used in Üç Tarz-i Siyaset was ırk, still commonly translated as race, which has its roots in an Arabic word referring to “purity of blood.”67 Less frequently, he also used the terms cins (meaning type, kind, or gender), kavım (people), and neseb (lineage). These three terms were frequently used in general among the Ottomans primarily to differentiate among different religious and social groups. The terms kavım and cins were typically used to differentiate between ethnicities.

Georgeon notes that, while ırk was in use among Akçura’s contemporaries, the way Akçura used it appears to have been relatively unusual, as if he was trying to “characterize a new reality.”68 Georgeon continues that the Turkish ethnic identity had always been used in reference to and subsumed by a wider Muslim identity, or the ümmet, and he argues that Akçura wanted the Turkish ırk to be understood and treated as

---

66 Karpat, 305.
67 Georgeon, 26.
68 Georgeon, 26.
an independent identity. Across the world, religion had become a secondary identity that “serve[d] races (ırklar),” such as in Russian Orthodoxy, German Protestantism, and Anglicanism. Likewise, he argued, Islam should become a secondary identity that served Turks rather than the then-prevailing norm.

In other words, Georgeon asserts, Akçura was not seeking exclusivity based around purity of blood but rather ethnicity, or a group of peoples sharing the same language, customs, and religion. At any rate, Akçura’s idea of an ethnically-exclusive national identity would clash with Gökalp’s vision of a national identity which, although chauvinistic in its own right, was much more inclusive and based on a shared culture, rather than on racial characteristics.
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Durkheimian Sociology and Corporatism

While numerous Ottoman and Turkic intellectuals shaped Gökalp’s views on Turkism, Islamism, and modernity, it was the French sociologist Émile Durkheim whose work most directly influenced Gökalp and shaped his worldview. Gökalp understood sociology as a “scientific discipline [that is] not only a science of society but also a science for society, whose findings are to be applied so as to ensure a healthy society.” Heyd takes a dim view of Gökalp’s use of Durkheim, asserting that Gökalp was “not an original thinker” and simply appropriated Durkheim’s theory. Parla vigorously disagrees with Heyd’s characterization, noting that Durkheim’s solidarism makes up only one part of Gökalp’s ideology. Moreover, he argues, the presence of Rousseau and Kant as well as Gökalp’s own original insights are just as visible in his ideology as Durkheim.

Gökalp was the first to introduce Durkheim to Ottoman intellectuals, who were still largely preoccupied with “nineteenth-century liberalism […] despite its mismatch with the Ottomans’ economic needs and communalistic values.” Indeed, Niyazi Berkes argues that Gökalp was the “real founder” of Turkish sociology since, unlike many of his predecessors in the Ottoman Empire who had studied sociology, Gökalp was the first to...
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use sociological thought in an original manner rather than a “mere translator or interpreter.” Gökalp found both liberalism and Marxism to be unsuitable solutions for the problems faced by Ottomans, instead finding a solution in Durkheim’s solidarism.

In *The Division of Labour in Society*, Durkheim argues that modern societies operate much like a biological organism; that is, individuals are interdependent and carry out specialized roles that allow a society to function as a unified whole, or what Durkheim referred to as organic solidarity. Organic societies evolved from simpler mechanical societies, in which individuals largely carried out the same role (i.e. subsistence farming) and were thus far more interdependent. The complexity of modern societies creates heterogeneous experiences and views, and thus the emergence of individuality was only possible in a modern, organic society. Still, while an individual consists of his own unique experiences, he remains attached to a larger social organism.

In Durkheim’s view, one of the greatest ills of modern society was pathological individualism, in which individuals are “without attachment to a social unit more important than themselves” and individual desires are unregulated. Modern society, then, must be regulated in order to remain healthy. Unregulated individualism and detachment is not simply a social problem, however, but was also an economic problem. In a complex society where levels of specialization are steadily increasing and
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competition is insufficiently regulated, division of labor must likewise be carefully regulated. Durkheim naturally eschewed classical liberalism as inadequately controlled, but also took issue with socialism. In a complex modern society, he asserted, the state would not be capable of adequately regulating economic activities. Durkheim proposed corporatism, in which social and economic regulations and individual interests would be managed by corporate groups that would act as intermediaries between individuals and the state. In solidaristic corporatism, in other words, “occupational groups and their corporations serve as a buffer between the Individual and the State” which instills “public-spiritedness [in] the otherwise egoistical Individuals” while also “check[ing] and restrain[ing] the State from encroaching upon the autonomous jurisdictional domain of respective corporations […] thereby also protecting the rights of Individuals.” Gökalp embraced Durkheim’s corporatism whole-heartedly, and would attempt to fuse corporatism with Turkish cultural norms in his later years to provide economic direction for the nation.
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The Dissolution of the Ottoman Empire and the Rise of Turkism, 1908-1914

After only a few short years in Istanbul as a student and prisoner, during which time Gökalp had become involved in Young Turk political activities and acquainted with important revolutionary thinkers, he was exiled to his hometown of Diyarbakır. While in exile, he began publishing poems on the peasantry and their economic struggles and eagerly consumed books on “natural sciences, philosophy, sociology, pedagogy, psychology, books in French on the ‘new sciences,’ works on Islamic philosophy, and mysticism, also resuming his study of Sufism (tasavvuf80).” He also became deeply acquainted with the works of the French sociologist Émile Durkheim, whose sociological theories would exert the greatest influence over Gökalp’s own political and social theories. Meanwhile in Istanbul, the Young Turks were successful in forcing Abdülhamid to restore the constitution, thus beginning the Second Constitutional era in 1908. They effectively ruled in the sultan’s place until he was officially deposed a year later. Following Abdülhamid’s deposition, Gökalp traveled to Salonica and became a member of the Central Committee of the Union and Progress Party.

After the events of 1913, the CUP was forced to deal with the fall-out that resulted from the nineteenth-century ascent of nationalist sentiments among its minority populations. While Ottomanism and Westernism had remained popular ideas to varying
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degrees among the Young Turks, the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 effectively crushed any lingering hope that Ottomanism could be successfully implemented. While the Young Turks did not officially adopt Turkism as a national policy, “their later actions, such as the attempt to Turkify the population of the empire, revealed the strength of Turkist ideas among them.”\(^{81}\) Although inspired by a number of his Turkist intellectual contemporaries, Gökalp would be the one ultimately responsible for “converting Turkishness into Turkism” and creating a systematic framework for Turkish nationalism.\(^{82}\) The evolution of his nationalist ideology can be roughly broken down into two periods, the first period being 1908 to 1914, when he developed his ideas and wrote articles that would ultimately be published as *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak (To Become Turkish, Islamic, and Modern)* in 1918, and the second being 1918 to 1923, the period in which he responded to the rapidly shifting political and social context resulting in his 1923 publication, *Türkçülüğün Esasları (Principles of Turkism).*

Despite the efforts of Tanzimat reformers, the Ottoman state had remained widely associated with Turks, or rather Turkish-speaking Muslims, as they were the most prominent and populous ethnic group within the empire - a fact that was understood and exploited by the Young Turks. By the late nineteenth century, there was extensive discussion over the issue of simplifying the Ottoman Turkish language, in particular the alphabet, to make it easier to learn and closer to colloquial Turkish. Writers such as Namık Kemal, Ahmet Mithat, and Yusuf Akçura were especially active in the drive to

\(^{82}\) Karpat, 356.
simplify Turkish, as they hoped to reach a broader audience through their newspapers and journals. “The idea of a new alphabet and the use of a simplified language, therefore, were an integral part of a type of populism that took ethnic form,” Karpat asserts, “since the language to be simplified was Turkish, and simplification brought it closer to the language spoken by the lower-class ethnic Turks.”

