

## Tarih ve GÜNce

*Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi Dergisi*  
*Journal of Atatürk and the History of Turkish Republic*  
II/4, (2019 Kış), ss. 3-38.

Geliş Tarihi: 15 Ağustos 2018

Kabul Tarihi: 31 Ocak 2019

# STATE OF MIND IN MINORITY POLICIES OF THE SINGLE PARTY PERIOD

Coşkun TÜRKAN\*

## Abstract

By the XIXth century multi ethnic empires like Ottoman Empire, with the accelerating impact of the ideology of nationalism, experienced a process of dissolution which resulted in the founding of new nation states. These nation states were grounded on a homogenous social structure and attempted various “demographical engineering” policies towards the discordant elements. This and also the migrations accelerated both the sharpening and socialisation of nationalist ideology and ventures of the ‘naming’ of those who live in their respective countries. Without doubt, this venture(s) of naming brought up the building of nation on one hand and with the extensification of the consciousness and aspects of “us”, suppressing and/or assimilation of the “other”, in short making them invisible on the other. It is a fact that Republic of Turkey, which replaced Ottoman Empire and which was designed in accordance to understanding of a nation-state, too were affected from these developments. As commonly known, the Treaty of Lausanne which was concluded as a result of the Turkish War of National Independence fought against the imperialist forces and their sub-imperial elements, sanctioned the lands of the Turkish nation-state before the international arena and these lands took an unprecedented homogenous appearance. On the other hand, founding fathers of the Republic, who experienced the imperial administration and thus could be defined as being partly in empire and partly in nation-state, with the impact of their witnessing of the process of dissolution in the empire, tried to homogenise all kinds of differences, turn the remnants of an empire into citizens and elevate it to the level of modern civilisation. Attitudes towards the minorities during the homogenisation policies were closely associated with the past experiences and with the nation desired or intended to build. This article aims to focus on the background state of mind of the attitudes towards minorities rather than the policies’ itself.

---

\* Lecturer, Adnan Menderes University, Department of Atatürk’s Principles and History of Turkish Revolution. coskunturkan@mynet.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2629-7602.

**Keywords:** Nationalism, Minorities, Nation-state, Turkish nation-state, Homogenisation.

## TEK PARTİ DÖNEMİ AZINLIK POLİTİKALARINDA HALET-İ RUHİYE

### Öz

XIX. yüzyıldan itibaren Osmanlı gibi çok etnili imparatorlukların milliyetçilik ideolojisinin de etkisiyle çözülme sürecine girmesi, yeni ulus-devletlerin kurulmasına yol açtı. Bunun yanında bu ulus-devletlerin homojen bir toplumsal yapıyı temel alması ve bununla uyuşmayan unsurlara yönelik çeşitli “demografik mühendislik” girişimleri ve bu süreçte yaşanan göçler de, hem milliyetçi ideolojinin keskinleşmesini ve toplumsallaşmasını hem de bu topraklarda yaşayanların ‘adlandırılma’ girişimlerini hızlandırdı. Şüphesiz bu adlandırma girişim(ler)i bir yandan ulusun inşasını, diğer yandan da “biz”lik bilincinin ve hallerinin yaygınlaş(tırıl)masıyla, “öteki”nin baskı altına alınmasını ve/ya asimilasyonunu, kısaca ‘görünmez’ kılınmasını gündeme getirdi. Osmanlı Devleti’nin yerini alan ve bir ulus-devlet anlayışına göre kurgulanan Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nin de bu gelişmelerin etkisi altında kaldığı bir gerçektir. Bilindiği gibi emperyal güçler ve onların alt emperyal unsurlarına karşı verilen Millî Mücadele sonucunda gündeme gelen Lozan Antlaşması, Türk ulus-devletinin topraklarını uluslararası arenada tescilledi ve bu topraklar, hiç olmadığı kadar homojen bir görünüm aldı. Bunun yanında imparatorluk deneyimi yaşayan ve bir anlamda bir ayakları imparatorlukta, diğer ayakları ulus-devlette olan cumhuriyetin kurucu kadrosu, imparatorluğun çözülüş sürecine yakından şahitlik etmiş olmanın da etkisiyle, her türlü farklılığı homojenleştirmeye ve imparatorluk bakiyesi bir toplumu muasır medeniyetler seviyesine ulaştırma ve yurttaşlara dönüştürmeye çalıştı. Homojenleştirme politikalarında azınlıklara nasıl yaklaşılacağı, yaşanan deneyimler ve inşa edilmek istenen/arzulanan toplumla da yakından ilgiliydi. Bu makale, azınlıklara yönelik uygulamalardan çok, bunların arak planındaki ruh haline odaklanma amacındadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Milliyetçilik, Azınlıklar, Ulus-devlet, Türk ulus-devleti, Homojenleştirme.

### Introduction

Hobsbawm mentions a “dual revolution” which affected the world in the XIX<sup>th</sup> century. In this period, during which the economy was shaped under the impact of the Industrial Revolution, politics and ideology were determined by French and the first sample, notion and vocabulary of nationalism were provided from France, the world and naturally the Ottoman realm were affected

from these respective developments.<sup>1</sup> For this reason, it is possible to maintain that, one of the most powerful political ideologies in the XIX<sup>th</sup> century, probably the first of them was nationalism, and nation and nationalism provided people new gods and new hopes.<sup>2</sup> In other words, weakening of agricultural social structure and thus traditional coherence ideologies/dependences with the industrialisation, crowds which were atomised to an unprecedented degree, were tried to be reunited around a new coherence ideology with the re-modeling social and political structures. At this juncture, it must be stated in a bracket that we handle the “coherence ideology” with its broadest meaning as “a bond in a community that tie individual to community”.<sup>3</sup>

It can be argued that, traditional Ottoman system, without facing a serious crisis, maintained to exist until the XIX<sup>th</sup> century. A serious quake and transformation in this structure was brought up with the above mentioned dual revolution. By the XIX<sup>th</sup> century integration of Ottoman Empire to global capitalist system caused to economic advancement of non-Muslim population especially in the port cities of the empire, emergence of a new middle class in these communities and spread of nationalist ideology. Besides, attempts of the European powers to gain privileges for non-Muslim bourgeoisie in the Ottoman lands, expressions and actions of the non-Muslim communities for independence forced Ottoman ruling elite for some reforms. These reforms led to transformation of religious communities/“millet system” at one hand, and increase in the importance of ethnical and secular values, as new coherence elements, especially among the non-Muslim communities on the other.<sup>4</sup> In addition to this, Ottoman ruling class, exposing the military, economic, political and ideological pressure

---

<sup>1</sup> Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Devrim Çağı: 1789- 1848*, transl. Jülide Ergüder- Alâeddin Şenel, V Yayınları, Ankara, 1989, pp. 101-102.

<sup>2</sup> Although different dates were proposed for the first examples of modern nationalism, it has been widely accepted that it was prominent in the French revolution and awakening at the end of the XVIII<sup>th</sup> century. See, Craig Calhoun, *Milliyetçilik*, transl. Bilgen Sütçüoğlu, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007, pp.13-14; Anthony D. Smith, *Kuram, İdeoloji, Tarih*, transl. Ümit Hüsrev Yolsal, Atf Yayınları, Ankara 2013, p. 15; Christophe Jaffrelot, “Bir Milliyetçilik Kuramı İçin”, Ed. Alain Dieckhoff, Christophe Jaffrelot, *Milliyetçiliği Yeniden Düşünmek, Kuramlar ve Uygulamalar*, transl. Devrim Çetinkasap, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul 2010, p. 51.

<sup>3</sup> See, Alaeddin Şenel, “Milliyetçilik Nereden Nereye? Tarihsel Bir Bakış/Açık Oturum”, *Marksizm ve Gelecek*, Issue 5, 1992, p. 70.

