

Chapter 2 – *Rural as the Realm* for Turkish Modernism and Nation-Building

Beginning of the Turkish Nationalism and “Anatolia”

Examining the Ottoman Empire at the beginning of the 20th century, in terms of political changes in the region, helps unveil how the ruralism of Anatolia was affected in the process of nation-building and modernization of Turkey. Incidents between the declaration of the Second Constitution after the Young Turk Revolution on the 23rd of July 1908, and the Proclamation of the Republic on the 29th of October 1923, generated the ideological background of the republican regime’s land idealization practices in the 1930s. They were culminated by the Republican People’s Party (RPP) and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk– who had the strongest political power in Turkey’s political history. The theme, “Going towards Anatolia,” had become the base of constructing the Turkish nationality; starting from the last years of the Ottoman Empire and lasting through the early republican nation-building operations. Namely, the word, “Anatolia,” also expressed a common conception binding the Late Ottoman intelligentsia and Early Republican elites. To grasp the emergence of Turkish nationalism and its relations to the idealization of Anatolian land and its people, it is crucial to review the position of the Ottoman Empire and Ottoman society in the world context (especially in European relations) on the verge of the 20th century.

The 19th century was characterized by rapid cultural and social changes grounded in science and technology, as well as by economic and industrial shifts in Western Countries. This change resulted in the widening of territorial borders and the secession of smaller regions into national unities. The Ottoman Empire, along with the expanding territories of European and Russian powers, ruled over lands from the Balkans to the Arabian Peninsula. To protect this territory, the Ottoman Empire had to adapt its economic and political way of granting privileges of permissive governance. The Ottoman state became

rigidly theocratic and coercive for the first time. In the late 19th century, tense conditions, inside and outside of the Ottoman territories, caused the first revolts against the imperial authority of young Ottoman elites. New political groups were organized under several operations at the beginning of the 20th century¹ and “The Young Turk Uprising” took place in an atmosphere that Ottoman Empire declined to resist.²

The uprising was instigated by the Party of Union and Progress which was led by groups who were interested in social transformations that had taken place in Paris, Berlin, and Moscow. The Young Turks were also motivated by the Independence Declaration of Bulgaria in 1878. Nevertheless, the work of the uprising cadre consisted of only minor adaptations to popular concepts in European societies. Therefore, the Young Turks and the Party of Union and Progress failed to develop a particular social theory or a lasting ideology. During this period, there was no consensus on achieving cultural and social progress. Only Turkish nationalism, with an emphasis on Ottomanism, acted as a crucial intersection of the political perspectives present during the second constitutional era.³ According to Uzer, an additional facet explaining the emergence of Turkish nationalism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries was the political strength among non-Turkish Christian and Muslim ethnic groups during this period. These groups gradually gained their independence or left the Ottoman state’s political body. Therefore, since the second half of the 19th century, “nationalist movements among Greeks, Serbs, Bulgarians, Albanians,

1 Sina Akşin, *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terrakki*, 5. Baskı (İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi, 2014). Şerif Mardin, *Türk Modernleşmesi*, Makaleler, 4, 1. baskı (Cağaloğlu, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991), pp. 94–100, Cağaloğlu, İstanbul.

2 Niyazi Berkes, *Türkiye’de Çağdaşlaşma*, ed. by Ahmet Kuyaş, Yapı Kredi Yayınları Cogito, 1713 117, 7. Baskı (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2005), pp. 389–390. Stanford Jay Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw, *Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808–1975*, History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, Stanford Shaw; Vol. 2, 1. publ. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1978), pp. 172–272. See also Erik Jan Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk’s Turkey*, Library of Modern Middle East Studies, v. 87 (London; New York: New York: I. B. Tauris; Distributed in the United States exclusively by Palgrave Macmillan, 2010). Stefano Taglia, *Intellectuals and Reform in the Ottoman Empire: The Young Turks on the Challenges of Modernity*, SOAS/Routledge Studies on the Middle East 23 (London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2015).

3 Mardin, *Bütün eserleri dizisi*. 1, p. 21. Berkes, *Türkiye’de çağdaşlaşma*, 393–401.

and Arabs downplayed the ideologies of Ottomanism and Islamism, making them irrelevant”.⁴

During the second constitutional period, different ethnic and religious groups prominently emerged in the empire’s political realm. These emergent groups caused two significant events that dominated the later years. Firstly, the political entities were established separately from the Ottoman Dynasty and other imperial and religious institutions. Secondly, the concept of Turkish nationalism was gradually and strongly spread among the elites. Until the late 19th century, there was no linguistic term that defined Turkish people in Ottoman institutions. However, for the first time during the second constitutional era, the Turkish people were declared a distinct nation alongside other groups in the empire.⁵ This was an extension of a crucial maneuver in internal politics that was principally concentrated on the image of Anatolia as homeland since the 1870s. At the end of Abdul Hamid II’s reign (from the 31st of August 1876 to the 27th of April 1909), the Ottoman Turks proclaimed Anatolia their homeland.⁶

By the 1860s, the first signs of Turkish nationalism had manifested among Turkic groups under the Tsarist regime in Russia. Specifically, the Tatar population of Tsarist Russia asserted themselves as “Turkish.” This influenced the Ottoman elites to pursue a cultural identity.⁷ Yusuf Akçura, a Turkish-Tatar intellectual born in Simbirsk in Russian Empire, first gained prominence by establishing the concept of Pan-Turkism during the Young Turks’ interventions. Afterward, he participated in the nation-building projects of early republican Turkey.⁸

4 Umut Uzer, *An Intellectual History of Turkish Nationalism: Between Turkish Ethnicity and Islamic Identity* (Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press, 2016), 16.

5 Berkes, *Türkiye’de çağdaşlaşma*, 405. François Georgeon also emphasizes this new perspective. He adds that around 1900s the word “Turk” still referred to an offensive term in the speaking language in Istanbul. It was connoted as coarse-provincial. François Georgeon, *Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi 1900–1930*, trans. Ali Berktaş, 2., Tarih 26 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2009), 32.

6 David Kushner, *The Rise of Turkish Nationalism, 1876–1908* (London; Totowa, N.J.: Cass, 1977), pp. 50–55.

7 Sacit Kutlu, *Didâr-ı Hürriyet: Kartpostallarla İkinci Meşrutiyet 1908–1913*, 1. baskı, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları 57 (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2004), 333.

8 François Georgeon briefly narrates the biography of Yusuf Akçura: He was born as a son of a Tatar bourgeois family in Russia in the verge of Ottoman-Russian War in 1877–1878. After he studied political science in the Sorbonne in 1900–1903, he settled in Russia and joined the Bolshevik Revolution in 1905. He was banished by tsarist regime. Short after

In 1904, Akçura declared his ideas on Pan-Turkism for the first time in the article, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Three Approaches to the Politics), published in Cairo in the journal, *Türk* (Turk). He discussed the Ottoman state's political concepts: Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism, and Pan-Turkism. He advocated that Turkish nationalism should dominate the heterogeneous national patterns of the Ottoman Empire, and Turkic ethnic notions should be emphasized to assert Turkish nationality. He addressed the middle Asian roots and the migration of Turkic folks as a common national myth that could be used as a tool for unification. At the same time, he pointed to Anatolia as the place of the Turkmen nomads and Turkish-origin villagers. He claimed to trace the cultural life of Anatolia to ancient times to assert a Turkish Homeland. His ideas led to a consciousness of the rural people's⁹ suffering due to war, underdevelopment, and the (financial) monopoly of privileged foreigners and feudal landlords since the 18th century. However, Akçura offered a narrow perspective by referring only to the Turkish people in Anatolia. Although Anatolia had for many ages been the homeland of various ethnic and religious groups that existed before the Turkish-origin people, he never offered solutions to problems grounded in the claims of the other numerous ethnic populations present across the Ottoman terrain.