Publications such as Ahmet Cevdet’s *Ikdam* and Ahmet Mithat’s *Tercümani Hakikat* were early testing sites for Turkish linguistic populism. Despite the fact that most articles in these newspapers usually toed the line and promoted Ottomanism or Islamism, there were also articles that “seemed to lean definitely towards ethnic Turkishness” and created a popular foundation for Turkish ethnic-national identity.

*Ikdam* provided an outlet for Mehmet Emin, whom Karpat identifies as the earliest populist advocate of Turkishness. Emin’s poems were notable for rejecting stylistic imitation of so-called high civilizations – both Islamic and European – in favor of a more colloquial and realist Turkish aesthetic. Gökalp, too, strove to write poetry in simple, colloquial Anatolian Turkish with a folk aesthetic.

Historical writing was also a crucial step for the evolution of Turkishness. The Ottoman Historical Society was established in 1909 and, under the direction of Mehmet V, the Society’s aim was to connect the history of the Ottoman state to the people, specifically the Turks. As a result, the terms “Ottoman” and “Turk” became one and the same in the Society’s historical writings, whereas previously the term “Turk” had not
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been considered respectable. Furthermore, the growing attention paid to political and ethno-national history among intellectuals brought about “[t]he clash, long in the making, between a historically conditioned and popularly accepted Turkishness with a powerful ethos of its own and the state’s artificially construed ethnic identity.” This conflict would not escape Gökalp’s attention.

Mehmet Fuat Köprülü, the “father of Turkish national historiography,” was highly influential in the development of Turkishness in general and Gökalp’s Turkism in particular, although he was not a Turkist ideologue himself. In 1908, Köprülü began writing for the journals Türk Yurdu and Türk Ocağı. It was through his work with Turkist journals that he met Gökalp, and the two appeared to have a mutual intellectual impact on each other:

Köprülü’s main historical thesis was that the early Ottoman state was established by ethnic Turks whose folk culture blended heterodox Islam with ancient Turkic traditions and beliefs; this paralleled Gökalp’s staunch belief in a grassroots, purely Turkish ethnic culture that had survived centuries of Ottoman cosmopolitanism.

After 1913, the Committee of Union and Progress continued to promote Ottomanism in varying forms to different regions of the empire. As discussed earlier, the CUP pursued heavy-handed policies based on Turkish nationalism in Anatolia, while emphasizing the Islamic character of the empire in its Arab provinces. Turkishness would not reach maturity and find a true audience among the Ottoman elite until the
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dissolution of the empire following the First World War, when Anatolia was all that remained.

Meanwhile, Gökalp had spent his time in Diyarbakır and Salonika grappling with the apparently conflicting currents of Westernism, Islamism, and Turkishness. After returning to Istanbul in 1912, he began “single-mindedly formulating the outlines of a realistic, non-expansionist Turkish nationalism”\(^90\) Between 1912 and 1914, he published a series of articles in Türk Yurdu – the nationalist journal founded by Akçura – that articulated his ideas concerning the synthesis of Turkism, Islam, and modernity. Gökalp’s articles would be collected and published in 1918 under the title Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak, or To Become Turkish, Islamic, and Modern.

While other intellectuals and bureaucrats were arguing for the supremacy of one current of thought over another, Gökalp argued that Turkishness, Islam, and Westernism did not have to be clashing identities and, in fact, must be integrated. In Gökalp’s essay, “Üç Cereyan” (“Three Currents”) and “Halk Medeniyeti” (“People’s Civilization”), he carefully distinguished civilization (medeniyet) from culture (hars) – a distinction that is central to his ideology. Civilization, Gökalp asserts, is “born of the book,”\(^91\) or in other words, knowledge, science, and technology. The creation and use of philosophical, scientific, and technological knowledge is not bound to one nation and is thus an internationality (beyenmilleliyet). Culture, on the other hand, is a nation’s unique language, customs, arts, ethics, and other cultural institutions and this belongs only to the

\(^{90}\) Parla, 15.  
individual nation. Notably, unlike Akçura, Gökalp did not believe that Turkishness was a matter of lineage but rather based “solely on upbringing.”

Here it is necessary to divert our attention momentarily to the issue of who, according to Gökalp, belonged to the Turkish nation. Gökalp elaborated his views on the relationship between ethnicity and race in his essay, “Türkçülük Nedir?” (“What is Turkism?”). He argues that “racist Turkists” (ırkçı Türkçüler) have wrongly conflated race with nation, an absurd conflation in his view since race is biological and has no bearing on social characteristics. Individuals are not born with “linguistic, religious, moral, aesthetic, political, legal, or economic conscience,” which are values learned through education. Furthermore, the idea of a racially and ethnically pure society is a fictitious one, an idea upheld by ancient societies to bond them. A modern society, however, is bound by culture, and culture is passed on through education.

Returning to the topic of Turkism, Gökalp contended that, for the health of the nation, it was necessary for Ottoman society to freely adopt Western civilization while also reviving its Turkish and Islamic culture:

According to the science of anthropology, people who possess the same anatomic structure form a race (irk), and according to the science of sociology the nations that are united in the same civilization form an internationality. When the Turkish people (Türk kavmi) entered Islamic civilization, the Turkish language, words, and terms became Islamicized. Therefore the thing that constitutes the soul of
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internationality, and thus civilization, is the book. Accordingly, there is no conflict between Turkism and Islam, as one is a nationality, the other an internationality.\textsuperscript{98}

Gokalp goes on to argue that modern civilization, as it is being produced in Europe through its technological progress, must be imported until the Ottoman Empire is capable of manufacturing such technologies independently. Various aspects of Turkism, Islam, and European civilization must be carefully selected and used to revitalize the empire and its people:

As we have said, there is no conflict between Turkism and Islam. Also there is not a conflict between these and modernity. […] Therefore it is necessary that we accept these three separate ideals by identifying the boundaries of each respective field. […] To wit, today the Turkish nation belongs to the Ural-Altaic family, the Muslim ümmet, and the European internationality.\textsuperscript{99}

His view of culture and civilization as dichotomous is illuminating; Heyd notes that Gökalp’s approach to culture is “emotional,” and that he “usually attributes to culture all that is praiseworthy and attractive […] such as originality, simplicity, spontaneity, beauty, etc.”\textsuperscript{100} Gökalp’s emphasis on Turkish culture is therefore not surprising, particularly since he finds “Turks rich in culture but poor in civilization.”\textsuperscript{101} Further, his idea of reviving Turkish culture is critical, as he identified authentic Turkish culture as having been preserved by the lower class and the high culture of the Ottoman elites as a foreign and artificial amalgamation of Arab, Persian, and European cultures. Similarly, Islam as practiced by the Orthodox elites had been imported from Arab and Persian cultures and bore little resemblance to Islam as practiced among the peasantry. The gulf
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between the artificial high culture and the authentic folk culture was ultimately, he
contended, a major cause of Ottomanism’s failure and Turkification was a necessary

Gökalp went on to identify the dichotomy between eastern and western
civilizations that he believed existed within the empire as a significant source of tension
within Ottoman society and the failure of the Tanzimat reformers. Tanizmatists’
insistence on trying to maintain two sets of civilizational institutions – for example, the
existence of traditional medreses alongside European-style schools, two court systems,
two sets of laws - created confusion among the people and led to the decline of the
empire. Further, these European-style schools resulted in the growth of national
consciousness among the empire’s minority communities, a development that came
relatively late to the Turks.