<sup>4</sup> For this topic see, Reşat Kasaba, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Dünya Ekonomisi, On Dokuzuncu Yüzyıl*, transl. Kudret Emiroğlu, İstanbul, 1993; Gerasimos Augustinos, *Küçük Asya Rumları, 19. Yüzyılda İnanç, Cemaat ve Etnisite*, transl. Devrim Evcı, Dipnot Yayınları, Ankara 2013; Donald Quataert, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Avrupa İktisadi Yayılımı ve Direniş(1881-1908)*, transl. Sabri Tekay, Yurt Yayınları, Ankara, 1987; Karen Barkey, *Farklıklar İmparatorluğu, Karşılaştırmalı Tarih Perspektifinden Osmanlılar*, transl. Ebru Kılıç, Versus Kitap, İstanbul, 2011; Çağlar Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar*, 17<sup>th</sup> Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2011; *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Liman Kentleri, Bazı Kuramsal ve Tarihsel Perspektifler*, Ed. Çağlar Keyder, Y. Eyüp Özveren, Donald Quataert, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul, 1994.

from the global capitalism, faced a dilemma and overlapping of the ethnical divisions with the class divisions complicated the class composition. “While domestic commercial bourgeoisie which was allied with European bourgeoisie was largely non-Muslims, those who were tied to land were mainly Muslims. This situation caused to perception and expression of material contradictions in the form of ethnical and religious forms.”<sup>5</sup> This phenomena inevitably brought up a set of searches for the creation of a new identity among Ottoman statesmen and unity of the state was tried to be sustained firstly with the identity of “Ottoman” in the context of *Tanzimat* reformations, later with an Islamic identity. It must be stated that, this process also brought forth a bureaucratic originated cultural Turkish nationalism. In the modeling of Turkish nationalism, generally, wars, migrations, reform movements and commercial activities stemming from the integration of Ottoman Empire to the global capitalist system were influential.<sup>6</sup> In addition to this it is necessary to add that Turkish nationalism emerged relatively late<sup>7</sup> and politisation and socialisation process started in the course of time. Especially after the II<sup>nd</sup> Constitutional Period, founding of associations that based on the historical and social origins of Turkish nationalism, political, economic and social themed articles of their media organ concerning Turkish nationalism, along with policies of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) played a major role in the politisation and popularisation of Turkish nationalism.<sup>8</sup> Although Union and Progress seem to be defending the idea of “ittihad-ı anasır” i.e. “union of the elements”, in fact they were not optimistic about the practicability of it.<sup>9</sup> Indeed a speech by Talat Bey delivered in August 1910 gives

<sup>5</sup> Haldun Gülalp, “Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nin Kuruluşu: Kapitalizm ve Modernite”, *Laiklik, Vatandaşlık Demokrasi Türkiye’nin Siyasal Kültürü Üzerine Çalışmalar*, Metis Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017, p. 44.

<sup>6</sup> Fatma Müge Göcek, “Osmanlı Devletinde Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Oluşumu: Sosyolojik Yaklaşım”, transl. Defne Orhun, Ed. Tanıl Bora, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce, Volume 4 Milliyetçilik*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2002, p. 66; Kemal H. Karpat, *Osmanlı’da Milliyetçiliğin Toplumsal Temelleri*, Timaş Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017, pp. 118-144.

<sup>7</sup> For instance, while Georgeon, states “the ‘real birth moment’ of Turkish nation was the moment when ‘a couple of people’ started to think as a ‘nation’ at the turning of 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries”, Akçam indicates, “starting of serious thinking on the what was or what must be the Turkish national identity is as late as the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century”. See, François Georgeon, *Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi (1900-1930)*, transl. Ali Berktaş, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006, p. ix; Taner Akçam, “Türk Ulusal Kimliği Üzerine Tezler”, Ed. Tanıl Bora, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce, Volume 4 Milliyetçilik*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2002, p. 53. Also see, David Kushner, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu 1876-1908*, transl. Zeki Doğan, Fener Yayınları, İstanbul, 1998.

<sup>8</sup> On this topic see, Füsün Üstel, *İmparatorluktan Ulus-Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği: Türk Ocakları (1912-1931)*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1997; Yusuf Bayraktutan, *Türk Fikir Tarihinde Modernleşme, Milliyetçilik ve Türk Ocakları*, T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 1996; Masami Arai, *Jön Türk Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliği*, transl. Tansel Demirel, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1994; Ali Engin Oba, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu*, İmge Kitabevi Yayınları, Ankara, 1995.

<sup>9</sup> Dr. Baha Şakir and Nazım Bey who said “Our association is a straight Turkish association. It will not be in compliance with idea of those who are enemy of Islam and Turkishness” on 2 July 1906, needed to state the “conditions” concerning the admission requirements of a non-Muslim Ottoman

an idea about this topic. "You are informed that equality between Muslim and non-Muslim was confirmed with the rules of the Constitution; yet you and everyone know and feel that this is an impracticable idea. [...] Emotions of Muslims and even emotions of non-Muslims themselves who stubbornly resisted all the attempts initiated for their Ottomanisation constitutes an insurmountable obstacle before the setting up genuine equality. We initiated unsuccessful attempts for turning non-Muslims into loyal Ottomans."<sup>10</sup> These lines not only reflect the perception of the "other", but also show that notion of "the dominant nation" was strongly prevailing among state officials. It can be argued that Unionist expressions and actions favoring Turkish nationalism gained momentum with the Balkan Wars, and these wars created a breaking point in its popularisation. Following these wars, Union and Progress members who observed that only Anatolia was remained under their sway, moved their ideological centers here, looked for ways of holding this land and gave importance to policies of cleaning it from non-Turkic/Muslim elements.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, causing of old subjects of the empire to defeats and land losses in these wars, directed the CUP to take some steps devoted to Turkish nationalism and modernisation and radicalised the attitude towards the "other". In other words, the CUP considered other nations and ethnical communities as a threat for its existence and preferred to blame "them" for what was happened.<sup>12</sup> While nationalism was turning into "statism", in a period in which Ottoman ruling class increasingly interested in nationalism, Unionists gave importance to nationalist policies in administrative, economic and cultural fields.<sup>13</sup> In fact this phenomena proves that "in Turkey the fate of nationalism was determined by actual events rather than the theory" as Karpas

---

to association. See, Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, *Türk İnkılâbı Tarihi Volume 1 Kısım 1*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 1991, p. 372.

<sup>10</sup> After this speech which was claimed by English deputy consul at Bitola (Manastır), to be given by Talat Bey, during a 'secret session' of the UP in Thessalonica, following lines written by English ambassador G. Lowthorpe to Sir E. Grey, are also meaningful: "It is obvious for a long time that the Committee has abandoned the idea of Ottomanisation of all the non-Turkic elements via sympathetic and constitutional means. For them 'Ottoman' clearly means 'Turk' and current policies of 'Ottomanisation' is no more than pesting of non-Turkic elements in a Turkish pot." See, Bernard Lewis, *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu*, transl. Metin Kıratlı, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 1993, pp. 217-218.

<sup>11</sup> It must not be overlooked that these wars, which resulted in the loss of the wealthiest, most advanced lands and regions from which most Ottoman ruling elites were coming, that is 1.1 million km<sup>2</sup> of a total area of 3 million km<sup>2</sup> and a population of 5 million of a total of 24 million, reinforced the dichotomy of "we"- "they" between Muslims and Christians, along with causing to a severe strike on multi-national state structure. See, Feroz Ahmad, *İttihat ve Terakki 1908-1914*, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, transl. Nuran Yavuz, Kaynak Yayınları, İstanbul, 2010, p. 186; Erik Jan Zürcher, *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*, transl. Yasemin Saner Gönen, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1995, p. 161.

<sup>12</sup> On this topic see, Feroz Ahmad, *Jön Türkler ve Osmanlı'da Milletler Ermeniler, Rumlar, Arnavutlar, Yahudiler ve Araplar*, transl. Ayşen Gür, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017; Hasan Taner Kerimoğlu, *İttihat-Terakki ve Rumlar 1908-1914*, Libra Yayıncılık, İstanbul, 2009.

<sup>13</sup> Georgeon, *Osmanlı- Türk Modernleşmesi*, p. 19. For the steps taken for the Turkisation of economy see, Zafer Toprak, *Milli İktisat-Millî Burjuvazi*, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul, 1995.

states.<sup>14</sup> In this context, the CUP members who were afraid of a Macedonia-like doom for Anatolia, especially by the year of 1913, aimed to exclusion of non-Muslims from Anatolia who were living in various regions, mixture of non-Turkic elements among themselves and visiting Anatolia, gave importance to social, cultural, political researches about resident ethnical communities.<sup>15</sup> It is essential to state that, the steps taken by the CUP for identification of “the physiological and morphological structure of Turkish community”<sup>16</sup> and for “Turkisation/Turkification” of Anatolia formed the foundation of Turkish nation-state and they were maintained by founders of the Republic. The Balkan Wars, and subsequent World War I and the occupations of the Armistice Period and cooperation of non-Muslims with the occupation forces during this process caused to “generalisation” of these communities and their encoding as unreliable in collective memory of Muslim-Turk population. Hence, during the years of Turkish War of National Independence (1919-1923), imperialist forces and Christian minorities who were considered as the Anatolian extensions of the imperialists were encoded with their religion as the most visible criteria, then with the elements that constitute their ethnical identities. Naturally those who would committed to the struggle defined themselves as a coherent uniform entirety, in other words as a Muslim-Turk population.<sup>17</sup> Without doubt these both caused the widening of the area of consciousness of “us” (all Muslims) and also sharpened this consciousness against “them/others”. During this period, in which priority was given to “liberation”/independence, ideologies of nationalism, socialism, and Islamism were utilized and prominence of religion in Anatolia<sup>18</sup>, directed the leading members of the National War of Independence to resort in religious expressions in order to ensure the participation of social groups. As

<sup>14</sup> Kemal Karpat, “Modern Türkiye”, *İslâm Tarihi Kültür ve Medeniyeti Volume 2*(P. M. Holt- A.K.S. Lambton-B. Lewis), transl. Hamdi Aktaş, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Kitabevi Yayınları, İstanbul, 1997, p. 104.