As mentioned above, during the Second Constitutional Era, the political realm served as a polyphonic stage for diverse ideas and concepts that dominated cultural life. Political and public organizations developed ideas through several mediums including modernist concepts like the modern state, populist economy, secularism and religion, nationalism, and socialism were discussed. Additionally, political texts were translated into and published in the Ottoman language.¹⁰ It appears to have been a somewhat intellectually stimulating atmosphere that generated a political sensibility that drew attention to the social

the Young Turk Revolution in 1908, he was exiled into Istanbul. He was involved in politics during the independence movements of Ottoman states such as Turco-Italian War in 1911–1912, Balkan Wars in 1912–1913. After the First World War, he joined Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and the assembly of Turkey's Independence War. With the proclamation of Turkish Republic Yusuf Akçura served for Kemalist regime during the rest of his life. See François Georgeon, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri, Yusuf Akçura: (1876–1935)*, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 40, 2. Baskı (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996), p. 6.

9 Georgeon, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri, Yusuf Akçura*, pp. 37–50.

10 Yusuf Akçura, *Yeni Türk Devletinin Öncüleri: 1928 Yılı Yazıları* (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1981), p. 188, and Georgeon, *Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi 1900–1930*, 23–37.

and economic needs of the people, and that lasted until the Party of Union and Progress built a government that dominated other ethnic groups.¹¹

The associations founded during the Second Constitutional Period, *Türk Derneği* (Turkish Association) in 1908, *Türk Yurdu Cemiyeti* (Association for Turkish Homeland) in 1911, and *Türk Ocağı* (the Turkish Hearths) in 1912, were intended to strengthen Turkish nationalism. Starting from 1912, *Türk Ocağı* (the Turkish Hearths) and its journal, *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Homeland), aimed to form a theoretical basis for Turkish nationality, and to develop it into a strong ideology.¹²

In 1913, the journal *Halka Doğru* (Towards the People), was founded by the same group associated with the journal, *Türk Yurdu*, with Ziya Gökalp and Yusuf Akçura in the cadre. Both journals, *Halka Doğru* and *Türk Yurdu*, concentrated on the “People” and “Peasantry”. They intended to bind the “Turkish elites” to “rural plebeians” by simplifying their language and discussing rural Anatolia’s social and economic problems. It was imperative for the authors that the elites direct their attention toward the people to understand and solve their problems. In other words, the elites should glorify the people to glorify the nation. This formula carried over during the early republican period and reflected the powerful bond between Populism and Turkish Nationalism.¹³

This synthesis was echoed in the approach of Ziya Gökalp¹⁴, whose scheme to construct the ideal of Turkish nationalism was clearly apparent in early republican operations. Gökalp introduced an entire program of Turkism in his essays written between 1911 and 1918, and between 1922 and 1924,¹⁵ and he outlined how elites should approach the “people”:

-
- 11 Douglas A. Howard, *The History of Turkey*, The Greenwood Histories of the Modern Nations (Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 2001), 76–80.
 - 12 Füsün Üstel, *İmparatorluktan Ulus-Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği, Türk Ocakları, 1912–1931*, Araştırma-Inceleme Dizisi, 47, 1. Baskı (İstanbul: İletişim, 1997), p. 51.
 - 13 Georgeon, *Türk milliyetçiliğinin kökenleri Yusuf Akçura*, 60–72.
 - 14 François Georgeon briefly outlines the biography of Ziya Gökalp: He was born in the east Anatolian province Diyarbakır as a son of a public servant in the Ottoman Empire. He went to public schools and came to Istanbul for further education. Here, he became interested in literature, philosophy and politics. He was involved in the Young Turks movement in 1908 and he was active in the Party of Union and Progress. His first essays were published in nationalist and populist journals such as *Halka Doğru* and *Türk Yurdu*. Georgeon, *Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi 1900–1930*, 92–93.
 - 15 Niyazi Berkes, “Translator’s Introduction,” in *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization: Selected Essays of Ziya Gökalp*, by Ziya Gökalp (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), 13. Niyazi Berkes referred for a list on Ziya Gökalp’s essays to Uriel Heyd, *Founda-*

“One of the fundamental principles of Turkism is the drive towards ‘going to the people’ What is meant by going to the people? Who are to go to these people?

The intellectuals and the thinkers of a nation constitute its elite. The members of the elite are separated from the masses by their higher education and learning. It is they who ought to go to the people. But why? Some would answer: To carry culture to the mass. But, as we have shown elsewhere, culture is something, which is alive only among the people themselves. The elite are those who lack it. Then, how can the elite, lacking culture, carry culture to the common people who are a living embodiment of culture?

To answer the question, let us first answer the following questions: what do the elite and the people have? The elite are the carriers of civilization and the people the holders of culture. Therefore, the elite’s approach to the people should only have following two purposes: to receive a training in culture from the people and to carry the civilization to them. Yes, it is only with these two purposes that the elite should go to the people. The elite will find culture only there and nowhere else...”¹⁶

And he continued:

“To reach the people in a real sense, they [the elite] must live amongst the people and get the national culture from the people. The only way to do this is for the nationalist youth to go to the villages as schoolteachers. Those who are not young should at least go to the towns in Anatolia. The Ottoman elite will become a national elite only by completely assimilating the folk culture. The second aim of going towards the people is to carry civilization to the people. The people lack civilization and the elite have its keys. But the civilization that they should carry to the people as a precious contribution will not be Oriental civilization or its offshoot, Ottoman civilization, but Western civilization...”¹⁷

The fundamental principles of Turkish Nationalism in Gökalp’s texts were more concerned with cultural self-assertion and language than with race and

tions of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp (Westport, Conn: Hyperion Press, 1979), 174.

16 Ziya Gökalp, *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization: Selected Essays of Ziya Gökalp*, trans. by Niyazi Berkes (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), p. 259.

17 Gökalp, 261–62.

ethnic origins.¹⁸ Gökalp distinguished between the people and the elite, but no normative definitions were used to delineate classes or ethnicities. He mainly underlined concepts of *Hars ve Medeniyet*¹⁹ (Culture and Civilization) and aimed to apply these concepts by “going towards the people”.

Here, populism differed in meaning and practice from European (and Russian) contexts. Both Ziya Gökalp and Yusuf Akçura interpreted the term in association with Ottoman societal patterns. The class conflict in modernized societies that brought about radical changes in cultural, economic, and public life emerged as a completely different case than had occurred during the Ottoman reign. The empire did not consist of a class grounded on society—it included several communities where differences and definitions were ambiguous. According to Yusuf Akçura’s description, Ottoman-Turkish society embodied two classes: the people’s class which comprised smallholding farmers and villagers, agricultural laborers, artisans, and small traders, and the (economically) ruling class including civil servants, merchants, landlords.²⁰

Yusuf Akçura categorized communities according to their economic positions in Ottoman society, while Ziya Gökalp identified the people in terms of their status in the construction of culture and civilization. Although they approached the problem via different paths, they both focused on the Turkish population in rural Anatolia. Yusuf Akçura and Ziya Gökalp provoked a perception of Turkish villagers, smallholders, and agriculture laborers whose living conditions were claimed to be improved and, at the same time, whose cultural origins were appropriated to affirm Turkism in Anatolia.

Turkish Anatolia as the Homeland

In 1913, Hungarian scholar Béla Horváth led a research trip in Anatolia, from Istanbul to Konya. It was a significant study that thereafter motivated Turkish intelligentsia. During his excursion, Horváth observed the living conditions and daily habits of Anatolian Turks, Turkmen nomads, and settlers in the

18 Taha Parla, Füsün Üstel, and Sabir Yücesoy, *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye’de korporatizm*, 3. baskı, İletişim Yayınları Araştırma İnceleme Dizisi, 76 9 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1999), 31.