Gökalp was absolutely correct in his observation that the Turks lagged behind in
the development of a national consciousness, as even though Turkism was slowly
ascendant among the elites at the time of his writing Türkleşmek, İslambilşmak,
Muasırlaşmak, it would not truly take hold for some time after World War I. The reason
for this, he explains, was that because the Ottoman state was founded by Turks and Turks
dominated state affairs for so long, they (mistakenly) conflated the Turkish nation with
the Ottoman state. “Turks intuitively steered clear of [Turkish nationalism] for a long
time, afraid to jeopardize the reality for the ideal. As a result of this, Turkish intellectuals

said, ‘There is no Turkishness, there is Ottomanism.’”

He argued that Ottomanism was an inherently flawed and ultimately detrimental idea, as one nation cannot sustain multiple cultures. Likewise, he dismissed Islamism as multiple nations belong to the Islamic ümmet and therefore an ümmet cannot be synonymous with the nation.

By examining a series of articles published between 1914 and 1917 in İslam Mecmuası (Journal of Islam), one can gain a deeper understanding of Gökalp’s views on the issue of religion and state. Applying Durkheim’s theory on division of labor to Islam, Gökalp argued that “[a] person may be a specialist in jurisprudence, but may not be in religion; and vice versa.” The mixing of the sacred and the profane resulted in a corruption of both:

The reason for our lagging behind other nations in religion and heedfulness lies in the backwardness of our judicial methods and practices in spite of the utmost perfection of the principles of our religion. It is because of the confusion of the two things that those who are dissatisfied with judicial conditions become unfaithful to religion in the long run. […] When muftis issue their religious judgments and qadis perform their judicial functions separately, both will succeed in maintaining the purity and integrity of their own fields.

Yet Gökalp strongly supported the Caliphate and the “sacredness of the state,” asserting that it was because pious, judicial, and ethical matters were considered sacred that there existed among Turks “traits such as loyalty to the secular ruler, a genuine fraternity and solidarity among the believers, sacrifice of interests and life for the sake of cihad, [and] tolerance and respect [for] others.”
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Gökalp developed and published the bulk of his articles for *Türkleşmek*, *İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* between 1912 and 1914, although the book itself would not be published until 1918 in rapidly changing political and social circumstances. While Gökalp’s early nationalist framework had been developed in the context of raising Turkish national consciousness within the Ottoman Empire, the empire had effectively ceased to exist in any recognizable form following the end of World War I.
The New Republic and Türkçeçiliğin Esasları, 1918-1923

Following a two-year exile in Malta, Gökalp returned to his homeland in 1921 to find his country in the midst of a turbulent transformation. The multi-ethnic and multi-confessional empire that had existed prior to the First World War was now overwhelmingly homogenous, with Muslim Turks making up the vast majority of the population. The Turkish National Movement in Ankara was in a struggle against the Ottoman state in Istanbul as well as Allied powers occupying and devising the partition of the empire. The National Movement was focused on saving Anatolia – which had been resituated as the Turkish heartland since the empire’s loss of its Balkan territories – from foreign powers. After successfully leading the National Struggle, Mustafa Kemal’s regime gained legitimacy and quickly set about building a modern republic for the Turkish nation. Between 1922 and 1924, his regime abolished the sultanate and caliphate, declared the founding of the Republic of Turkey, established a national parliament (whose members were required to belong to the People’s Party), and ratified a new constitution.

Mustafa Kemal strove to orient Turkey westward through secularizing reforms. Alongside the aforementioned abolishment of the caliphate, the new regime moved to abolish other religious institutions such as the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Pious
Foundations, sharia courts, and religious schools. Mustafa Kemal and the People’s Party faced opposition, however, particularly from the (short-lived) Progressive Republican Party. Interestingly, when the PRP invited Gökalp to join their opposition party, he declined. Gökalp’s loyalty now lay firmly with Mustafa Kemal.

Upon arriving in Ankara, Gökalp “did not find a very warm welcome” due to his past association and connection with the Committee of Union and Progress. He once again settled in Diyarbakır and resumed teaching and writing. His attention remained fixed on nationalist ideology, but the new political and social context had shifted the focus of his idea of a tripartite identity. As reflected in the title of his next work, Türkçülüğün Esasları (Principles of Turkism), Turkish identity was now front and center in his ideology, an unsurprising development given the new demographic makeup of the Turkish Republic. Gökalp turned his attention to providing a roadmap for the young Turkish nation-state, having seen much of his earlier vision actualized in the creation of the Republic.

Türkçülüğün Esasları was published in 1923, the same year Mustafa Kemal declared the republic. Gökalp’s praise and admiration for Mustafa Kemal is a common refrain throughout his work, honoring the Gazi as the savior of the Turkish nation:

However, all these Turkist movements would have remained merely currents if a great genius had not appeared to rally Turks around the ideal of Turkism and save them from extinction. It is not necessary to say the name of this great genius, for today, the whole world recognizes the name Gazi Mustafa Kemal Paşa as a sacred word and venerates him. Previously, the Turkish nation did not have any status within Turkey. Today, every right belongs to the Turks. Control over the land
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belongs to the Turks, and authority over politics, culture, and economy belongs to all Turkish people. There is no doubt that the great man (zat) who has carried out this great revolution is Turkism’s greatest man. Thinking and speaking are easy. However, it is very difficult to act and, especially, to be successful.\footnote{Ziya Gökalp, The Principles of Turkism, trans. Robert Devereux (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), 11.}

Between the publication of Türkleşmek, İslamaşmak, Muasırlaşmak in 1918 and Türkçülüğün Esasları in 1923, Gökalp appears to have undergone a shift in his views towards Islamism in Turkish society. In Türkleşmek, he stated that “[t]here is no discrepancy between the ideals of Turkism and the ideals of Islamism,” as he had viewed them as complementary ideals that should coexist alongside modernity.\footnote{Gökalp, Türkleşmek, 12.} In Türkçülüğün Esasları, he had a dimmer view of Islamism, placing blame for the slowed progress of Muslim societies squarely on the shoulders of theocratic and clerical movements for delaying the development of national consciousness.\footnote{Gökalp, Türkçülüğün, 134.} His position on the role of Islam in Turkish society appears consistent, particularly on the issue of the Caliphate. In a 1922 article, “Hilafetin İstiklâli” (“Independence of the Caliphate”), published in Küçük Mecmuu (Little Journal), Gökalp writes:

The Turkish revolution of today has assured the complete independence and freedom of these two [political and spiritual] powers. As the right and sovereignty of the Turks has passed entirely to the people, the Caliphacy too has won its independence by being separated from the Sultanate. […] Our religious life which has been for many centuries in a state of lethargic slumber will re-awaken, and, in accordance with the promise of our Prophet, the splendor of Islam will shine in much the same way it shone in its Golden Age.\footnote{Gökalp, Turkish Nationalism, 229.}