<sup>15</sup> Fuat Dündar, “İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Araştırmaları”, *Toplumsal Tarih*, Issue 91, 2001, pp. 43, 45. For a detailed study on this topic see, Fuat Dündar, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Mühendisliği (1913-1918)*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2008.

<sup>16</sup> Talat Paşa's and Ziya Gökalp's following statements in the general council of the party, are important in regard to showing state of mind of the Unionist milieu and clues concerning to policies to be applied. When Talat Paşa said “we took the lead of this nation. Yet Anatolia is a closed box for us. I believe, firstly we need to became familiar of it, then render service to this nation worthy of its prowess.” Ziya Gökalp drew attention to “social revolution”: “We made a political revolution. That is, creating a constitutional administration we changed pattern. However, the greatest revolution is social revolution. Revolutions that we could make in our social body, in cultural field will be the greatest and most productive of them. This can only be possible with identifying the morphological and physiological structure of Turkish community.” Nejat Birdoğan, *İttihat Terakki'nin Alevilik Bektaşilik Araştırması (Baha Sait Bey)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Berfin Yayınları, İstanbul, 1995, pp. 7-8; cited by Dündar, *ibid*, p. 45.

<sup>17</sup> Kemal Karpat, *Kısa Türkiye Tarihi 1800-2012*, Prepared by Güneş Ayas, Timaş Yayınları, İstanbul, 2012, p. 114.

<sup>18</sup> Baskın Oran, *Atatürk Milliyetçiliği, Resmi İdeoloji Dışı Bir İnceleme*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Bilgi Yayınevi, Ankara, 1990 p. 64; Taner Timur, *Türk Devrimi ve Sonrası*, İmge Kitabevi Yayınları, Ankara, 1993, pp. 23-24. Also see, Taha Akyol, *Ama Hangi Atatürk*, Doğan Kitap, İstanbul, 2008.

“the meaning of war of independence was considered by majority as the success of Muslims over non-Muslims rather than national success of the Republic”<sup>19</sup> referring to the symbolic sources of Islam for ensurance of social unity, in a sense, brought up the instrumentalisation of religion.<sup>20</sup> In consequence, successful conclusions of struggle of “liberation” and “departure of Christian minorities from Anatolia made Turkey a culturally coherent entirety, thus creating a national state and enhancing national consciousness of Turks became easier.”<sup>21</sup> Henceforth founders of the nation state, particularly Mustafa Kemal, gave importance to ‘naming’ the Muslims living within the Misak-ı Milli borders, in other words to defining the Turkishness and “building the nation”. However, the psychosis of constriction from a dissolved empire to a nation-state always prevailed both among the founders of nation-state and also in social imagination. In addition to ‘internal and external actors’ which led to this dissolution ‘its form of naming/evaluation’ by the founders of Turkish nation-state was also important. After the Lausanne, which was the founding treaty of new Turkish state in international arena, all of these became influential in the determining the expressions and policies towards minorities who were encoded as “others”. From this point of view it can be argued that interconnected and self-feeding factors like “late nationalism/state of lateness”, “idea of forming a pure homeland”, “understanding of nation building and ‘the dominant nation’ ” and “state of being economicly backward” were influential in determining the views, expression and applications towards minorities. Naturally we think that evaluating the perception minority in the imagination of statesman, bureaucrat and journalist of the period and application towards minorities over these parameters will make the case more understandable. At this juncture, it is consistent to restate that this study will focus on the background state of mind of attitudes towards minorities rather than the policies itself and this will be done mainly based on the sources from the single party period.

### **Minorities as the “exceptional” elements of the “foundation”<sup>22</sup>**

The Treaty of Lausanne which created a setting for Turkey to have basic conditions of political and economic independence, also determined the borders

---

<sup>19</sup> Kurt Steinhaus, *Atatürk Devrimi Sosyolojisi*, Transl. M. Akkaş, Sarmal Yayınevi, İstanbul, 1995, p. 91; Oran, *Atatürk Milliyetçiliği*, pp. 71,74, 75.

<sup>20</sup> Heper interprets, Mustafa Kemal’s holding of his first meetings at mosques, after his landing at Samsun, in order to encourage people to resistance, as “benefiting from traditional legality symbols”. See, Metin Heper, “Atatürkçülük: Karizmanın Emredici ‘Siyasal Çerçeve’ye Dönüşümü”, *Betül Nuri Esen’e Armağan*, AÜ. Hukuk Fakültesi Yayınları, Ankara, 1977, p. 195.

<sup>21</sup> V. Thomas Lewis, “Nationalism in Turkey”, *Nationalism in the Middle East* (The Middle East Institute), Washington D.C, 1952, p. 5; cited by Kemal Karpat, *Türk Demokrasi Tarihi*, Afa Yayınları, İstanbul, 1996, p. 62.

<sup>22</sup> In this study, minorities that were mentioned in Lausanne, Greeks, Armenians and Jews, in a sense those who were acknowledged as official minorities, will be treated.

which here highly overlapping with demographic structure. Signing of the Convention and Protocol Concerning the Exchange of Turkish and Greek Population in Lausanne, the compulsory exchange of Orthodox Christian Turkish citizens resident in Turkey and Muslim Greek citizens resident in Greece, with the exception of Greeks in İstanbul and the Muslims in West Thrace, was initiated<sup>23</sup>, and this brought up a quick internal “organisation and furnishing”.<sup>24</sup> During the inter-war period, favoring of western values to a homogenous nation state and the fact that most of the countries that represents western civilisation were based on single cultured homogenous nations, encouraged founders of Turkish nation-state to make policies freely in this manner. For all kind of nationalisms, minorities within the nation-states are images “other”, “enemy” or “foreign” and their existence are “exceptional/accidental”.<sup>25</sup> As Bali emphasized, either sympathy or cooperation of individual and occasionally organised movements among non-muslims that support occupation forces during the last years of the Ottoman Empire and during the Turkish War of National Independence made an unforgettable place in Turkish collective memory.<sup>26</sup> In other words, “feeling that ‘one or more generations of Christians in Turkey were contaminated with foreign propaganda, their apparent betray peaked [...] during the war and armistice years’ widened the gap between Christians and Muslim Turks”.<sup>27</sup> Indeed following lines expressed by İsmail Hakkı at the beginning of the 1920s and by Başar at the end of the single party period are important in regard to reflecting the state of mind of the period and continuity in attitudes towards minorities. İsmail hakkı who touches the content of a chapter concerning minorities, in a book published in French by Hüseyin Ragıp Bey, ex-General Director of Printing in Ankara, relates the following about “oppression of minorities in Turkey”: “Who is slaughtering who?! [...] Turks were not only slaughtered in İzmir or Bursa, Turks were slaughtered, perhaps for centuries, between the teeth of minority snakes! Turkey’s wealth was imprisoned at the hands of ‘minority bankers’, Turkey’s stomach was melting with the ‘minorities’ alcohol’, Turkey’s bliss was constricted with the ‘minorities’ lust’. Turkey’s political unity was threat-

<sup>23</sup> On the population exchange see, Kemal Arı, *Büyük Mübadele Türkiye’ye Zorunlu Göç (1923-1925)*, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul, 1995. Zürcher states population changes between 1913-1923, brought Anatolia to a culturally different place too. Such that, population of Armenian community reduced to sixty-five thousand, Greek community to one hundred and twenty thousand and Muslim rate in Anatolia, which was 80 percent before wars, reached to 98 percent. Besides, in regard to spoken languages, there remained two major communities, Turks and Kurds. See, Zürcher, *Modernleşen Türkiye’nin Tarihi*, p. 240.

<sup>24</sup> Klaus Kreiser, *Atatürk*, transl. Dilek Zaptçioğlu, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2010, p. 223.