19 Gökalp, *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization*, 89–109.

20 (Georgeon, 1996, pp. 90–91) Here Georgeon referred to Yusuf Akçura’s writings in *Halka Doğru* in 1930. Yusuf Akçura, “Halka,” *Halka Doğru I* (1930): 22–23, 25, 27, 30.

villages. It was not only an ethnographical collection of data—the narratives Horvath introduced generally illustrated the social and economic conditions of rural life in Anatolia. He described Anatolia as a place for “a composition of peoples” who, surprisingly, amalgamated their diverse characteristics.²¹

Horváth's observations of the region from Istanbul to Konya included details on rural architecture and building traditions that reflected the living conditions of rural populations. He introduced the Tatarian village, organized according to a central plan consisting of a square in the heart of the village with small single houses arranged around the square, and the Circassian village organized according to the central axis on which small single houses were built. Horváth further described another architectural element that he observed in every village he visited: *Köy Odası* (The Village Room). He described these buildings as simple one-room houses where the villagers gathered.²²

Horváth's excursion was crucial in its observation of Anatolian rural life right before (immediately prior to) the First World War. He described the environments of villages and small rural towns which illuminated disparate social and economic circumstances. For the first time, he brought the daily life of the rural population, within its cultural context, to light. He exposed their poverty and lack of awareness of a social and economic class conflict.

Moreover, during the First War, the nostalgia for Anatolia as the Turkish Homeland suddenly appeared among Turkish elites, politicians, and military officers, continuing with the Turkish War of Independence between 1919 and 1923. The seizure of Ottoman terrain, especially the majority of Anatolia and Eastern Thrace, united Anatolian populations in building a counterattack against the occupation forces. It developed into a collective defense that consolidated communities, political parties, ethnic and religious groups, and peoples.²³

21 Béla Horváth, *Anadolu 1913*, trans. Tarık Demirkan, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları 36 (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1996), V–VI.

22 Horváth, 8.

23 Howard, *The History of Turkey*, 80–84. Berkes, *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*, pp. 468–69. For further reading on the political circumstances of Anatolian terrain in the Ottoman Empire during the First World War, see also *The Gallipoli Campaign: The Turkish Perspective*, ed. by Metin Gürcan and Robert Johnson, Routledge Studies in First World War History (London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2016), Haluk Oral, *Gallipoli 1915: Through Turkish Eyes*, 1st ed (Beyoğlu, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2007), Mustafa Aksakal, *The Ottoman Road to War in 1914: The Ottoman Empire and the*

The organization against the occupation forces and the Ottoman Dynasty was led by military officers discharged from the Ottoman Army and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. They guided this group, starting with congresses in the north and north-eastern Anatolia, and declared that they rejected the dynasty to conduct the state, calling on the politicians, elites, merchants, and landlords to unite against the occupation.²⁴ They expected to create a consciousness of a struggle for an independent state, firstly among ruling groups, and then the people. The establishment of the Grand National Assembly in Ankara, on the 23rd of April 1920, strengthened the political and administrative dimension of the war in Anatolia and the Thrace Region, which emerged from army operations supported by several civil movements.²⁵ The First World War and, immediately afterward, the War of Independence, created a collective myth, considered the most robust tool for the emerging nation by the republican intelligentsia and politicians.

Starting from the second half of the 19th century, the desire for a Turkish Anatolia developed from various political changes. The transformation from a multi-national Ottoman Empire to the nation-state of Turkey did not emerge as only a regime change in the political context. It also had strong veins altering the society to form the nationhood. Bernard Lewis interpreted that although the War of Independence and the creation of Turkish state were impulses of the First World War, they were also reactions against the Ottoman authorities. The accomplishments of civil organizations in Anatolia during the war and the establishment of a new parliament in Ankara caused a shift in focus from the European provinces of Ottoman Empire to Anatolia during the negotiation of the borders for the Republic of Turkey.²⁶ This was a significant reflection of the fact that Anatolia not only became the administrative center of Turkey, but it constituted the emotional center of the new Turkish nation.²⁷ The situation of

First World War, Cambridge Military Histories (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

24 M. Kemal Atatürk, *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri: Açıklamalı Dizin İle* (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 2006), pp. 1–6.

25 Howard, *The History of Turkey*, 84–90.

26 For further reading on peace conferences between 1919–1923; Andrew Mango, *From the Sultan to Atatürk: Turkey*, Haus Histories (London: Haus Publishing, 2009). For the correspondences during the peace conferences in Lausanne Treaty, see also Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, *Nutuk, 1919–1927: Tam Metin*, ed. Mustafa Bayram Mısır (Ankara: Palme Yayınları, 2010), 674–712.

27 Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 478–79.

the empire from the late 19th century to the early 20th century assisted in creating the fundament for the nation as the Turkish people and its idealized land, Anatolia. Nevertheless, constructing rural Anatolia with systematic programs to reshape the rural society and the built environment did not occur until the early republican years. It developed into a complete concentration on the whole land and the new definition of Turkey's Anatolia.²⁸

The social processes following the First World War led the country towards becoming the nation-state of Turkey. In fact, without national awareness, The War of Independence against the occupation forces of the First World War in the several locations of Anatolia and the eastern Thrace, and later the Greco-Turkish War in the western Anatolia created a collective memory of victory which united the people who fought. The determination of Turkey's borders defined a national territory, which included Anatolia and the east of the Thrace Region. Turkey's map after the negotiation of the Lausanne Treaty on the 23rd of July 1923 showed the Turkish state and the land that was to be thoroughly nationalized, namely – Turkified. The nationalization approach of early republican Turkey cemented the idea that the nation consisted of an imagined community that would have the will to build its national state. This approach guided state campaigns to affirm Turkey's land as a whole nation. The concept of Turkish Anatolia was legitimated during the dramatic and didactic nation-building process of early republican Turkey.²⁹

The new regime constructed a national historicism, which unconditionally rejected the Ottoman Empire. Turkish Anatolia culturally referred to the people rooted in ancient central Asian Turkic tribes who migrated to Anatolia and Thrace and blended with the ancient peoples. Shared cultural habits and common language as Turkish resulted from living closely for centuries under the

28 Here I use the term 'Turkey's Anatolia' to include in the geographical reference of eastern Thrace, remained within the Republic of Turkey's border after the Treaty of Lausanne.

29 Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, 17. [reprint] (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2008), 75–84. Anthony Smith explains the 'dramatic' and 'didactic' patterns in the nation-building process. He introduced the Pan-Turkism and Turanism in the late Ottoman period as an exemplary idea for dramatic and didactic practices. He claimed that both Pan-Turkism and Turanism pointed to roots and the homeland to the central Asia. The migration from central Asia and settling in the Anatolia and Balkans became a collective history and myth among the idea. And this conception demonstrated the dramatic narrative in historical context, and the didactic narrative to pass through to the future generations.

Turkish-speaking authority. This historical reading was used as a tool to cement the idea of a Turkified Anatolia. The formula was clearly declared in the speech of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in 1930: “The Turkish Nation is Turkey’s People who established the Republic of Turkey.”³⁰ Here the Republic of Turkey was meant in terms of the national territory. The people who settled in this terrain, and could speak the Turkish language, were considered Turkish; irrespective of their ethnic, cultural, or social differences.