While the first section of Gökalp’s work generally reiterated many of his older views, if modified as previously discussed, the second half of Türkçülüğün Esasları,
“The Program for Turkism,” provided a roadmap for applying Turkism to cultural, legal, economic, and political institutions. Köprülü’s influence is apparent in the historical arguments Gökalp made for his prescriptive Turkism program. With the aim of recovering authentic Turkish culture, he repeatedly referenced ancient Turkish societies. In the process, he often came dangerously close to essentializing Turks and potentially undermining his previous assertion that national belonging is based on shared culture rather than ethnicity or race. At any rate, it demonstrated Gökalp’s “rejection of […] the formative processes rooted in history” and his “idealization of myths.”\(^{115}\)

A striking example of this appears in Gökalp’s essay, “Türklerde Ahlâk” (“Ethics Among the Turks”), in which he asserted that “[e]very great nation has achieved preeminence in some field of civilization. […] The Turks have won in morals.”\(^{116}\) The ancient Turks possessed strong feminist and democratic values, professional ethics, and family as well as civic morals. In “Hars ve Medeniyet,” he referred back to the nature of religion in pre-Islamic Turkish culture to explain the nature of Islam as practiced by contemporary Turks. Gökalp explained that Gök-Taṛr, the god worshipped by ancient Turks, possessed the power to reward but not punish. The result was a people who loved God, a trait that remained strong among Turks: “Fear of God is rare among Turks. The experiences of preachers in Istanbul and Anatolia show that preachers who talk of beauty and goodness are always more successful than preachers who mention hell and demons.”\(^{117}\)

\(^{115}\) Karpat, 384.  
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Gökalp carefully laid out how Turkism should be applied to social and cultural institutions in order for Turkey to modernize and fully enter Western civilization. In short, the Turks had to return to their true culture – the morals and customs possessed by the ancient Turks – together with pursuing secularism and solidarism in order to become a modern nation. The goals of legal Turkism were to create a modern state, enact laws to facilitate the creation of Durkheimian corporate groups, and reform family law so that “man and woman [are] equal in marriage, divorce, inheritance, professional and political rights.”\footnote{Gökalp, Türkçülüğün, 156.} On the last two goals, he suggested that both were grounded in the ethics of ancient Turks. While the ancient Turks had guilds that were beneficial for the local economy, it was necessary for the new Turkish nation to establish corporate groups for a national economy.\footnote{Gökalp, Türkçülüğün, 139-140.} Similarly, modern family law should be a reflection of ancient Turkish family morals, in which husband and wife had equal ownership of the home and rights to their children.\footnote{Gökalp, Türkçülüğün, 155-156.}

In “İktisadi Türkçülük” (“Economic Turkism”), Gökalp again appealed to the history of the ancient Turks while attempting to blend the supposedly natural characteristics of Turks with Durkheimian corporatism. He asserted that the ancient Turks were wealthy as a result of their industrious work ethic, but also generous due to their communal nature. Still, “Turks cannot be Communists because they love freedom and independence,” he wrote, “but they cannot be individualists because they also love equality.”\footnote{Gökalp, Türkçülüğün, 161.} Both communism and capitalism were, in his view, unsuitable for the
Turkish nation. The need for individual ownership in Turkish society was crucial, but he also supported the need for social ownership to benefit society and protect the weak.

He proposed solidaristic corporatism as a third-way between classical liberalism and communism, as proposed by Durkheim. Corporations, or groups made of members belonging to particular industries, would act as mediators between the state and individuals and allow for a constitutional government. “As a way to promote labor-management cooperation rather than class conflict, corporatism was anti-Marxist” but also “anti-liberal in providing an alternative to the individualism” that was incompatible with Turks’ communal society.\(^{122}\)

Gökalp argued that a prototype of corporate groups (ocaklar) already existed in Turkish society in the form of Ottoman guilds (esnaf loncalari). In order for Turkey to establish a robust national economy, it was necessary for Turks to establish modern occupational groups which should be led by secretaries-general. Every city should have its own central committee consisting of representatives from each occupational group who would “regulate the economic life of the city.”\(^{123}\) This organization structure would be repeated from the municipal to the national level, resulting in a council of corporations in the capital:

Such a corporative organization, Gökalp argues, provides sanctions for occupational morality and professional ethics, which are lacking in Turkey. Corporations supervise the members of the occupation through internal regulations and disciplinary committees. They establish norms of conduct within their jurisdictional domain. Also among their functions are mutual assistance, occupational training, and advancement of the profession. To be noted is the additional emphasis Gökalp places on the normative function of occupational

\(^{122}\) Findley, 237.
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organizations. For Durkheim, occupational morality and corporative organization are mainly a measure to check the centrifugal tendencies in societies of advanced division of labor, i.e. the conflict between capital and labor in industrial capitalism. For Gökalp, in addition to this, they also provide the moral and organizational bases for economic development, i.e., the deepening of division of labor in the direction of industrialization through a united national effort, a harmonious “work mobilization,” among occupations as well as employees and employers.\textsuperscript{124}

In “\textit{Milli Dayanışmayı Güçlendirmek}” (“Strengthening National Solidarity”), Gökalp suggested a number of occupational groups, including engineers, doctors, musicians, painters, teachers, authors, officers, lawyers, merchants, farmers, manufacturers, blacksmiths, carpenters, tailors, bakers, butchers, grocers, and so on.\textsuperscript{125} As Parla points out, what is most remarkable about Gökalp’s categories is the rationale he provides for them: “‘These groups are mutually necessary for, and complementary to, one another.’ This very sentence later became the official catechism for the duration of the Kemalist single-party rule in Turkey (1923-1945) repeated verbatim both in the declarations and speeches of the ‘leaders’ and ‘subleaders’ […] and in staple articles of the party programs.”\textsuperscript{126}

Finally, Gökalp’s program discussed political Turkism and established the basis of populism in Turkist thought. According to Gökalp, Turkism as a cultural doctrine and populism as a political doctrine are harmonious ideologies because they “both conform to realities and both reflect the complete truth.”\textsuperscript{127} Carter Findley notes that Gökalp’s use of
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the word *halkçılık* meant both populism and democracy. Later use of the word *halkçılık* by Republicans, however, did not carry the association with democracy.\textsuperscript{128}

Gökalp did not live to witness most of the radical changes that the Turkish nation would experience under Atatürk’s regime, as he died in 1924, only a year after the publication of *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. During the last years of his life, Gökalp was an ardent supporter of Atatürk and the *Halk Fırkası* (People’s Party), believing that Atatürk’s regime had embraced political Turkism:

Today, Turkism supports the People’s Party. The People’s Party gave Turks sovereignty over the nation and granted the name of Turkey to our state and to our people the Turkish nation. […] Under the direction of an excellent guide, Gazi Mustafa Kemal Paşa, the Society for the Defense of Rights (*Müdafaai Hukuk Cemiyeti*) – the mother of the People’s Party – was able to, on the one hand, rescue Turkey from enemy invasions and, on the other hand, rid our politics of absolutism. In fact, we can say, the Society for the Defense of Rights utilized Turkism’s political program without knowing it.\textsuperscript{129}

However, Parla appears correct in his assessment that “[Gökalp] could not have partaken in the authoritarian, bureaucratic, and vanguardist practices […] of the Kemalists.”\textsuperscript{130} Gökalp believed that it was the responsibility of the elites to bring civilization to the masses but, just as if not more important, it was critical for the masses to bring authentic Turkish culture to the elites who were too far removed from true Turkishness in their Ottoman milieu. Elitism was strongly manifested in Kemalism, however, despite Republican overtures to populism. Gökalp would have no doubt disapproved of the state’s interference with traditional Turkish customs and religion.