<sup>25</sup> Tanıl Bora, “Türkiye’de Milliyetçilik ve Azınlıklar”, *Birikim*, Issue 71-72, March-April 1995, p. 34.

<sup>26</sup> Rifat N. Bali, “Resmî İdeoloji ve Gayri Müslim Yurttaşlar”, *Birikim*, Issue 105-106, January-February 1998, p. 171.

<sup>27</sup> Soner Çağaptay, *Türkiye’de İslâm, Laiklik ve Milliyetçilik Türk Kimdir?* transl. Özgür Bircan, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009, p. 45.

ened with 'minorities' schools'. In summary, there is a nation in Turkey, deprived of rights, but who?! Poor Turks."<sup>28</sup> Başar in 1942 states that "it was our right to suspect non-Muslims who did not incorporated into Turkish nation until present and not to trust them after historical events and bitter experiences".<sup>29</sup> For sure, ethnical cleansing committed by Christian forces against Muslims and ethnical struggle that went parallel with the struggle of independence along with founding of a nation-state as a remnant of a multi-ethnic empire and other reasons mentioned above were influential in this suspect and distrust, in the bias of Turkish nationalism towards minorities and their perception as enemies.<sup>30</sup>

### i. "Feeling of lateness, anxiety of perpetuity " and minorities

"We are a nation which lagged and neglected the application of ideas of nation [...] Especially our nation, experienced the bitter consequences of pretending to be ignorant of its nationality. Various nations within the Ottoman Empire saved themselves by holding their national values. We understood who we are and that we are a different and alien nation for them only when they excluded us with force. At that moment when our strength was drained, they scorned and insulted us. We understood that our fault was forgetting our own identity".<sup>31</sup> Mustafa Kemal's these words are suggestive in regard to illustrating that Turkish nationalism emerged at a late period and for reflecting the attitude towards the "other/them". As will be treated below, founders of Turkish nation-state regarded nationalism as the solution to various questions, chiefly the anxiety of perpetuity. Besides, Turkish nationalism, beginning in the XIX<sup>th</sup> century

<sup>28</sup> İsmail Hakkı, *Mürebtilere*, Sühulet Kütüphanesi, İstanbul, 1932, p. 81.

<sup>29</sup> Ahmet Hamdi Başar, *Bir Medeniyetin Sonu*, Cumhuriyet Matbaası, İstanbul, 1942, p. 246

<sup>30</sup> Bora, *ibid*, p. 34; Çağatay, *ibid*, p. 219. It is possible to see traces of attitude towards non-Muslims in most articles written in this process. Bilsel, concerning to "disaster days" at the beginning of the XX<sup>th</sup> century, narrates the following: "Turks did not forget this pain. They animated the anecdotes of losing Rumelia. They aroused a national spirit, a national resentment by telling these anecdotes to students in schools, to children in houses, to soldiers in barracks. They planted the spirit of settling the account the insult and cruelty that were committed to Turkishness. Rumelia was illustrated in maps as painted in black. The whole army was provoked to revenge its defamed honour. Soldiers were daily going to drill with the song of 'Turkish honour was defamed in 1328 (1912) alas. Alas, alas, alas, alas revenge'. When a soldier returned to his village, he was sowing while singing this song" Similarly, Refik Halid too, who was listed among the 'one hundred and fifties', later returned to Turkey, mentioned Greeks who were "enemy to swine" Turks and uttered his discomfort due to eventual staying of Greeks and Armenians as citizens, who insulted them during the Armistice years. See, Cemil Bilsel, *Lozan I<sup>st</sup> Volume*, Sosyal Yayınları, İstanbul, 1998, 126; Refik Halid Karay, *Bir Ömür Boyunca*, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 2011, pp. 92-93. For a more detailed study on the observations of different writers on minorities and their places in collective memory see, Rifat Bali, "*Azınlıkları Türkleştirme Meselesi*" *Ne İdi? Ne Değildi?*, Libra Yayınları, İstanbul, 2014, pp. 232-382.

<sup>31</sup> "Konya Gençleriyle Konuşma 20. III. 1923", Compiled by Nimet Arsan, *Atatürk'ün Söylev Demeçleri II (1906-1938)*, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, Ankara, 1997, pp.146-147.

was shaped amid the emotions of dissolution, fear and enmity. Land losses resulted from defeats at the end of the XIX<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the XX<sup>th</sup> centuries, massacres of Muslims, “siege mentality and perception of a dangerous environment” and migrations to Anatolia, which was called as the last shelter, were influential in this.<sup>32</sup> These migrations led to gradual rooting of an anti-Christian meeting. In other words, while Turkish nationalism was “stigmatised with defeats” it was also fed with the feeling of being pinched that stemmed from repeating defeats of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>33</sup> One of the most important feature of this process in regard to topic that we are treating is that, it was the period in which the staff that would found Turkish nation-state was born and started their education. Zürcher states that at least half of the staff that found Turkish nation-state came from the lands that were lost between the years of 1911-1913 and adds: “This was such a world that, its integration to Europe, its literacy level, material and cultural developments was totally different from those of central and eastern Anatolia”. Additionally, this group, in which the average birth year was 1883, was comprised of persons who were educated, like former Unionists, in secular schools at the level of modern European standards. Besides a considerable part of them with the impact of being raised in Balkans, Aegean or İstanbul, closely witnessed the rising Christian bourgeoisie in the cities and towns of the Empire and nationalist organisation in the Balkans.<sup>34</sup> All of these and transformation experienced in the Empire eased the rallying of this generation around the nationalist ideology and also affected their expressions and policies towards minorities. One of the points that requires attention here is that, while this generation lost their native lands, they did not focus on the lost provinces, instead “after 1912 they directed their spiritual capacities to the discovery of Anatolia and its embracement as a new homeland and to a deep towards non-Muslim communities whose loyalty to the Empire were in doubt. Identity definition of the Young Turks was rested on Muslim – non-Muslim contrast from the very beginning; their guerilla warfare experience in the Balkans sharpened this contrast. Now this contrast turned into hatred.”<sup>35</sup> It is possible to see in several writers of the period that, Turkish nationalism developed as a response to western

<sup>32</sup> Taner Akçam, *Türk Ulusal Kimliği ve Ermeni Sorunu*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1994, p. 57; Lewis, *ibid* p. 353; Taner Timur, “Uluslaşma Süreci, İttihatçılık ve Devrim”, Ed. Sina Akşin, Sarp Balcı, Barış Ünlü, *100. Yılında Jön Türk Devrimi*, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, İstanbul, 2010, p. 55.

<sup>33</sup> François Georgeon, “Türk Milliyetçiliği Üzerine Düşünceler Suyu Arayan Adam’ı Yeniden Okurken”, transl. Tuvana Gülcan, Ed. Tanıl Bora, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce, Volume 4 Milliyetçilik*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2002, p. 36; Etienne Copeaux, “Türk Milliyetçiliği: Sözcükler, Tarih, İşaretler”, Ed. Tanıl Bora, *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce, Volume 4 Milliyetçilik*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2002, p. 44.

<sup>34</sup> Erik Jan Zürcher, “Yıkımın ve Yenilenmenin Mimarları: Kemalist Jenerasyona ve Jön Türklere Dair Bir Grup Biyografisi Denemesi”, *Mete Tunçay’a Armağan*, Compiled by Mehmet Ö. Alkan-Tanıl Bora-Murat Koraltürk, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007, pp. 552-560.