The early republican approach to Turkish nationalism shaped itself in the new pursuit to melt the ethnic and cultural differences in the pot of Turkification. İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu, who was another early republican intellectual supporting Turkish nationalism during the 1930s and 1940s, sought a solution for the definition of Turkish nationalism in his texts published in several mouthpieces of the Kemalist regime. He declared, “The idea of a nation emerged from the idea of history, the idea of genesis, and the idea of evolution.”³¹ He believed the nation was the foundation of a bridge to connect the past, present, and future with a dynamic structure, and there was no other nation in the world without a shared memory and history and a promising future.³² He added that “the culture and tradition belonged to the nation; however, the civilization belonged to all nations,”³³ an international goal to achieve.

Similar to Ziya Gökalp’s “Culture and Civilization,” İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu endeavored to construct a national ideology, including cultural aspects and its development towards a higher civilization. Again, he theorized that civilization occurred as an empirical process, but culture emerged and was nourished by the de facto habits of peoples, and therefore, culture demonstrated the essential character of a nation. To be acquainted with the essence of a nation – the culture, which one could discover by “going towards the people,” ought to be the most important movement. The ideal folk consisted of the shared cultural values between the people, who preserved the fundamental elements of culture, and élites, who transmitted civilization.³⁴

30 Ayse Afet Inan, *Medeni bilgiler ve M. Kemal Atatürk'ün el yazıları* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, 1998), p. 18, Ankara.

31 İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu, *Millet Nedir?, Türk'e Doğru* (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil, Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 1994), 369.

32 Baltacıoğlu, 369–70.

33 İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu, *Milleti Anla!, Türk'e Doğru* (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil, Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 1994), 247.

34 İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu, *Problemler, Türk'e Doğru* (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil, Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 1994), 23.

The Turkification and modernization of Anatolia occurred in several ways following this approach. This method accomplished the agenda of the new state and justified the regime's interventions by observing, displaying, reconstructing, and improving rural Anatolian people and their living conditions. At the same time, the common perspective saw the new regime's ideology as a synthesis of nationalism and populism. According to Şerif Mardin, early republican objectives existed in a realm where the self-recognition of a nation had not wholly arisen and where the forms of social classes did not exist as they had in western societies. However, early republican ideology, as in Kemalism³⁵ – systematically blended nationalism and a form of populism that would not develop into class differentiation in the Western sense.³⁶

The program in the 1935 fourth congress of the Republican People's Party (RPP), established in 1919 and the political face of the new regime, generated the crystallized relationship between the party, state, and Kemalism with this statement: "The main lines of our intentions, not only for a few years but for the future as well, are here put together in a compact form. All these principles, which are the fundamentals of the party, constitute Kemalism." Party principles were declared repeatedly and emphatically: the homeland, the nation, the constitution of the state, and public rights:

"Fatherland is the sacred country within our present political boundaries, where the Turkish nation lives with its ancient and illustrious history, and with its past glories still living in the depths of its soil. Fatherland is a Unity, which does not accept separation under any circumstance.

The Nation is political composed of citizens bound together with the bonds of language, culture and ideal.

[Statement for the constitution of the state:] Turkey is a nationalist, populist³⁷, state socialist, secular, and revolutionary Republic.

[Statement for the public rights:] It is one of the important principles of our Party to safeguard the individual and social rights of liberty, of equality, of

-
- 35 The principles of Kemalism which dominated the early republican years, were embodied in six precepts: Republicanism, Nationalism, Populism, Secularism, Statism and Reformism. (Munis) Tekinalp, *Kemalizm* (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Gazete ve Matbaası, 1936).
- 36 Şerif Mardin, *Bütün eserleri dizisi. 3: İdeoloji*, İletişim yayınları, 191, 3. baskı (Cağaloğlu, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1995), p. 98, Cağaloğlu, İstanbul.
- 37 Translators' note: "i.e. dependent upon popular sovereignty".

inviolability, and of property. These rights are with the bounds of the State's authority".³⁸

It is significant to note that during the first period – from the establishment in 1919 to the one-party regime of the RPP in 1930 – Kemalist ideology had a populist character, and with the plurality in parliament, unified diverse folks under the Republic of Turkey.³⁹ After 1930, the ideology slightly shifted from one of populism to that of nationalism. It strengthened the idea of a Turkish Anatolia that idealized Anatolian land on behalf of the “Turkish” population and the Kemalist state.

Institutionalization to Legitimize the Turkish Anatolia

The efforts of the intelligentsia and the politicians to determine a Turkish Anatolia starting in the late Ottoman period gained momentum in the early republican ideology. These attempts occurred principally in institutional forms, as well as in the construction operations of the state. Proof of Turkishness was first pursued in the historical and linguistic roots of the existing Turkish population. With the establishment of the Archaeological Museum in the republican capital city Ankara in 1921, the Turkish Historical Society in 1931, and the Turkish Language Association in 1932, state institutions sought to prove a form of

38 John Parker and Charles Smith, trans., ‘Appendix: Program of Republican People's Party’, in *Modern Turkey*, 1. ed. (London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1940), pp. 235–251 (pp. 235–236).

Another resource which points to the strong bond between Kemalism, the RPP and the Turkish state was written by Malik Evrenol in 1936. In his book “Revolutionary Turkey”, Evrenol introduced the party program, state reforms, the economic, industrial and cultural developments and the role of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk to the English-speaking public. Malik Evrenol, *Revolutionary Turkey* (Ankara: Istanbul: Librairie Hachette, 1936), Ankara: Istanbul.

39 Nazan Maksudyan emphasizes the period, the authoritarianism started to appear, in terms of emergence of Turkish nationalism. She pointed to the Law on the Maintenance of Order – *Takrir-i Sükun Kanunu* in 1925 which restricted opposition in parliament. In 1927, in the second Party Congress of RPP, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk read the *Nutuk* (the Speech on the incidents from the beginning of Independence War in 1919 to the proclamation of Turkish Republic in 1923). This paved the way for the authoritarian regime emphasizing Atatürk's competence and Kemalism, that ruled the following years. See Nazan Maksudyan, *Türklüğü Ölçmek: Bilimkurgusal Antropoloji ve Türk Milliyetçiliğinin İrkçi Çehresi, 1925–1939*, İlk basım (Beyoğlu, Istanbul: Metis, 2005), 40–42.

Turkism that had been blended with other civilizations and cultivated in Anatolia for ages.

One of the earliest institutions for research on Anatolian cultures was the Ankara Archaeological Museum⁴⁰, founded in 1921, which aimed to narrate an ancient storyline of the Anatolian people. The primary purpose emerged from the idea to create a museum for the Hittite Civilization in Ankara. At this time, the intelligentsia was moving from Istanbul to Ankara to be involved in establishing the new state and following the new parliament.⁴¹ In the first years, the Hittite monuments around Ankara were placed in the museum. Afterward, the collection expanded to the monuments of ancient civilizations from all over the country.⁴²

The priority placed on Hittite studies by the Ankara Archaeological Museum represented another intention of early republican nationalist ideology: showcasing Ankara and its surrounding region as the geographical center of Hittite civilization. In this respect, the capital city of the new Turkey in the heart of this ancient civilization would support the testimony that the Anatolian people inherited the land, the culture, and the tradition from past civilizations. Now they would carry this heritage into the future.⁴³ The Ankara Archaeological Museum is early evidence of the state's intention to connect to-

40 The museum later renamed as "Museum for Anatolian Civilizations".

41 Hittite research started in 1905 by Theodor Makridi, who was in charge of the Royal Museum in Istanbul, and German philologist Hugo Winckler, an Assyriologist and Associate Professor of Semitic Languages in Berlin. Makridi and Winckler studied in Bogazkoy. In 1907, the German Archaeological Institute participated in the excavations on the site. The team – Otto Puchstein, Heinrich Kohl, Daniel Krencker, Ludwig Curtius, and Erich Puchstein – studied the temples, city walls and city gates until 1912. Jürgen Seeher and Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, eds., '*Hattuşa'da 106 Yıl: Hitit Kazılarının Fotoğraflarla Öyküsü*' = '106 Years in Hattusha': Photographs Tell the Story of the Excavations in the Hittite Capital, Yapı Kredi yayınları, 3712, 1. baskı (Beyoğlu, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları: DAI, 2012), pp. 23–71, Beyoğlu, İstanbul. The excavation started again in 1931 with a team of Dr. Kurt Bittel and the support of the German Archaeological Institute and the Deutsche Orient Gesellschaft until 1939. During this period the Hittite Palace buildings and fortification walls were excavated. Seeher and Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 72–89. The excavations were discontinued due to the Second World War and restarted in 1952 by Kurt Bittel. The research was extended by Peter Neve between 1978 and 1993 and by Jürgen Seeher between 1994 and 2005. The studies on site are continued by Andreas Schachner since 2005.