\textsuperscript{128} Findley, 238.
\textsuperscript{129} Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün*, 164-165.
\textsuperscript{130} Parla, 16.
The issue of divergence between Gökalp’s Turkism and Kemalism is rarely more clearly seen than in language reform policies. Gökalp rejected both Arab-Persian and Turkish linguistic purism. Supporters of Arab-Persian purism in Turkish language insisted on retaining the pronunciation, spelling, moods and particles of Arabic and Persian words that had entered into Turkish. On this matter, Gökalp argued that this amounted to a sort of linguistic subjugation of Turkish to Arabic and Persian. Yet he was also against those who wanted to cleanse Turkish of its Arabic and Persian influences. Not only was trying to purify Arabic-Persian linguistic elements that had been corrupted and assimilated into colloquial Turkish contrary to his belief that the common Turk and his language represented the national ideal, but such an attempt was also simply unrealistic. The only instances in which foreign words should be discarded are when they exist alongside a Turkish word of the same meaning that was currently in use.\(^{131}\)

More to the point, he disdained those who wanted to purify Turkish by purging the language of its Arabic and Persian loanwords and replace them with words from other Turkic languages, a reform that the Kemalist regime would eventually attempt. Gökalp reasoned that, first, Turkic languages themselves have borrowed words from other languages such as Mongolian, Chinese, and Tungus and, second, that Turkic languages had all evolved along their own paths. Shoehorning Turkic words into Istanbul Turkish would destroy the beauty of the language.\(^{132}\) He concluded that “every word that the


Turkish people know and use is Turkish. Every word that is assimilated and not artificial is national.”

Gökalp would not have been wholly at odds with the Kemalist regime, however. On the issue of the relationship between the Ottoman Empire and its Turkish successor state, he presented Republicans with “the most authoritative argument for rejecting the study and understanding of Ottoman history, which really amounted to a denial of national history.” Gökalp had argued vigorously that Ottoman high culture was foreign and detached from original, authentic Turkish culture. Turkishness had to be untethered from its “Ottomanist-Islamist framework” in order for Turks to achieve national consciousness. Mustafa Kemal contributed to the extrication of Turkish history from Ottoman history through the aforementioned language reform as well as by emphasizing Turks’ pre-Islamic roots over their Ottoman past.

---
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Gökalp and Literary Turkism

Although much has been written on Ziya Gökalp’s social and political writings, little has been said by modern scholars about his literary output, which was prolific. Throughout his career, Gökalp published numerous poems in various magazines and journals and even wrote epics and folktales that drew on popular and recognizable themes, motifs, and characters from Turkish folk stories. Despite his abundant literary output, Gökalp had little concern for high literary achievement or, as some of his harsher critics have noted, even literary competence. Yahya Kemal, one of Turkey’s most lauded poets and a friend to Gökalp, remarked that Gökalp “was not […] a good poet and could not contribute to the renewal of Turkish poetry, even though [Gökalp] understood poetry well and also understood how national poetry could be created.”

Gökalp himself acknowledged his shortcomings as a poet, writing in his 1918 poetry anthology *Yeni Hayat (New Life)*:

In periods of consciousness poetry remains silent, while in periods of poetry consciousness is only a spectator. I think that our period can be included in the first group: Poets are distant from their inspiring muses; meters and rhymes are in the hands of conscious poetasters… Such a situation exists also in the lives of children: There are intervals of play between lessons… At the same time, part of the education of children is presented in the form of games; would it be a bad idea if we copied from this and, in trying to educate the public, presented some ideas in the form of poetry?
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Gökalp presented himself as a poetaster, who aimed to educate the public and raise national consciousness in a time of crises through poetry rather than create high art. Real poetry was best left to times of peace. Erol Köroğlu notes that Gökalp used poetry to advance his ideology, in that he would initially discuss an idea with friends and colleagues, then write an article based on his idea, and finally express the idea through poetry in a “simpler and more emotional way” and in language that was more accessible to the public.¹³⁸ So although scholars have widely ignored Gökalp’s literary works in favor of his social and political writings, his literary works have significant value in illuminating his thoughts and ideology.

All of Gökalp literary works have a very clear social and political agenda – that is, his goal was to promote pride in Turkishness, familiarity with Turkish culture, and national consciousness – that paralleled his social and political thoughts. However, unlike his social and political articles, Gökalp’s poetry and epics were often aggressive, militaristic, and chauvinistic. Such literary works, far more so than his social and political works on Turkish nationalism, provide perhaps that greatest justification for those who have condemned Gökalp as a racist and expansionist.

A number of scholars have held Gökalp’s Turkist ideology as racist, holding him responsible for erasing Kurdish identity and providing the ideological justification for the Armenian Genocide. His response to opponents who accused him of being of Kurdish lineage was to erase his own heritage, claiming that any Kurdish blood was irrelevant, as

¹³⁸ Köroğlu, 115.
his language, culture, and religion were those of a Turk. Scholars of the Armenian Genocide in particular have held him responsible for the Ottoman state’s destruction of its Armenian communities during World War I, with James Reid writing that “What Wagner was to Hitler, Gökalp was to Enver Paşa” and Peter Balakian referring to him as “a virulent racist […] foreshadowing the leading Nazi propagandists Alfred Rosenberg and Joseph Goebbels.”

Gökalp wrote widely on Turan and Turanism - a theme that is central to accusations of racism and expansionist beliefs - in his poems and epics, a theme that is mostly absent from his political writings. One notable exception is his article “Türkçülük ve Turancılık” (“Turkism and Turanism”), appearing in his 1923 publication Türkçülüğün Esasları, in which he aimed to define the boundaries between what is Turkish and what is Turanian.

Turan originally referred to a region in Central Asia inhabited by an Iranian tribe, the Tuirya, and would later come to refer to land inhabited by Turkic peoples. Turanism developed in the nineteenth century as a nationalist movement that aimed to unite the so-called Ural-Altaic peoples, that is, Turkic peoples as well as Magyars, Finns, and Mongols. In his 1923 article, Gökalp remarked that the “ideal of Turkism is Turan,” but he rejected the inclusion of culturally and ethnically far-flung groups such as Magyars, Finns, and Mongols. First, he noted that the link between Uralic and Altaic peoples had not been scientifically proven and that Finns and Magyars likely belong to
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different groups than Turks and Mongols. Second, he acknowledged that while peoples such as Yakuts, Kyrgyzs, Uzbeks, Kipchaks, Tatars and Oghuz Turks shared a linguistic connection, any cultural connections had long been severed. Turkistan, therefore, should be for Turks. 143