<sup>35</sup> Zürcher, *ibid*, p. 567.

bias and abasements along with the feeling of “lateness”. Engin states that, “this circumstance naturally provided us the greatest psychological strength and caused to reveal of rooted history and high virtues in the Turkish spirit. Attacks directed to whole of our race, stemming Europe’s certain bigoted and imperialist sources especially after recent deplorable Balkan disasters and *istibdat* or tyranny period, were accusing us as a national massive; Many, including our foes and even friends were asserting such theories like ‘Turks cannot advance, racial abilities of the Turks are not suitable for progress’. We felt that, it was a duty to rally and advance as a national massive, actively refute and controvert these theories, these grave reproaches. All of these were among the elements that shook us and evoked our real entity. Europe, more or less fueled us when we were amid the worst darkness”.<sup>36</sup> It is obvious that, this state of mind soon would turn towards “internal others”. Bora, who mentions that compensation rush of Turkish modernisation and nationalism developed through conditioning each other, emphasizes that this rush “caused the sharpening of Turkish nationalism with a strong perception of threat and anxiety of perpetuity”. Stating that, all nationalisms which were formed, compared to those of western Europe, late, share this characteristics by degrees, Bora expresses difference of Turkish nationalism as: “unlike the most of the late nationalisms, it was not shaped in exertion of gaining independence, but in anxiety and trawm of losing an empire which also provoke the anxiety of losing independence.”<sup>37</sup> In other words it can be argued that Turkish national identity was shaped by self-consciousness of its own weakness and desperation. This state of weakness, desperation and lateness, idea of forming maintaining and even affirming the spirit of “us”, deepened the difference of “us/others”. As Connolly emphasized “identity needs difference to exist and in order the guarantee its own firmness, turns difference to other”.<sup>38</sup> Indeed İsmail Hakkı while discoursing on the “appearance of consciousness of nationality” says that: “like in every nation, also in our experience, massive and intrinsic movements, such as battle, famines, oppressions that caused social consequences led to kindling of this consciousness” and adds: “The Greek War awakened an intense nationalism or popularism thrill in the spirits of young and educated officers, for it illustrated the Turkish soldiers naked and revealed the boundless ability of life despite the *istibdat*, or tyranny and extravagance of the palace. Balkan war was another element of this awakening of Turkism. [...] All

---

<sup>36</sup> M. Saffet Engin, *Kemalizm İnkılâbının Prensipleri Büyük Türk Medeniyetinin Tarihi ve Sosyolojik Tetkikine Methal*, Volume II, Cumhuriyet Matbaası, İstanbul, 1938, pp. 72-73.

<sup>37</sup> Tanıl Bora, *Cereyanlar Türkiye’de Siyasî İdeolojiler*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017, pp. 195-196. Akçam too, after discoursing on, Turkish national identity was formed as a reaction to a continuous abasement, mentioned that, Ottoman Turkish administrators and intellectuals were aware of the negative judgements on themselves in the Western world, and this was “an element that influenced their manner to a considerable degree”, and even that this was “among the most important concerns of the leaders of War of National Independence”. See, Akçam, *ibid*, p. 55.

<sup>38</sup> William E. Connolly, *Kimlik ve Farklılık Siyasetin Açmazlarına Dair Demokratik Çözüm Önerileri*, transl. Fermâ Lekesizalın, Ayrintı Yayınları, İstanbul, 1995, p. 93.

these events were enough for the turning of Turkish consciousness to an idea of strength”<sup>39</sup> Without doubt the image of “other”, i.e. the Christian minorities who were considered as one of the chief blameworthy of the dissolution and collapse of the state, were influential in “reinforcement of Turkish consciousness”. These communities were considered by Turkish-Muslim population of the Empire, not only as instigators who desired to wreck and divide the Ottomans but also as elements that coveted their dominant status and power.<sup>40</sup> “Non-Muslim Ottomans were a nuisance that bequeathed by Fatih (i.e. Mehmet II the Conqueror). If we compare the benefit that we earned by conquering İstanbul with the loss that we incurred by letting these non-Muslims live in, eventually we see that we were beguiled. [...] Fatih, could not realise the enormity of the great nuisance that he charged for centuries upon his descendants. [...] For centuries christian states of Europe encouraged them against us and patronised. [...] Dreams of Great Armenia, Great Greece would almost turn to a bitter reality. It is rather preferable that these Christian could confine themselves to their national goals, yet they maltreated the Turks whom they lived together for centuries and gained benefit by their courtesies. Their revenge went too far.”<sup>41</sup> In Suphi Nuri’s these lines, it is possible to see traces of social Darwinism which can be roughly summarised with the principle of “right belongs to powerful” and which affected founders of Turkish nation-state to a large extend, along with the notions of “natural selection/resignation” and “the struggle to survive” which were added to Ottoman political vocabulary by Akçura since 1904.<sup>42</sup> One of the elements that triggered the sharpening of this state of lateness and understanding of nationality was the notion that, the communities whom “we tolerated to ascend the highest status” and “advocate their nationality among us” did this. One of the writers of the period asserted that “we tolerated minorities to a such degree that, they became a separate force among us, against us.” Same writer continues: “while every nations was advocating their nationality among us, claiming of Turks of their rights was considered a fault. [...] It must be noted

<sup>39</sup> İsmail Hakkı, *ibid*, p. 70.

<sup>40</sup> Akçam, *Türk Ulusal Kimliği ve Ermeni Sorunu*, 57, 66.

<sup>41</sup> Suphi İleri, *Sèvres ve Lausanne (Sevr ve Lozan)*, Arkadaş Matbaası, 1934, pp. 5, 6, 9, 17. Let us state that, Suphi Nuri’s these speeches were “given in the form of conferences to students in the course of Special State Law, in the second year of the İstanbul Faculty of Law during the years of 1932-1933”.

<sup>42</sup> Bozarslan states that, it was “social Darwinism, which is compatible to merge with nationalism, Islamism and even liberalism” that brought answer to the Young Turks’ basic concern in regard to creating and consolidating a new nation “rather than Comte’s or Durkheim’s positivism”. Bruneau too, emphasizes that the Young Turks were “positivist at the same time”, they gave credit positive sciences like sociology and statistics, they “relied on census data, maps and ethnographical researches to discover social process”. See, Hamit Bozarslan, *Türkiye Tarihi İmparatorluktan Günümüze*, transl. Işık Ergüden, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2015, pp. 184-187,236; Michel Bruneau, *Küçük Asya’dan Türkiye’ye Azınlıklar, Etnik-Milli Homojenleştirme, Diasporalar*, transl. Ayhan Güneş, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2018, p. 178.

that non-Turks who were fed and even reached the highest status with the blessing of Turks were again at the same place from their point of view. [...] This toleration is the fault of Turkish nation. [...] Turkish nation harmed themselves with this tolerance both in religion and nationality fields".<sup>43</sup> While minorities poorly repaid the tolerance of Turks, they also contributed the emergence of "conscious Turkish nationalism". "Searching the origins of conscious Turkish nationalism" Engin says "our witnessing of initiation of propaganda by foreign ethnicities who live on our lands, in order to promote their nationalities, naturally urged Turks, the dominant nation within the Ottoman community, to understand, embrace and revive their nationality.[...] When Armenians started to be proud of being Armenian, Greeks to be Greek and Jews of being Jewish, it was natural that Turks would start to feel their Turkishness, to understand its highness and virtues." After saying that, Engin virtually gives credit where it is due, namely the 'others'; This caused the appearance of rooted history and high virtues in the spirits of Turks."<sup>44</sup> In short, inclining of Christian Western Powers to Anatolia in the first quarter of the XX<sup>th</sup> century, their cooperation with fellow Christians in their land claims and experienced anxiety of perpetuity intensified the severity of the struggle that was given against the other. Similarly, existence of "others" on the lands that belongs "us" kept, both state of being us and never-ending untrustworthiness of others alive.

## **ii. The idea of creating "a pure homeland, homogenous/monolithic population" and the minorities**

"The Greeks, Armenians and Jews, who were resident in our country, were all enemies to us. Especially they were desiring to see doom of the Turks. They thrilled to pieces when they saw enemy dreadnoughts in the shores of İstanbul. Greek, Armenian, Jewish schools rallied their students, welcomed the enemy with flags at their hands. [...] Greeks, all hanged the flag of Greece in their houses and shops. [...] They committed every insults to Turks. Armenians and Jews too, hanged the flag of kingdom."<sup>45</sup> These lines which were written in order to tell "The War of National Independence for Children", are important in regard to showing that, state of mind of being late and being internally divided, maintained the anxiety of perpetuity were closely related with the idea of forming a "homeland", in fact "a pure homeland".

Bora states that, during inter-war period when understanding of ethnical engineering, as a political norm, directed the lining of new borders, the principle of nationality and an ethno-centric monogeneric identity building in

---

<sup>43</sup> Celal Nuri İleri, *Taç Giyen Millet*, Prepared by Şennur Şenel, Berikan Yayınevi, Ankara, 2008, pp. 154-156.

<sup>44</sup> Engin, *ibid*, pp. 71, 73.