42 Raci Temizer, *Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1966), 1.

43 Bozdoğan states that: "it was postulated that the first indigenous people of Anatolia, the Hittites, were in fact ancestors of Turks." Sibel Bozdoğan, *Modernism and Nation*

day's people to the cultural roots of Anatolia in ancient civilizations by erasing the memory of Ottoman history and underlining the archaic one. At the same time, archaeological research undertaken by the state aimed to construct a substantial bond between the people and western culture; since the 18th century, archaeology arose as a vigorous tool for self-determination of national identity among European societies.⁴⁴

Since the 18th century, Antiquity was idealized as the roots of European culture. Excavations directed by German and English scholars in the Ottoman territories showed Ottoman intelligentsia that fields like archaeology, anthropology, and ethnography serve to justify nationalist theories in the West. Following this tradition, early republican intelligentsia aspired to construct another bridge between the European civilizations and Turkey's people who were one of the first inhabitants of Anatolia due to the discourse in the early republic.⁴⁵ Anatolia, considered the origin of Western society, was also affirmed by this discourse as a shared element between Turkey and Europe. According to Can Bilsel, this approach demonstrated the desire of the nation, which rooted itself in archaic ancestors in Anatolia and central Asia, to seek a connection to European civilizations.⁴⁶

Relatedly, in 1930, the Ethnography Museum of Ankara was founded to present components of the Anatolian culture studied in empirical research across the country. In 1933, the Ankara Archaeological Museum and the

Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic, Studies in Modernity and National Identity (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001), p. 243.

- 44 For a reading on archaeology as a tool for nationalism, see Bruce G. Trigger, "Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist", *Man*, 19 (1984), 355 <doi:10.2307/2802176>. For further reading on how archaeology was instrumentalized in early republican Turkey's nation building program, see Tuğba Tanyeri-Erdemir, "Archaeology as a Source of National Pride in the Early Years of the Turkish Republic", *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 31 (2006), 381–393. See also Serpil Akkaya, *Sumerer, Hethiter und Trojaner – Urahnen der anatolischen Türken? Eine rezeptionsgeschichtliche Betrachtung der Rolle antiker Kulturen in den Identitätskonzeptionen der Atatürk'schen Reformpolitik*, 1. Aufl, Thesis series (Innsbruck: Innsbruck Univ. Press, 2012).
- 45 Hamit Sadi, *İktisadi Türkiye: Tabii, Beşeri ve Mevzii Coğrafya Tetkikleri*, Yüksek İktisat ve Ticaret Mektebi 14 (İstanbul: Ahmet Sait Matbaası, 1932), 51.
- 46 S. M. Can Bilsel, "Our Anatolia": Organicism And The Making Of Humanist Culture In Turkey', in *Muqarnas, Volume 24 Muqarnas, Volume 24 History and Ideology: Architectural Heritage of the 'Lands of Rum'*, ed. by Gülru Necipoglu Bozdoğan (Brill Academic Publishers, 2007), pp. 223–242 (p. 224) <doi:10.1163/ej.9789004163201.i-310.39>.

Ethnography Museum of Ankara joined under the publication *Türk Tarih, Arkeolojya ve Etnografya Dergisi* (The Journal for Turkish History, Archaeology, and Ethnography). Reşit Galip (Mustafa Reşit Baydur), the minister of education, announced the journal's primary goal in the first issue. "This journal targets to disclose archaeological studies, create a communication tool between local and foreigner scholars, record historical, archaeological and ethnographical news about Anatolia which contains a great, untouched treasure, and report them abroad."⁴⁷

Moreover, Turkish history research was maintained by the *Türkkocağı Türk Tarihi Tetkik Encümeni* (Turkish Hearths Research Committee for Turkish History) from 1930. This committee consisted of historians and politicians such as Yusuf Akçura, Halil Ethem Eldem, Ayşe Afet Inan, Reşit Galip (Mustafa Reşit Baydur), Samih Rifat and İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı. In 1931, they released the first stage of the study of Turkish history called *Türk Tarihinin Anahatları* (Outline of Turkish History)⁴⁸. In the same year, the committee founded the Turkish Historical Society focusing on research about Turkish history.⁴⁹

Reşit Galip (Mustafa Reşit Baydur) presented the fundamental Turkish history hypothesis. The direction of relationship dynamics between Europe and Asia was hitherto introduced as a flow from the West to the East. However, on the contrary, a flow from the East to the West was historically more prevalent. During the archaic ages, Turkic tribes had moved from Central Asia to the West, where they settled and took on new cultural qualities due to the conditions they confronted in different environments. Anatolia emerged as a region where the majority of migrated tribes were settled since it was geographically midway on the path of migration. Therefore, the Turkification of Anatolia began in the Paleolithic ages, and the masses had gradually Turkified for centuries, turning Anatolia into a land purely representing Turks. As a result of

47 Reşit Galip, "Tarih, Arkeolojya ve Etnografya Dergisi Niçin Çıkıyor?," *Türk Tarih, Arkeolojya ve Etnografya Dergisi* Temmuz, no. 1 (1933): 4.

48 The Turkish history hypothesis was presented in publication by Ayşe Afetinan in 1931, with the title of Prolegomena to an Outline of Turkish History – Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları, Methal Kısmı. See (Ayşe) Afetinan, "Afet İnan: Prolegomena to an Outline of Turkish History", in *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770–1945): Texts and Commentaries*, ed. by Ahmet Ersoy, Maciej Górný, and Vangelis Kechriotis, trans. by Ahmet Ersoy (Budapest; New York: Central European University Press, 2010), pp. 54–61.

49 Büşra Ersanlı, *İktidar ve Tarih*, İletişim Yayınları 880, Araştırma İnceleme Dizisi 139 (İstanbul, Turkey: İletişim Yayınları, 2003), 139–80.

that fact, Anatolia exhibited a Turkish history as early as central Asia.⁵⁰ Following this argument, the Turkish Historical Society crystallized the idea of the “Roots of Turkism in Anatolia” enormously depending on the hypothesis. Then the Turkish scholars focused on folklore and ethnography studies as well as archaeological and historical research to testify to a parallel history belonging to Turkic folks in Anatolia.