Most significantly, he made it clear that the ideal of Turan is one of cultural and linguistic unity: “Turkists’ long-term goal is to unite the Oghuz, Tatars, Kyrgyzs, Uzbeks, and Yakuts in language, literature, and culture [emphasis mine].” 144 Further, Gökalp continued, such a goal of cultural unity remains a fantasy of Turkists that may or may not ever come to fruition. 145 Cultural unity was clearly not an immediate or even necessary goal to Gökalp, let alone political and territorial creation of Turan. Indeed, he referred to Kızılelma – a term for the legendary Turkish utopia and the title of one of his best known literary works – as “only a dream.” 146

Gökalp made it clear from his 1923 article that he held no expectation of the pursuit of Turan or any sort of political and territorial unity among the Turkic peoples. Yet accusations of expansionist ideology are not without basis, as his early poetry and epics are filled with aggressive calls to unite under Turanism. It is necessary here to examine his Turan-focused literary works in order to discern what, if any, changes occurred in regards to his belief in the ideal of Turanism and what basis there is for accusations of an expansionist ideology and racism.
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Kızılelma is an anthology of Gökalp’s poetry that was written between 1911 and 1914. Köroğlu remarks that while “[t]hese poems are suitable to the patriotic agitation” of this period, “few of the poems […] contributed greatly to the formation of this atmosphere.”\textsuperscript{147} Among the few that appeared to influence public opinion, however, were his Turan-focused poems, including “Turan,” “Altın Destan” (“Golden Epic”), “Ergenekon,” “Kızılelma” (“Red Apple”), and “Kızıl Destan” (“Red Epic”).

“Turan” was one of Gökalp’s earliest poems, having been written in 1911. A short poem, he connected his Turkish readers to the glory days of Attilâ and Cengiz and, most significantly, cast that connection in terms of racial lineage with the verse, “the heads that crowned my race [ırkım] with victory.”\textsuperscript{148} He concluded by expressing longing for a Turanian homeland:

The homeland is neither Turkey for the Turks nor Turkistan;  
The homeland is a great and eternal country: Türän…\textsuperscript{149}

Likewise, his epic poem “Altın Destan” – first published in the Turkish literary magazine Genç Kalemler - expressed longing for a great homeland and again harkened back to the great Turkic leaders of the past:

Where are Attila, Temujin, Gurkan?  
Let me go, let me search: Where is beauty?  
Kashgar, Delhi, Beijing, Istanbul, Kazan,  
There are five Great Khans in these five places:  
Sarı (yellow), Kızıl (red), Gök (blue) Han, Ak (white) Han, Kara (black) Han  
---the Ilkhan shines upon them all---  
Let me go, let me search: where is the ilkhan?…\textsuperscript{150}

\textsuperscript{147} Köroğlu, 118.  
\textsuperscript{149} Gökalp, Şiirler, 3.  
\textsuperscript{150}
His story in verse, Kızılelma, was written during the Balkan Wars and first published in the nationalist literary journal Türk Yurdu in February 1913. Kızılelma would give its name to his first collection of fiction.¹⁵¹ With Kızılelma, Gökalp “abandoned Turan as a mythological concept and started to think of how to build Turan, taking into consideration the real circumstances of the time.”¹⁵² Kızılelma, the title of both his epic and his collection of fiction writing, refers to a legendary utopia in Turkish folklore. Paul Wittek asserted that the kızıl elma, or red apple, of Turkish lore is a reference to a golden throne, which in turn was a symbol of Constantinople, a city that had been “the ultimate goal of Turco-Muslim conquests.”¹⁵³ The story tells of a young woman, Ay Hanım, who must return home from studying in Paris following her parents’ deaths. Upon returning home, “[Ay Hanım] wanted to open schools in Turân / to disseminate light of truth to souls.”¹⁵⁴ She opened two schools, one for girls and one for boys, which she called İstikbâl Beşiği (Cradle of the Future). She was mentored by a Molla, who taught her the ways of Islam while she also studied the ways of the West.

And in the tradition of Turkish and Islamic folktales, Ay Hanım became the Leyla to a young man’s Mecnun. The young man in question, Turgut, went to the Molla and
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asked him where the Kızılelma can be found. Through the Molla’s answer, Gökalp expressed his view of Turkish history and culture 155:

Molla said, “My son, Turkish conquerors
Have invaded everywhere;

Besides the conquest they knew one goal,
They believed the Garden of Eden itself was there.

Turkishness surged up thousands of times:
Always in the aim of reaching this promised country

This sweet homeland:
It pervaded India, China, Egypt, Anatolia.

It went to all the capital cities and finally to the Chinese;
But it never got close to this nameless place;

Because the distant promised country
Was not that promised country.

Is there no Kızılelma? No doubt, it exists;
But its whereabouts are another realm…

The foundational goal, a sky dream…
One day it will be real, but for now it is a fairy tale…

Turkish civilization is without imitation,
As it was not just born this homeland is the secret that will remain...

We have been able to conquer many places;
In each we were spiritually conquered.

We took country to nationality,
We adapted ourselves to civilization here.

Sometimes we were Indian, sometimes we were Chinese;
With Arab, Persian, European religions.

Neither a Turkish law, Turkish philosophy,

155 Harmancı, 1471.
Nor a poet’s voice that resounded in Turkish…

The poet also came from us;
Many of whom wrote in Persian, some who wrote in Arabic…

We wrote in French, Russian, Chinese,
We scarcely wrote several syllables for Turkish.

Look for example: the monumental
Fârâbî wrote in Arabic, Karamzin in Russia;

Sînâ, Celâeddin, the Zemhaşerîs labored for Arabs, for Persians.
Buhârâlı Şevket, Genceli Husrev, followed Firdevsî or Sa‘dî…

Even today many of our scholars are only
Able to write in European (languages).

As for the ones who write in Turkish,
The words are torn to pieces,

Things are polluted as European imitation.
Our true dream, our pure language cries out to them: ‘Come to us!… […]

We don’t have a history, we have histories,
Our Mars did not enter the astrological sign;

Each part shone in another sky…
Hundreds of bodies found the same soul.

Neither history united, nor people pure!
So, Kızılelma is a signal for this.

If a secret need is in the nation,
The national conscience finds a medicine for it;

The Turk who doesn’t look at the Garden of Eden or Sebâ
Says, “I will go to Kızılelma…”

Going to the goal,
Toward unity, national consideration, livelihood…

(It) knows one day a national consciousness will be born,
A new Orhun and new Turfan will be born.
A communal homeland, a people’s history
Will exonerate Turkishness from imitation.

But who knows, who will open the road,
to radiate the light of Turkishness to time?...

By the end of Gökálp’s Kızılelma, Ay Hanım and Turgut were no longer Leyla and Mecnun archetypes, but had transformed into the new Adam and Eve of the Turkish utopia of Kızılelma. They continued to teach and educate the children on their grand history and culture and build up Turkish consciousness.

The most aggressively militant of his Turan-centered works of literature is “Kızıl Destan” (“Red Epic”), written in 1914, prior to the Ottoman Empire’s entrance into the First World War. The preface to this epic reads, “The enemy’s country will be ruined! / Turkey will grow and will become Turan!” The poem goes on:

The notice wrote that there is a campaign.
The robust lions run to the army!
Those who stay at home are not Turkish sons.

The time of bravery will come!
The earth will be a dungeon for the cowards.

Europe is fed up with benefactions now.
It tears down the heaven it created.
Jaurès’ hope has come to naught.

The land of civilization will be red blood!
Every point will be the new Balkans!