<sup>45</sup> Ahmet Refik, *Çocuklara Türk İstiklâl Harbi*, Hilmi Kitaphanesi, İstanbul, 1929, pp. 7-8.

the face of rooted social depressions, were influential in eliminating the feeling of helplessness and disturbances of modernity. In the context of Turkey, ethnical homogeneity was not solely ordained by requirements of modern world or zeitgeist. Multi-ethnical social structure was deemed insecure for it was considered as the main reason for the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, which was desired to be left in past with its all aspects and even because it was considered as the insignia of corruptness.”<sup>46</sup> This perception of insecurity required “marbleisation, granitisation of national structure”<sup>47</sup>, “a monolithic national population”<sup>48</sup> and even “abolishment of differences that exist in imagination”. Şükrü Kaya, Minister of Internal Affairs, who mentioned that, nations during the middle ages were a body like a heap of sand, a particle of sand that was shattered when hit, while nations of modern age were “a layer of clay though composed from pieces” stated that: “The greatest duty of a state is to annex and represent all who resident on its lands. (Voices of Bravo). Opposite of this was witnessed in our experience and state was dissolved. If Ottomans had converted people to their languages and religions [...] where they went, borders of Turkey would still start from the Danube. [...] It is our debt to include those who exist within our community into the Turkish community in any case and let them to benefit the advance of civilization. [...] The element of Turk is an element that represent most. It is not convenient to neglect these differences. If anyone has any slightest feeling of difference about himself, let us erase it in schools and community, then this man too would become a Turk as much as me and serve this country.”<sup>49</sup> It must not be neglected that the idea of “rippled and non-homogeneous population was obstacle to progress”<sup>50</sup> was prevalent among founders of nation-state. Besides “fear of losing the homeland entirely”<sup>51</sup> and “Sevres syndrome” were deeply influential in the state of mind of the period. Suphi Nuri who adverts “since Jews and Christians were appointed as civil servants” thousands of Turks could not be civil servants, since “solidarism, credit, capital and protection”

<sup>46</sup> Bora, *ibid*, p. 216.

<sup>47</sup> Peker who “believe in a disciplined national population could be created in a real sense with a feeling of unity that placed in deeps of souls” was thinking that “our nation [must] turn itself to a convivial granite block with its volume, height and sides, by pulling out of being separate, with spinning, clustering and organizing.” See, Cemil Koçak, *Recep Peker Konuşuyor, Disiplinli Hürriyet*, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul, 2018, pp. 35, 53, 57.

<sup>48</sup> Prime minister İnönü stated the following: “Within this monolithic nationality foreign cultures must all melt down. There cannot be different civilisations within a national population. We frankly offer those who consider themselves member of different communities other than civilisation of Turkish nation: They be with Turkish nation. But not in the form of ‘mixture’. [...] If we live together, we live as a monolithic national population”. For the PM İnönü’s this sentences see, H. Fikret Kanat, *Milliyet İdeali ve Topyekûn Millî Terbiye*, Çankaya Matbaası, Ankara, 1942, p. 149.

<sup>49</sup> For this sentences uttered by Şükrü Kaya during the talks of Surname Act see, *TBMM ZC (GNAT PN)*, Volume 23, 21. 6 1934, pp. 246, 249.

<sup>50</sup> Avram Galanti, “Türkleşmek Yolu”, *Akşam*, 5 May 1925; cited in, *Atatürk Devri Fikir Hayatı II*, Prepared by Mehmet Kaplan, İnci Engnün et alii, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 1992, p. 555.

<sup>51</sup> Falih Rıfkı Atay, *Çankaya*, Bateş Yayınları, İstanbul, 1984, p. 450.

were “available for non-Turks there would be no livings for Turks financial field”, stated that “Christian states of Europe encouraged them against us for centuries” and “we experience Sevres because we fed enemy in our own homeland and we could not ensure unity.” Reason for the “endurance of Turkish nation to storm once more, albeit all disasters, gradual decrease in land and in population, was their maintenance of core character.”<sup>52</sup> The homeland, i.e. the *Misak-ı Milli* borders, which was sustained as a result of this protection of core character, was encoded as the “last shelter” and was consecrated in one sense at the end of a long process of withdraw and land losses. Such that, Yalman was mentioning that we “became the master of our home for the first time after our successful struggle<sup>53</sup>, and Sevük “a homeland that would be saved by continuous clipping.” “We still have a land at our hand to be saved that was clipped for two and a half centuries since the siege of Wien. Being great is different, and being big is different; one is on map, other is an internal matter; it was our bigness that was clipped, saved is our spirit. We saved the last homeland with our saved spirit. We are not big but great. For two and a half centuries we sacrificed the bigness in pieces in the face of incoming invasions. The giant of the invasion was fed with map. Fortunately we were so huge.”<sup>54</sup> Although Yalman said “we became masters of our home for the first time” Sevük “now we are not big but great” and Kazım Nami “Turkey became completely independent. Turks had lost such a complete independence probably for two centuries”<sup>55</sup> as previously stated, it was an important problem that, like a part of the founders of the state, a part of the ‘new residents’<sup>56</sup> of the last shelter were coming from the lost land and also that Anatolia was not adequately familiar.<sup>57</sup> Additionally, although “great majority of new population was racially, linguistically and culturally were Turks” existence of those who were “racially non-Turkic” and “racially

---

<sup>52</sup> Suphi Nuri, *ibid*, pp. 9-10, 19.

<sup>53</sup> Ahmet Emin Yalman, *Gerçekleşen Rüya, Cumhuriyetin On Beşinci Yıldönümünü Arifesinde Memleket Meselesine Dair Düşünceler*, Tan Matbaası, İstanbul, 1938, p. 38.

<sup>54</sup> İsmail Habib Sevük, *Tunadan Batıya*, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul, 1944, p. 70.

<sup>55</sup> Kâzım Nami, *Türkün Kitabı*, Kanaat Kütüphanesi, 1931, p. 43. Let us state that in this book, which was advised by Ministry of Education to Nation Schools, people’s reading chambers and primary school libraries, “Armenians who trampled the country beneath enemy feet” and “Greek bandits” were mentioned.

<sup>56</sup> Hamdullah Suphi, who emphasizes that Arabic was spoken in southern regions of Anatolia, and Kurdish in east “beneath Turkish flag”, leads up to those “among us”, and states that “we rallied again in Anatolia” and “would spend a new period of fermentation” after mentioning those who came from the banks of the Danube, those Turks returned from isles, those who migrated from Thessaly and Morea and Those Turks who came from Kazan and Caucasus. See, Hamdullah Subhî Tanrıöver, *Dağ Yolu I* (Prepared by Fethi Tevetoğlu), Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 1987, p. 110-112.

<sup>57</sup> Let us state that this familiarity encompasses not only demography but also geographical field. Indeed, Hamdullah Suphi in 1924, mentioning the ‘science of country’ which was called by Germans as ‘*heimatkunde*’, complained about we did not “study Anatolia” and states that although “possibly everyone knows his own quarter in part”, “we need to study Anatolia region by region and region by region”. See, Tanrıöver, *ibid*, pp. 86, 87.

non-Turkic and religiously non-Muslim” were also noticed.<sup>58</sup> Besides places of “our those citizens and fellow nationalities who were attempted to be propagated with the idea of being kurdish, circassian and even laz or bosnian” along with “the Christian elements who work for the collapse of the state at every opportunity”<sup>59</sup> in the collective memory was indicating that task of the founders of state was not easy. Ünlü comments that policies of homogenisation that aims to create a unicity and union between state and community, thus simultaneously builds a new state and community, demarcated the “inside” and “outside”, “we” and “they” with precise terms and borders.<sup>60</sup> From this point, it is possible to maintain that “racially non-Turkic Muslims” and “racially non-Turkic and religiously non-Muslims” were not considered same by founders of Turkish nation state. While ‘racially non-Turkic Muslim’, because of their owning of the “Turkish spirit”<sup>61</sup> were generally acknowledged as they could be within the circle of Turkishness,<sup>62</sup> it is difficult to say same thing for ‘racially non-Turkic and religiously non-Muslims’. Because, these communities were those who required

---

<sup>58</sup> Akçura who said that “approximately 6/7 of Turkey’s current population is pure Turks” about the period after Lausanne, with reference to 1927 census, reflects the following: “Great majority of this population are Turks, in regard to race, language and culture. Racially non-Turks have a population of maximum 1.5 million. Racially non-Turk and religiously non-Muslim Turkish citizens cannot exceed four hundred thousand.” See, Akçuraoğlu Yusuf, *Türk Yılı 1928*, Prepared by Arslan Tekin, Ahmet Zeki İzgöner, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 2009, p. 73.

<sup>59</sup> A. Âfetinan, *Medenî Bilgiler ve M. Kemal Atatürk’ün El Yazmaları*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 1988, pp. 23, 36.

<sup>60</sup> Barış Ünlü, *Türklük Sözleşmesi, Oluşumu, İşleyişi ve Krizi*, Dipnot Yayınları, Ankara, 2018, pp. 161-162.