The establishment of the *Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti* (Turkish Language Association) in July 1932 was another endeavor of the Turkish Historical Society to create a testimony to Turkish Anatolia. The Alphabet Reform in 1928⁵¹ created a new language theory related to the Turkish history hypothesis. Changing lettering from the Arab alphabet to the Latin-origin alphabet emerged as a step in continuing the process of language reform, which also included replacing Arab-origin words with Turkish-origin words.⁵²

In October 1932, the First Turkish Language Congress was assembled. During the conferences, the committee concentrated on discussions about the history of the Turkish language, strategies for its development, and systematic research that would elevate the Turkish language to a prestigious place among other languages worldwide. First, differences between written and spoken language should be reconciled. Then, with the help of a thorough analysis of dialects and articulations of idioms seen in different parts of the country, the Turkish language should be reformed into a more populist and nationalist adaptation.⁵³ The committee of the First Language Congress developed a theory on the Turkish language – The Sun Language Theory following the Turkish history hypothesis. Hereafter, the Turkish language contained features belonging to Indo-European and Semitic languages; in fact, the origin of Turkish arose as the genesis of these languages. In other words, scholars proposed that the first Turkic languages appeared as the ancestors of all human

50 Reşit Galip, ‘Türk Tarih Tarih İnkılabı ve Yabancı Tezler’, *Birinci Teşrin*. Sayı 9 (1933), pp. 167–168, and Maksudyân, *Türklüğü Ölçmek*, 56–62.

51 Yeşim Bayar introduces the Alphabet Reform from the perspective in which Language politics were instrumentalized in the nation-building projects.: Yeşim Bayar, *Formation of the Turkish Nation-State, 1920–1938* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 54–58.

52 İsa Öztürk, *Harf Devrimi ve Sonuçları: Deneme* (İstanbul: Adam, 2004), and *Harf İnkılabı, 1928–1938: Tarih, Tahlil, Tasvir*, C.H.P. Beşiktaş Halkevi Yayınları, Sayı 1 (İstanbul: İstanbul: Kader Basımevi, 1938), İstanbul.

53 Samih Rifat (Yalnızgil), “Birinci Gün, 26 Eylül 1932 Pazartesi, Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti Reisi Samih Rifat Beyin Açma Nutku” (İstanbul Devlet Matbaası, 1933), 1–10.

languages.⁵⁴ The Sun Language Theory represented early republican ideology in forming well-established nationhood, which roots referred to essences of other cultures, especially Western civilizations.⁵⁵

Between 1932 and 1934, the Turkish Language Association conducted research on the dictionary, grammar, syntax, and etymology of spoken and written language in Anatolia. At the same time, the association established a committee that collected the words in spoken Turkish and sought replacements for foreign expressions in the language. They believed that the essence of Turkish was being spoken among Turkoman nomads or Turkic-origin villagers in the country. Therefore, the research team traveled across the country to discover new dialects, accents, and vocabulary. The scholars lived with the villagers to grasp the language's authenticity and categorized and compiled materials by region.⁵⁶ This approach ushered in a physical connection between the intelligentsia and rural people that was realized in theory and practice.

Language studies and research on archaeology, ethnography, and history were not the only fields in which scholars focused projects on rural Anatolia. Various institutional programs of the one-party government of RPP from 1930⁵⁷ to 1945 ultimately defined the acts of the state. Among them the People's House – Halkevi was introduced in the third congress of RPP in 1931 as a significant program to approach the masses and serve the political and ideological endeavors of the RPP, and hence the state, not only in cities, but also in small towns all over the country:

“The principles which summarize the essentials of the Turkish state, and the revolutions of Atatürk are to discard deleterious and negative facts from the

54 Hüseyin Sadoğlu, *Türkiye'de Ulusçuluk ve Dil Politikaları*, 1. baskı, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları 44 (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2003), 246–63.

55 Can Bilsel also comments on the Sun Language Theory: Can Bilsel, “Our Anatolia,” 225.

56 Ahmet Caferoğlu, *Anadolu Dialektolojisi Üzerine Malzeme I: Balıkesir, Manisa, Afyonkarahisar, Isparta, Aydın, İzmir, Burdur, Antalya, Muğla, Denizli, Kütahya Vilayetleri Ağzları*, Edebiyat Fakültesi Dil Seminerleri 105 (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1940), VII–XI.

57 Free Republican Party (or Liberal Republican Party) – *Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası* was established by Fethi Okyar in August 1930. However, it was dissolved after four months due to their strong opposition to Kemalist reforms. For the reading on the multi-party experience in early republican Turkey, see Ahmet Ağaoğlu, *Serbest Fırka Hatıraları*, İletişim Yayınları Anı Dizisi, 253 15, 3. bs (İstanbul: İletişim, 1994), İstanbul.Osman Okyar and Mehmet Seyitdanlıoğlu, *Fethi Okyar'ın Anıları: Atatürk-Okyar ve Çok Partili Türkiye* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür yayınları, 1999).

country and the people, to operate positive science and modern technology in all fields, to preserve the national character of the country and the people, to raise Turkish people up to the greatest civilization that they've merited, to increase the population and enrich it to a higher wealth level.

It was necessary that the great revolution of Atatürk approach to the hearth of People. The revolution was leading us to a new life and in a new direction. It was our duty to unite the People in ideology and its process, to inspire them in development and to display their unique qualities in their essence by inducing a new perspective on life.

According to RPP, it was crucial to step our people up through the public education except from the state education, having adopted the particular ways of our people. Therefore, it was thought that the new perspectives in the social and cultural sphere will be nourished by a new and national institution which will emerge from the elements of our own society. This idea resulted in the regulations for the People's House in the third congress of the Party in 1931. After a long examination, the instruction of organization was gridded. According to this guide the People's House establish in nine branches: 1. Language, Literature, History; 2. Fine Arts; 3. Performance Arts; 4. Sport; 5. Social Assistance; 6. Public Training Schools and Courses; 7. Library and Publication; 8. Village Affairs (*Köycüler*); 9. Museum and Exhibition. All of these branches have the missions to widen and develop the essence of the society".⁵⁸

The organization, officially established in 1932 in 14 city centers, emerged from a program based on Kemalist reforms directed towards the people, especially in rural areas. Based on a short-term multi-party experience in 1930, it was believed that the people could not adopt the principles of Kemalism. At first, the People's House was meant to realize Kemalist Revolutions in big cities and small towns and villages by providing adult education. To make scientific observations about this kind of organization and learn how to improve the national model, scholars were sent to Germany and Central European countries, where state houses became a substantial place for public schooling during the 1930s.⁵⁹ Although the organization was defined as a Public Education Center, it was de facto aimed to develop it into the state's local agent to govern, hence

58 *Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi Onbeşinci Yıl Kitabı* (Ankara: TBMM, 1938), 15. Author's translation.

59 M. Asim Karaömerlioğlu, 'The People's Houses and the Cult of the Peasant in Turkey', *Middle Eastern Studies*, 34 (1998), 67–91 (p. 69).

controlling the population in the countryside. On the other hand, the People's House provided a platform for Turkish intelligentsia to reach the villagers, provincials, and their culture. In other words, besides the political and ideological aims, the organization intended to bridge the differentiated groups of society. Moreover, it resulted in the founding of 379 People's Houses⁶⁰ in the cities and towns and equipping education programs by the peasantist discourse of the early republic.⁶¹

The People's House provided a physical space to spread the ideology of state – the ideology of RPP, and to construct the bond between the people and elites. When reemphasizing early republican nationalist discourse, it was believed that the national culture was rooted in rurality while the elites held the keys to improving in a modernized landscape. Here the People's House was perceived as a shared place to bring these two essences of the society together. The People's House generated an awakening for Anatolia to artists, academics, and officials who left the big cities such as Istanbul and Ankara to participate in particular programs in rural Turkey. The mobilization of intelligentsia caused the idealization of Anatolian land and, at the same time, initiated the discussion on the social and economic problems of Anatolian people.