For what did these affairs appear.
Let me explain it to you, brother.
The Cross said: no mercy for the Qur‘ân.
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Muhammed’s community will pillage!
This phase of history will be for nothing!  

The epic goes on to recount the events that led to the outbreak of war and that had occurred thus far, concluding with the verse: “The Britons seized the Sultan Osman I, / and with this India and Amman! / Islam knew who its enemy was. // After not much time a happy moment will come to be: / It will be the Qur‘ân that takes revenge on the enemies!”

The remainder of Gökalp’s major Turan-focused poems and epics - “Ergenekon”, “Kendine Doğru”, and so on – continued in the same vein as the aforementioned poems, teaching Turkish history and promoting unity of the Turkic people. It is easy to see how Gökalp’s fervent promotion of Turan and pan-Turanist ideals via his literary works could lead readers to believe he held expansionist views. However, it must be remembered that, first of all, Gökalp ceased to use the word Turan or wrote of the ideal of Turanism in his literary works after 1916. Second, and most importantly, the previously discussed essay, “Türkçülük ve Turancılık” leaves no room for doubt that he did not seriously pursue the dream of Turanist unity, at least after 1923. It seems highly unlikely that he took seriously the notion of Turan even prior to that, as he was writing his Turan-centered verse prior to World War I. A more likely explanation is that, in addition to teaching Turkish history and culture through his poems and epics, he was responding to feelings of betrayal brought about by the Balkan Wars, as the bulk of his Turan-centered poetry was written between 1912 and 1914. There is no evidence to suggest that Gökalp ever gave
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serious support to any expansionist policies or thought and it is far more likely that, as Köroğlu suggests, the Turkish thinker’s purpose was to spur patriotic agitation and national consciousness rather than to beat the drum for territorial conquest.¹⁶¹

Gökalp’s poem, “Ergenekon,”¹⁶² is further evidence that the Turkish intellectual’s aim was nationalist agitation rather than expansion, as the Ergenekon myth was revived in literature during the late Ottoman and early Republican eras as a symbol of Turkish nationalism. In Turkish myth, Ergenekon is the valley where Turks were trapped for centuries until a blacksmith created a passage to free them. It was then that a grey wolf – another enduring symbol of Turkish nationalism – led them out of the valley and to freedom. Like later nationalist writers, Gökalp used Ergenekon as a “primordial symbol” which demonstrated “timeless” essence of the Turkish nation.¹⁶³ Again, we see Gökalp reviving symbols and myths of pre-Islamic Turks for the purpose of patriotic agitation.

The question of Gökalp’s racism is quite a bit more complicated. Prior to the Balkan Wars and the First World War, Gökalp was an ardent supporter of a Turkish-dominated nationalism within the Ottoman Empire. In fact, his political and social writings in Türkleşmek, İslamlasmak, Muasırlasmak never directly addressed the existence of non-Muslims and rarely addressed the existence of non-Turks within the empire. Any form of nationalism is, however, by definition exclusionary, particularly in the context of a multi-ethnic empire. The question is, then, was Gökalp’s goal to create a

¹⁶¹ Köroğlu, 122.
¹⁶² Gökalp, Şürrler, 78-83.

62
homogenous nation-state as his opponents have accused? The evidence for such a goal is weak.

Prior to the empire’s dissolution, his work pushed for the creation of cultural solidarity; that is, his non-fiction articles gave no indication that he sought a political system to be created from Turkism. Moreover, he actively argued against those whom he perceived as racist (e.g. Akçura) and rejected the idea of Social Darwinism, a popular contemporary ideology.

Still, there were instances in his literary works that demonstrated hostility towards non-Turks, or perhaps more accurately, non-Turkish separatists. His poem “Yeni Attila” (“New Attila”) was very aggressive in its hostility towards Balkan separatists:

“March! March!” A voice from the sky
Oh Turk called to you: “March!
Be a windstorm, blow in the mountains,
Be a lightning bolt, attack its face!

The enemy is running away,
March! March! Turkish soldiers!

Your bayonet is your main remedy,
Your horse neighs, it wants a raid!
Serbians, Greeks, Bulgarians are escaping;
Attack! Attack! Don’t you dare stop!

The fear of revenge has seized the West,
March! March! Turkish army! […]

Give way to us, Kara-Balkan!
We will come to Thessaloniki!
We will bandage the wounds
Whose red blood is still flowing!

The fear of revenge has seized the West,
March! March! Turkish army! […]
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The Turkish banner will be unfurled
Before we arrive at Shkodër!
The Albanians will bow
Prostrating to the New Moon!

The enemy is running away,
March! March! Turkish soldiers!

Skopje is decorated,
In honor of the Turkish army!
The European is suffering,
Finally there is no regret!
The fear of revenge has seized the West,
March! March! Turkish army!

Oh Europe, where will you go
To avoid trouble?
You will spill many tears
Because of a Second Attila!

The enemy is running away,
March! March! Turkish soldiers!

Again, Gökalp demonstrated a sense of betrayal and anger resulting from the Balkan Wars and the breaking away of numerous Balkan nations from the empire.

Interestingly, one of Gökalp’s more religiously militant poems made national headlines in Turkey in 1997 with its public reading by then-Mayor of Istanbul Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. At a political rally in Siirt, a city in southeastern Anatolia heavily populated by Kurds, Erdoğan read the following lines which he claimed to be from Gökalp’s 1912 poem, “Asker Duası” (“A Soldier’s Prayer”): “Our minarets are our

---
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bayonets / Our domes are our helmets / Our mosques are our barracks.” Those lines, however, do not appear anywhere in “Asker Duası.” In full, the poem reads:

A rifle in my hand, faith in my heart,
I have two desires: Religion and the homeland…
The army is in my heart, the sultan is great…
    Aid the Sultan, oh God!
    Prolong his life, oh God!

Our path is holy war (gazâ), martyrdom is its end,
Our religion asks for loyalty and service,
Our mother is the homeland, our father is the nation,
    Make the homeland prosperous, oh God!
    Uplift the nation, oh God!

My banner is the Oneness of God (Tevhît), my flag is the Crescent (Hilâl)
One is green, the other is red,
Take bitter revenge on the enemy for Islam,
    Make Islam prosperous, oh God!
    Ruin its enemies, oh God!

Our commanding, powerful fathers,
Our sergeants, corporals, chiefs,
Our ordered and respected laws,
    Make the army in good order, oh God!
    Make our banner superior, oh God!

Many brave heroes in the battlefield,
Became martyrs for religion and country,
Let the hearth give off smoke, let hope not be extinguished,
    Do not let the martyr be mournful, oh God!
    Do not let his end be powerless, oh God!166

Erdoğan’s creative interpretation of Gökalp’s poem resulted in a 10-month prison sentence, for which he served four months, on the charge of inciting religious hatred.167

166 Gökalp, Şıirler, 58.
167 Aslaneli, “Erdoğan Goes to Prison.”
Despite Erdoğan’s inaccurate recitation of Gökalp’s poem, he more or less accurately captures the idea behind “Asker Duası” – that is, the idea of Islam as a source of strength and solidarity for Muslim soldiers against their enemies. Charges against Erdoğan for inciting religious hatred aside, it seems unlikely that that was Gökalp’s aim given the broader context of his ideology and the specific context in which he wrote the poem. Like “Yeni Attila,” “Asker Duası” was written in response to Balkan Wars. Again, his aim was to create a sense of solidarity and inflame patriotic feelings agitation among his predominantly Muslim readers.