<sup>61</sup> Ziya Gökalp, who had considerable influence on founders of Turkish nation-state, thinks that, racially non-Turkic Muslims could “serve the ideal of Turkishness”: “For instance there are many fellow Muslims, who have the spirit of Turkishness from cultural point of view, though racially non-Turkic, and associates in our disasters as well as felicities. Even, some of them, leading in our national sacred wars, actually showed great sacrifices. Because of education they gained they cannot live among nations other than Turkish nation and cannot work for an ideal other than Turkish ideal. Supposing them out of Turkishness, results from not knowing scientific nature of nationality.” Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Ziya Gökalp, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları*, İstanbul, 2007, p. 82.

<sup>62</sup> During 1920’s certain policies like making Turkish sole education language, prohibiting ethnical identities, were applied in order to accelerate the assimilation of Anatolian Muslims within Turkish nation. On this topic see, Soner Çağaptay, *Türkiye’de İslâm, Laiklik ve Milliyetçilik Türk Kimdir?*, transl. Özgür Bircan, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009; Uğur Ümit Üngör, *Modern Türkiye’nin Şifresi Doğu Anadolu’da Ulus, Devlet ve Şiddet(1913-1950)*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2016; Mustafa Suphi Erden, *Türkiye ve İran’da Vatandaşlık ve Etnisite*, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017; Mesut Yeğen, *Müstakbel Türk’ten Sözde Vatandaşa Cumhuriyet ve Kürtler*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006; Nevzat Onaran, *Ermeniler, Rumlar ve Kürtler Türk Nüfus Mühendisliği(1914-1940)*, Kor Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017.

us “to conquer a homeland within our homeland”<sup>63</sup> and a “rabble, though Turkish nationality, their relation to Turkishness at the level of none at the best”.<sup>64</sup> Repercussions of this can be seen in Mustafa Kemal’s Adana speech: “Our friend in his statement said that, various elements, those, these, Armenians, who invaded our Adana had occupied our craft centers and took a stature as if they were the masters of this country. Without doubt there would be no more grievance and insolence than that. Armenians have no rights in this prosperous country. Your lands are belonging to you, to Turks. [...] Armenians etcetera’s have no rights here. These fertile places are real and genuine Turkish country”.<sup>65</sup> Mustafa Kemal’s such statements, which he uttered referring to minorities, like “those”, “these” and “various elements”, shortly a hegemonic superior language were often used by bureaucrats and press of the time. In this period, as political and social discourse were unified under nationalism, the very fact that minorities were social entities along with their biological existence was ignored<sup>66</sup> and they were frequently invited to “logical attitude” in reference to past experiences. Indeed, Sadak after mentioning that Jews, Greeks and Armenians had cut their connections with Turks, with Turkish language during the Ottoman period and they were a nationless, landless, infidel foreign olio, leads up to new era: “The Republic respects everyone’s belief and nationality. But in exchange to rights bestowed on them, demands some services. Republic of Turkey too, would demand from those nations who want the right to live here, above all to be Turks.” At this point Sadak, referring to İnönü’s “Nationality is our unique coalescence medium; our duty is in any case to turn those who happen to be in this homeland into Turks. We will blockade and dismiss everyone and everything that is against Turkishness and Turkism” words, which he uttered few days ago, states that, prime minister had “expressed the most influential policy of the government of the Republic” and had ‘lectured’ the “minority elements.

---

<sup>63</sup> İsmail Habib, who mentioned “memory of the danger of old desires” for Maraş in 1936, was discoursing “our conquest of a homeland within a homeland” when talking about Zonguldak: “Neither flags on the eaves nor habitants no more within the all of these foreign buildings which were aligned on the most commanding place of the city. All of them are only a reminder from the danger of old desires”. “There, the old Frank district, a place that Turks even did not used to step in, one more mark of our conquest of a homeland within a homeland, hereafter this too ours.” İsmail Habib Sevük, *Yurttan Yazılar*, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 1987, pp. 106, 199.

<sup>64</sup> Ahmed İhsan, “Matbuat Hatırlarım”, *Milliyet*, cited from 1 June 1930, *Türkiye Nasıl Laikleştirildi*, Prepared by Hüseyin Durukan, Çıdam Yayınları, İstanbul, 1991, p. 437.

<sup>65</sup> “Adana Esnaflarıyla Konuşma 16. III. 1923”, *Atatürk’ün Söylev Demeçleri III (1918-1937)*, Compiled by Nimet Arsan, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, Ankara, 1997, p.130. For Mustafa Kemal’s expressions about minorities especially during the War of National Independence period see, Mîm Kemal Öke, “Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’ün Azınlıklar Hakkındaki Görüş ve Değerlendirmeleri”, *Atatürk Konferansları Dizisi*, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 1986, pp. 109-118.

<sup>66</sup> Üngör, *ibid*, p. 294.

[...] "They, from now on and with their own initiatives, should try for their Turkisation."<sup>67</sup>

Since nation-states were based on "sovereignty" and "territorial integrity", the impact of international political developments, along with the past experiences, must not be glossed over in the desire of Turkish nation-state founders to create "a homogenous population". In other words, internal "others" were both considered as separatist elements and extensions of foreign powers that aim to create pressure on Turkey, "spies of imperialism", "the fifth column". An important politician of the period, who said "maybe it would not appropriate to speak opposite Christians in the Ottoman Mebusan Assembly. But I do not consider myself in the Ottoman Mebusan Assembly as in ancient sense." was "speaking as a man who witnessed that Christian strata have no rights in this country: They benefited from the citizenship of this country and resigned by treachery, pulling a gun on. They were the ingrate children of the Ottoman history and lost all their rights in these lands. In this country which desires to the defends its on rights, they are spies of imperialism and traitor children of this homeland."<sup>68</sup>

Occurrence of ethnical and/or religious uprisings during 1920s and 1930s and duration of the perception of a continuous foreign threat, always kept alive the necessity of fortification the inside. In other words, the bias that minorities were confederates and their factors of unreliability increased during the years of imminent war. In such a process Karabekir, remarked "the elements sucking Turkish blood: [...] Friends, wherever there is a non-Turkic place, certainly you can be sure that it is a den of spies! [...] The Anatolian club is full of Jews. [...] Two intellectual deputy who were members of the party speak on what, when they go there? Naturally they would mention politics, current situation. They listen with their ears and appliances and commit every propaganda

<sup>67</sup> Necmettin Sadak, "Türkleşmek Mecburiyeti", *Akşam*, 30 April 1925; cited in, *Atatürk Devri Yazarlarının Kaleminden Altı Ok (1919-1938)*, Prepared by Şaduman Halıcı-Murat Burgaç, Kaynak Yayınları, İstanbul, 2016, p. 448. For this sentence that uttered by İnönü after Sheikh Sait Rebellion see, Füsün Üstel, *İmparatorluktan Ulus-Deolette Türk Milliyetçiliği Türk Ocakları 1912-1931*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1997, p. 173.

<sup>68</sup> For Mahmut Esat (Bozkurt) Bey's this speech given during the talks of *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye* Law see, Murat Sevinç-Dinçer Demirkent, *Kuruluşun İhmal Edilmiş İstisnası 1921 Anayasası ve Tutanakları*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017, p. 101. Also Mustafa Kemal, in his statement to reporter of the New-York Herald, emphasized that, "Greeks who lived with us for four hundred years, one day, considering themselves as freed, started to think about the day when they would get rid of Turkish hegemony", "they perceived the government as foreign, under which they lived and at whose schools studied their languages and religions." It was also meaningful that Mustafa Kemal, after his statement asked, in case of western governments faced the same situation, to what degree they would tolerate it. See, "Hilâfet ve Yabancı Dini Müesseseler Hakkında 4.V.1924", Compiled by Nimet Arsan, *Atatürk'ün Söylev Demeçleri III (1918-1937)*, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, Ankara, 1997, p. 103.

and espionage organisation at will. [...] We must take measures in regard to future order of İstanbul. What would do Armenians, Greeks and Jews there? Therefore, Turkish elements must be put in commanding position in İstanbul. [...] After Turkic elements would be diminished and considering armed and prepared elements, then think of the gravity of situation! [...] While these elements, who suck Turkish blood, reside in excellent buildings, Turks [...] are residing [...] in fireplaces, in dirt!"<sup>69</sup> Let us conclude with English ambassador Sir Ronald C. Lindsay's report to London, which probably summarize the desire for a pure homeland and the psychological factors that lie under the distrust towards minorities best: "Republic [of Turkey], full of a deep distrust towards all non-Turkic elements which was resulted from policies of [European] states on Turkey that were applied for a century, seems to be determined in building a Chinese Wall around itself and leave no place to the impact of foreign influence in the state that would be established [in this], even though this influence would come from individuals and even from merchants. This policy which was supported by the entirety of population wholeheartedly was continuing to be applied with a ruthless determination."<sup>70</sup>

### iii. "Nation building, understanding of 'the dominant nation'" and minorities

In the perception towards minorities, how the notion of "we", in other words the identity of Turk was given a meaning and how those who were outside of this were named were also important factors. As commonly known, after the period of War of National Independence, during which "the series of identity designs remained as nebulae in a great extend" and "identity engineering" was not committed,<sup>71</sup> great importance was given to creating of a new identity and the Ottoman Empire, which presents a cosmopolitan and Islamic outlook, was desired to be made invisible. In this context, Turkish national identity between 1924-1929 was, in accordance to realised revolutions, mainly based on a secular republican naming. This, in its essence was relying on particularistic-monolithic understanding of Turkishness which was based on the partly judicial, yet largely political definition of "every person who are tied to Republic of Turkey via citizenship and who adopted Turkish language, culture and national ideal, is a Turk". Between 1929-1938, depending upon foreign political developments, national community was defined in ethnical axis and basing on common

<sup>69</sup> Kâzım Karabekir, *Ankara'da Savaş Rüzgârları II. Dünya Savaşı CHP Grup Tartışmaları*, Emre Yayınları, İstanbul, 1994, pp. 225, 247-248.