Institutional organizations of the republican state occurred in several fields in addition to academic research and adult education programs in the countryside. One of the crucial examples of these interventions was the Gazi Educational Institute, founded in 1929 in Ankara, which prepared students for teacher training in the countryside. After graduation, young teachers worked in secondary schools in small towns and elementary schools in the villages and small rural towns of Anatolian cities. In 1932 the Art Department of the Gazi Educational Institute was founded by educationist İsmail Hakkı Tonguç, who aimed to generate a new art movement that emphasized Anatolia. The educators in this department concentrated on the Anatolian people, their living conditions, built environment, and the landscape. Malik Aksel worked

60 Asım Karaömerlioğlu, *Orada Bir Köy Var Uzakta: Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Köycü Söylem*, 1. baskı, Araştırma-İnceleme Dizisi 200 (Cağaloğlu, İstanbul: İletişim, 2006), 56. Referring to: İlhan Başgöz, *Türkiye'nin eğitim çıkmazı ve Atatürk* (İstanbul: Pan, 2005), 198.

61 İlhan Tekeli and Gencay Şaylan, "Türkiye'de Halkçılık İdeolojisinin Evrimi," *Toplum ve Bilim Dergisi* 6–7, no. Yaz-Güz (1978): 83.; Karaömerlioğlu, *Orada Bir Köy Var Uzakta*, 56–60. For further reading on the establishment and function of People's House during early republican years, see Nurcan Toksoy, *Halkevleri: Bir Kültürel Kalkınma Modeli Olarak* (Kavaklıdere, Ankara: Orion Yayınevi, 2007).

in the institute as a painter and an art historian and pioneered the movement of “Anatolia in Turkish Art”. In 1934, Malik Aksel and his students organized an exhibition in the People’s House in Ankara under the theme of the Anatolian landscape and people. After this performance, several artists looked to “Anatolia” for thematic material in art.⁶²

The RPP and People’s House initiated a program between 1938 and 1944 called *Yurt Gezileri* (Homeland Excursions). The artists were encouraged to travel to the country to include folkloric elements and cultural and national motifs in their art. It was aimed that artists’ observations reflected on the canvas would result from empirical research about the land. They were supported and awarded by the state.⁶³ The first excursion started after the legal decision of RPP on the 27th of July 1938. According to the act, the goal was an organization for artistic research about homeland focusing on confirming the “beauty” of Anatolia in ten different cities. The artists who participated in the excursions were chosen by a committee of the Fine Arts Academy in Istanbul. Each of them was sent to different cities and returned with a considerable amount of artwork about landscape and cultural/local symbols of the cities and towns.⁶⁴

Homeland Excursions attracted the attention of artists in that, on the one hand, they could participate in the nation-building project of the state by becoming acquainted with the daily lives and customs of Anatolian people. However, on the other hand, they were glad to get the state’s support. Either artist involved supported the ideological facet of RPP’s program, or they considered the Homeland Excursions as a point of access to a prestigious position in their field. In both cases, this enterprise made an acquaintance between artists and the people. Painter Refik Epikman stressed this fact in *Ülke*, the journal that served as a mouthpiece for the RPP during the 1930s:

“This program [Homeland Excursions] which connects the people to art and artists, will, no doubt, generate a new movement in [Turkish] art. The party

62 Kaya Özsezgin, *Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılında Türk Resmi*, Türkiye İş Bankası, Kültür Yayınları; Cumhuriyet Dizisi, Genel yayın no. 436. 20 (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1999), 43; Sezer Tansuğ, *Çağdaş Türk sanatı*, 3. basım (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1993), 171; İsmail Hakkı (Tonguç), “Malik Bey ve Talebesinin Resim Sergisi,” *Ülke* 16, no. Haziran (1934): 297.

63 Tansuğ, *Çağdaş Türk sanatı*, 216.

64 Kıymet Giray, “Yurdu Gezen Türk Ressamları-1: 1939–1944 Yurt Gezileri,” *Türkiye’de Sanat* 18, no. Mart-Nisan (1995): 34–35.

[RPP] places the importance of art with supportive and incentive attitude that leaves very positive impact on the people. A growing amount of comments from people demonstrating their will to be enlightened by art, appears to be the greatest evidence of this impact".⁶⁵

Homeland Excursions were not the only enterprise concentrating on Anatolia in art. Art and sculpture exhibitions organized by the People's House between 1936 and 1938 motivated artists to travel to Anatolian cities, small towns, and villages, live with locals, and exchange cultural notions.⁶⁶ Artists pictured and hence documented rural Turkey, exhibiting the locality and variety of culture in different parts of the country. This led to the need for a consciousness of a relationship between the elites and people. Besides, this connection echoed in art movements in the 1930s and 1940s in Turkey. The artists first sought the synthesis of folkloric materials of Anatolian culture and coded them using the cubist abstraction.⁶⁷ Later this approach transformed into a political criticism by introducing the rural life from a realistic perspective rather than an idealized image. Finally, they emphasized an aesthetical version of socio-realism; the group took a more critical position towards the state by illustrating the problems in the countryside.⁶⁸

Another dimension in the idealization of Anatolian Land emerged in Turkish literature beginning in the republic's first years following the nationalist wave. The nationalist and populist approach, formed during the last years of the Ottoman Empire, and advocated by Ziya Gökalp, shaped this dimension in literature during the early republican period.⁶⁹ As in the field of art, the theme of Anatolia was placed at the center of literature. In Rural Anatolia, small towns and villages emerged as the scenery for bringing the people's living circumstances and issues to light in a realistic way. The facts of peasantry and village life, their cultural, societal, and moral transformation on the verge of evolution from feudalism to capitalism, and the practices pursued during this pro-

65 Refik Epikman, "Türk Ressamlarının Yurt Gezisi," *Ülkü* 21, no. Temmuz (1939): 461. Author's translation.

66 Kıymet Giray, "Örneklerle Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Resim Sanatı," in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Resim Sanatından Örnekler: 22 Ekim – 03 Aralık 2003 Ankara Devlet Resim ve Heykel Müzesi Sergi Kataloğu* (Ankara: TC Merkez Bankası – Kültür Bakanlığı, 2003), 7.

67 Tansuğ, *Çağdaş Türk sanatı*, 181.

68 Kaya Özsezgin, *Cumhuriyetin Elli Yılında Plastik Sanatlar* (Tunca Sanat, 2010), 111.

69 Ramazan Kaplan, *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Romanında Köy*, 3. baskı, Kaynak Eserler 32 (Kızılay, Ankara: Akçağ, 1997), 43.

cess were portrayed particularly after 1950. However, early republican literature also projected rural life to demonstrate its transformation and, at the same time, its position in nation-building and modernization enterprises.⁷⁰ Literature on rurality referred to the concept, “towards the People” and the other mediums. Texts on Anatolian people and their way of living had another value, in addition to depicting circumstances in the rural realm and as populist enlightenment among elites. The authors, who portrayed rural life, believed that their texts were crucial tools for the people to guide their own lives.

According to İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu early republican literature, like the art in other disciplines based on rural narratives, provided a critical function in society. In his writings *Edebiyatta Türk’e Doğru* (Towards Turk in the Literature), he stressed the idea of “Art for the People”:

“The assignment of literature is a genuine duty in the society. ... Like economy and technics, literature is a beneficial discipline for the society. ... The masses, literature addressed, is the People. The people, themselves, are the entity, which is not influenced by the separation related to wealth, status, and education. Thus, the literature work, addressed the large masses, remains forever”.⁷¹

The theme of Anatolia and Anatolian people in early republican literature appeared in different ways, such as, in the representation of Kemalist approaches and criticism of intelligentsia, social, economic, and political inequality, and realistic perspective toward the social life of rural people.⁷²

Asım Karaömerlioğlu categorized the peasantry theme related to Anatolia in Turkish literature under these three authors: Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu represented the Kemalist perspective; Sabahattin Ali introduced a socialist point of view, and Memduh Şevket Esenal thematically addressed the populist approach. In his 1932 novel, *Yaban* (The Stranger), Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu portrayed the conflict between intellectuals and rural people for the first time. He pointed to the problems of the Anatolian peasant and aimed

70 Ahmet Oktay, *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyatı*, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları; Sanat-Edebiyat Dizisi / Yayınlar Dairesi Başkanlığı, 1562. 69–6 (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1993), p. 129, Ankara.