Following the dissolution of the empire, the question of minorities became a non-issue for the most part, as the population of the new nation-state was now overwhelmingly Turkish and Muslim. Indeed, Gökalp’s last (and most popular among Turkish nationalists) poetry anthology, *Yeni Hayat*, lacked the fire of nationalist agitation that characterized his pre-war poetry and was focused almost solely on educating Turks on their customs and history, with works which promoted themes of religion, culture, solidarity, and Turkism. In *Yeni Hayat*, the focus of his works shifted decisively towards bolstering Turkish national and cultural identity.

An example of this is his poem “Din” (“Religion”) which presents the approach to religion he believed was inherent to Turkish culture:

My religion is not hope or fear;  
I worship my God whom I love!  
I do my duty, without  
fear of heaven or hell.

Preacher!... Do not speak of heaven’s fire
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Not knowing how many thousands of weights are removed from fire.
Say that existence is a beautiful sun,
Our love is born from fire…

Say that there is a tree called Goodness
Rooted in the sky, its branches in hearts…
My soul has eaten, it is not hungry;
Its honey is all love and affection.

Preacher!... Tell me
Am I not seeking devil or angel?
Hermits say these secret words:
Who is loving, who is love, what is love?

To me, heaven is comfort and consolation,
It is in my heart, therefore it is beloved,
I do not fear punishment in hell,
My heart does not know fear, it is crazy.169

The poem “Vatan” (“Homeland”) expressed gentle pride in the existence of the Turkish nation:

A country in which a call to prayer is done in Turkish,
The peasant understands the meaning of the prayer’s invocations…
A country in which one can read the Quran in Turkish,
Everyone, young and old, knows the Lord’s commands…
O Turkish son, here is your homeland!

A country in which there is no other soil in the eye of the province,
There is one ideal, language, custom, religion in every individual. […]
Children give their loving souls to the border;
O Turkish son, here is your homeland!

A country in which all capital returns to the markets,
Where Turkish art is guided by science.
Where professions protect one another;

169 Gökalp, Şiirler, 99.
Where shipyards, factories, ferries, and trains are Turkish;
O Turkish son, this is your homeland!\textsuperscript{170}

\textsuperscript{170} Gökalp, \textit{Şairler}, 100.
Conclusion

Ziya Gökalg has been credited as the architect of Turkish nationalism, providing the groundwork for social and cultural solidarity among Turks in the new Republic. Scholars such as Heyd, Parla, and Berkes have examined the Turkish intellectual’s social and political thought through his essays and articles, but his poetry and stories can help to illuminate some of the more controversial aspects of his ideas.

There is little evidence in Gökalg’s works – whether literary, political, or social – that supports charges that he advocated for a racist and expansionist program; to the contrary, the unifying theme of his many writings, regardless of the context in which they were written, was the creation and bolstering of cultural solidarity and national consciousness among Turks with no sincere interest in territorial and political expansion. His first collection of articles - written between 1912 and 1914 and published in 1918 in Türkleşmek, İslamaşmak, Muasırlaşmak – was written in response to an increasingly fractious social and political situation. Strong national identities were rapidly developing among the non-Turkish communities within the empire and posing an ever greater threat to the survival of the Ottoman Empire. Attempts by Ottoman intellectuals to heal and prevent further cracks in the empire’s foundation by Tanzimat reformers through Ottomanism were largely ineffective, and the disastrous loss of the Balkan territories in 1912-1913 made it plain to Gökalg that a new direction must be pursued. His work
during this era emphasized the need for Turks to develop their own national consciousness and strengthen their cultural identity while pursuing scientific and technological progress.

Gökalp’s articles promoting the pursuit of Turkishness, Muslimness, and modernity were written for a very specific audience – that is, the educated elite who had both the ability to read his articles and place them in the wider debate regarding national identities within the Ottoman Empire as well as access to the journals and magazines in which they were published. Between the years 1911 and 1914, he also wrote numerous works of prose and poetry that reflected the ideas he put forth in Türkleşmek, but were more accessible to a wider audience. Gökalp’s collection of prose and poetry, published together in Kızılelma, reiterated his ideals of building Turkish national consciousness and cultural solidarity through education in a more simplified and emotive manner. Furthermore, he wrote these works in the more humble Anatolian dialect of Turkish rather than the refined Ottoman Turkish that he wrote his non-fiction essays in. As such, Gökalp’s ideology was made more accessible to a broader audience.

Following the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and during the rise of Atatürk’s regime, the focus of Gökalp’s writings shifted in response to the changing political and social context. The dominance of Turks was now the default in the new Turkish nation-state, as Muslim Turks now made up the vast majority of the population following World War I. Despite this, Turks widely lacked a shared sense of national identity and cultural identity based on Turkishness. His 1923 publication, Türkçülüğün Esasları, aimed to build Turkish national identity through educating the Turkish people on their history and
cultural roots. Again, he reached out to Turkey’s elites via his social and political writings in Türkçülüğün Esasları, but disseminated those same ideas to a broader audience in Yeni Hayat.

The bulk of his writings aim to educate on and revive the religion, culture, and language of “authentic” Turkish folk culture in order to achieve national consciousness and solidarity among Turks, much as non-Turkish minorities within the Ottoman Empire had been doing for much of the preceding century. His poems, epics, and short stories are certainly more aggressive and militant than his non-fiction articles, but it is evident that he was using passionate language as a tool to inflame the nationalist sentiments of the Turkish public, an audience that was not otherwise reachable through his publications in literary and intellectual journals. The aggressiveness and hostility in his poems, particularly towards Greeks, Bulgarians, and Serbs, was present overwhelmingly in the period during and immediately following the Balkan Wars and does not appear to be directed towards non-Turks within Anatolia. While not excusing the effects of encouraging characterization of Balkan nationals as the enemy, his more militant works strike me as a practice in the building of national consciousness and solidarity – a practice that is inherently exclusionary and even chauvinistic, to be sure. Yet accusations that he provided the fuel to Enver Paşa’s fire in carrying out the Armenian Genocide strike me as, at best, a reach and are the result of misreading of Gökalp’s works. What is clear is that Gökalp’s agenda was not territorial and political expansion for the Turkish people, but the development of Turkish cultural solidarity.
Despite Heyd’s claims to the contrary, Gökalp was a profound and talented intellectual, one whose influence over the shape of the modern Turkish nation is difficult to overstate. First and foremost, he was instrumental in formulating and articulating Turkish national identity and providing a social and cultural roadmap to achieve national consciousness. Further, Berkes argues that Gökalp was Turkey’s first sociologist and, in fact, the first chair of sociology was created just for him at the University of Istanbul in 1912. More importantly, his critical understanding and adaptation of Durkheimian sociology to twentieth-century Ottoman society has had deep political implications for the modern Republic. Indeed, Taha Parla and Andrew Davison argue that Gökalp’s use of Durkheimian corporatism provided the foundation for Kemalism, even though Gökalp’s thought “underwent some transformations within the ideological frame of the Kemalists, who maintained the solidaristic core formulated by Gökalp while also tinkering partly, but consciously, with distinctly fascistic corporatist tendencies.” Consequently, Gökalp’s corporatism has underpinned mainstream Turkish political culture, both left- and right-wing, ever since.

---
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