71 İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu, *Edebiyatta Türk’e Doğru, Türk’e Doğru* (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil, Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 1994), 82. Author’s translation.

72 Carole Leslie Rathbun, “The Village in the Turkish Novel and Short Story 1920 to 1955” (unpublished Thesis (Ph. D.), Princeton University, 1968), pp. 21–22.

to convince the early republican elites of the significance of peasantry. At the same time, he backed the operations of the Kemalist Revolution and ideology in the countryside. As a result of this, he drew the attention of Kemalist intellectuals during the 1930s.⁷³

In *Yaban*, the author writes a storyline around the main character, Ahmet Cemal, a well-educated military officer who fought in the First World War and afterward participated in the Turkish War of Independence. Ahmet Cemal decides to settle in one of his soldier's villages in the center of Anatolia. He describes the village as "a frozen part of the earth" and "an ancient Hittite ruin," and criticizes the relations between the officers and the villagers:

"The reason for this, young Turkish intellectual, is you! What did you ever do for this devastated realm and this mass of deprived humanity? For years you sucked his blood and threw him back to the hard earth like pulp, and now you come and find in yourself the right to loathe him."⁷⁴

Anatolian people had a soul; you couldn't touch it. They had a mind you couldn't enlighten. They had a body you couldn't nourish. They had land to live on; you couldn't cultivate. You gave them up to the hands of ignorance, poverty, and drought. They grew like a weed between hard earth and dry sky. Now, you came here with a hook to harvest. What did you ever plant to harvest, these nettles or dry hawthorns? Then, of course, they prick to your feet! Look, you are bleeding, and you are wincing with pain. You are boiling with rage. This thing, grates you, is all your fault, it is all your fault!"⁷⁵

Emphasis on the ignorance towards the Turkish peasant and rural people engendered the idea that the distance between elites and people must be broken to begin the populist enlightenment in all layers of society. Elites should engage the people intelligently by considering facts and providing development instead of simply idealizing them. This point of view spread further with the idea that continued progress in society and building the new Turkish nation were completely dependent on the circumstances of the Turkish peasantry.⁷⁶

73 Karaömerlioğlu, *Orada Bir Köy Var Uzakta*, 153–55.

74 Carole Leslie Rathbun translated this part in her Ph. D. thesis. See Rathbun, "The Village in the Turkish Novel and Short Story 1920 to 1955," 38. Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, *Yaban*, 34. baskı, Y. Kadri Karaosmanoğlu Bütün Eserleri Dizisi 1 (İstanbul: İletişim, 1999), 100.

75 Karaosmanoğlu, *Yaban*, 100. Author's translation.

76 Karaömerlioğlu, *Orada Bir Köy Var Uzakta*, 160–61.

The critical position of the relationship between the intelligentsia and the rural population also appeared in Sabahattin Ali's works. In contrast to Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu's acceptance of Kemalist ideology, which directed the rural population to a community without any social class, Sabahattin Ali did not support this idea or romanticize the rural life. Instead, he addressed the realities among the rural people in a bitter sense. He addressed to the social and economic struggle of the Turkish peasant. According to Rathbun, he "concentrated more on a portrayal of political and social injustice suffered by a passive and uninformed peasantry."⁷⁷ His novel, *Kuyucaklı Yusuf*, written in 1937, was considered one of the earliest works issued about the Turkish village, rural people, and, again, their relationships with Turkish elites from a socio-realistic perspective. This criticism of the circumstances of peasants and villagers was also addressed in *İnce Memed* (Memed, My Hawk), written by Yaşar Kemal in 1955. Similar to Ali's approach, he conveyed a bitter relationship and struggle between the state, villagers, bandits, and landlords.⁷⁸

Another artistic vein for the theme of Anatolia emerged in studies of Turkish music during the early republic. While the attempts of Turkish scholars sought to foster authenticity in folkloric elements and lyrics, the state supported the Western forms; especially classical music. They invited several German and Central European musicologists to the country to produce a Western-Turkish synthesis in music.⁷⁹

Comprehensive research on Turkish folk music was conducted by Turkish scholar, Adnan Saygun, and Hungarian scholar, Béla Bartók, who arrived in the country in 1936. On several excursions throughout the country, Saygun and Bartók collected local motifs and generated an archive of Turkish folk music in the Ankara State Conservatory. This study motivated Turkish musicians who were willingly forming a national art. Béla Bartók analyzed the folkloric melodies and sought to create a synthesis between them and Western music.⁸⁰

77 Rathbun, "The Village in the Turkish Novel and Short Story 1920 to 1955," 22.

78 Yaşar Kemal, *Memed, My Hawk*, trans. Edouard Roditi, New York Review Books Classics (New York: New York Review Books, 2005).

79 During the early republican years, Turkish music was forbidden in the state radio. The state policy was ambiguous, since the studies on folkloric music was carried out by scholars all over the country. Fethiye Erbay and Mutlu Erbay, *Cumhuriyet Dönemi (1923–1938), Atatürk'ün Sanat Politikası*, 1. basım (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 2006), 150.

80 Tansuğ, *Çağdaş Türk sanatı*, 216.

His analysis of local melodies referred not only to ethnomusicological vocabulary. He also noted the cultural and social status of the people and the characteristics of the villages, and he collected the information in terms of literature, linguistics, history, and folklore. He sought to display the cultural characteristics by studying the layers of Anatolian melodies.⁸¹

Adnan Saygun and Béla Bartók's approach to national music fulfilled early republican aims. He believed it was essential to collect folkloric themes from Anatolian villages where the real authentic tunes were rendered to generate Turkish national music. Researching these motifs and exhibiting them would foster national awareness. According to Bartók, this was the reason why the melodies in a village had the most outstanding artistic quality, and they would become the "classical" pieces of Turkish culture. Following his concept, in 1936, the People's House organized another excursion, *Kültür Gezileri* (Culture Excursions), into small towns and villages to understand folkloric melodies with a sense of cultural archaeology.⁸² However, the compilation of Turkish folk music did not reach the public until musician and folklorist Muzaffer Sarısözen accessed the archived songs that Saygun and B Bartók collected. Sarısözen started a new choir, *Yurttan Sesler Korosu* (Choir of the Sounds from the Homeland), in the Ankara State Conservatory in 1947. The choir was broadcasted on the state radio and carried Turkish folk music to a more considerable amount of publicity for the first time.⁸³

During the 1930s and 1940s, the theme of Anatolia, which appeared prominently in state politics, projects, institutional organizations, and studies, was considered the most significant subject matter. Typically, early republican intelligentsia, politicians, and artists collected narratives that either supported the Kemalist ideology and its actions, or not. In any case they learned about the Anatolian people. Their study grounded the nation on the Anatolian cultural landscape by observing the rural people and their livelihoods. Indeed, these organizational, artistic, and scientific interventions also paved the way for operations modernizing the land and influencing the rural population on behalf of the republican regime.

81 Béla Bartók, *Küçük asya'dan türk halk musikisi*, trans. by Bülent Aksoy, Pan Yayıncılık, 16 (İstanbul: Pan Yayıncılık, 1991), p. 8, İstanbul.

82 Bartók, 9.

83 Niyazi Yılmaz, *Türk Halk Müziğinin Kurucu Hocası Muzaffer Sarısözen* (Ankara: Ocak Yayınları, 1996), 16–20.