<sup>70</sup> See, Ayhan Aktar, *Varlık Vergisi ve 'Türkleştirme' Politikaları*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2000, p. 59.

<sup>71</sup> Tanıl Bora, "İnşa Döneminde Türk Millî Kimliği", *Toplum ve Bilim*, Issue 71, Winter 1996, p. 172.

origin feeling, racial-generic patterns were articulated to republican definitions.<sup>72</sup> At the same time, indecision about the definition concerning “we”-“Turk” and tension between the definition of nation based on citizenship and definition of nation based on ethnicity-origin, considerably affected the view towards minorities.<sup>73</sup> One of the most important points that requires attention is that what was behind this tension. Was it ‘conjectural developments’ and ‘inherited mentality’ or ‘necessity’? Yıldız asserts that, the statement of “residents of Turkey, regardless of religion and race difference, were generalized as Turks in regard to citizenship” which was written in the 1924 Constitution, was in a secondary capacity and the article was stemming from ‘necessity’, namely the Treaty of Lausanne which enjoined Turkish nation-state to monitor the rights of minorities, and adds: “For this reason, Kemalist absorption policies were mainly put into practice with administrative and *de facto* precautions instead of judicial regulations”.<sup>74</sup> On the other hand, Toprak maintains that, French modelled civic nationalism of Thessalonica was dominant in Turkey during the period of the proclamation of the Republic. He states, this understanding, which gave importance to geography and stayed aloof from “inherent” factors and based on emotional link, reflected on the citizen identity that was built with *Teşkilat-ı Esasiyye Kanunu*, i.e. the Constitution, and emphasizes that, this was “a nationalism that formed on citizen identity”.<sup>75</sup> At this point we think that two examples will shed light on the topic in regard to what was understood and/or what was must be understood with “Turk” and “Turkish citizenship”. First, was a conversation on who must be understood with the word “Turk”, during a legislative talk in GNAT on February 1924, concerning a law that provides exemption for companies, owned by Turkish citizens, from customs. During the negotiations Diyarbakır deputy Zülfü (Tiğrel) Bey, asked how the notion of Turkishness in the law would be interpreted in case of foreign-capital companies were in Turkish ownership. Şükrü (Saraçoğlu) Bey, who was a participant in drafting of this law, replied ‘Sir, saying Turks and Turkish companies, we are referring to lawful meaning of Turks and Turkish companies’. Çorum deputy İsmail Kemal (Alpsar) Bey, who thought that the issue was not properly disambiguated, asked ‘are

<sup>72</sup> For these periodisations see, Ahmet Yıldız, “*Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyebilene*” *Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin Etno-Seküler Sınırları (1919-1938)*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2001 and Sevan Nişanyan, “Kemalist Düşüncede ‘Türk Milleti’ Kavramı”, *Türkiye Günlüğü*, Issue 33, March-April 1995, pp. 127-141.

<sup>73</sup> On this topic see, Tanıl Bora, “İnşa Döneminde Türk Millî Kimliği”, *Toplum ve Bilim*, Issue 71, Winter 1996; Ayşe Kadioğlu, *Cumhuriyet İradesi Demokrasi Muhakemesi*, Metis Yayınları, İstanbul, 1999. As Üstel stated, in the “nation” chapter of the Civic Advices for Citizens, definition of nation, which was claiming to be contractarian relying on the sameness of language, culture and ideal, gradually proceeds to understanding of an organic nation, with explanation and references to historical homeland of Turkish nation and origins of Turks. See, Füsün Üstel, “*Makbul Vatandaş’ın Peşinde II. Meşrutiyet’ten Bugüne Vatandaşlık Eğitimi*”, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2004, p. 223.

<sup>74</sup> Yıldız, *ibid*, pp. 139-140.

<sup>75</sup> Zafer Toprak, “Antropolojik Dilbilim, Dil Devrimi ve Sadri Maksudi”, *Toplumsal Tarih*, 219, March 2012, p. 23.

we counting Armenians and Greeks as Turks too?’ and Gümüşhane deputy Zeki (Kadirbeyoğlu) Bey clarified the ‘issue’: “They are by no means Turk.”<sup>76</sup> Another incident that shed light to ‘issue’ is about the statement of “residents of Turkey, regardless of religion and race difference, were generalized as Turks” that was laid in Assembly General Council during the 1924 Constitution talks. In these talks Hamdullah Suphi Bey expressed that minorities could not be Turks: “We are saying, citizens of the state, Republic of Turkey, are entirely Turks. On the other part, government [...] is trying to discharge those Greeks and Armenians who are working in the institutions established by foreigners. When we want to discharge them because they are Greek and Armenian, what if they would say ‘No, according to law enacted in our Assembly they are Turks’? [...] We can find a literal interpretation. [...] But there is a truth. They cannot be Turks, even the Assembly cannot make fugitive Greeks and Armenians, Turks. They would not be either, it is impossible.” Celal Nuri Bey who took the floor during the talks, mentioning the “our genuine citizen” described them as follows: “Our genuine citizen today, is a Muslim, Hanafi, Turkophone person.” Following the negotiations, Hamdullah Suphi’s “literal” amendment proposal was accepted and the 88<sup>th</sup> article was passed as “residents of Turkey, regardless of religion and race difference, were generalized as Turks”.<sup>77</sup> Celal Nuri in 1932, remarking on register “in regard to citizenship”, stated that “official Turk” and “racial Turk” were tacitly separated and drew attention to difference between “Turk by custom” and “Turk by law”: “In the determination of nationality by citizenship, language, origin and race are not enough. In short, for the Turkishness of a person, being a Turkophone, white and Muslim were not laid down as a condition. In so far, almost all of Turks speak Turkish, their skins are white, they are Muslim and their sects are Hanafi. Those who have these last conditions are Turks by custom”.<sup>78</sup> This “state of indecision” about Turkishness in the form of “genuine Turks” and “citizen Turks”, shows that Turkishness and citizenship were not same things in the eyes of the state. As Yeğen states, Turkishness, was an aspect with three sides, one political which is identical to citizenship, other cultural which can be assimilated and/or must be assimilated, and the last ethnical genealogical.<sup>79</sup> One of the most important points that not to be overlooked here is that, even when a secular Turkishness was desired to be formed, if minorities were the issue, religious references became significant in citizenship and Turkish

---

<sup>76</sup> For the “Law Concerning to Exemption of Vessels That Would Be Purchased by Persons and Companies That Have Nationality of Republic of Turkey from Customs” see, Soner Çağaptay, “Kim Türk, Kim Vatandaş? Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Vatandaşlık Rejimi Üzerine bir Çalışma”, transl. Pemra Hazbay, *Toplum ve Bilim*, Issue 98, Fall 2003, p. 168.

<sup>77</sup> TBMM ZC (GNAT PN), Volume 8/1, 42<sup>th</sup> session 20.04.1340, p. 909-911.

<sup>78</sup> Celal Nuri İleri, *Devlet ve Meclis Hakkında Musahabeler*, Prepared by Halit Erdem Oksaçan, Emre Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007, p. 76-78.

<sup>79</sup> Mesut Yeğen, *Müstakbel Türk'ten Sözde Vatandaş'a Cumhuriyet ve Kürtler*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006, p. 105.

identity, and Gökalp's definition of Turkishness was activated.<sup>80</sup> Indeed Sevig stated, for Atatürk, it was impossible "to take Anatolian people as a judicial conception" because of the existence "of organisations that adverse to national welfare" "within the people that [he] desired to turn into a unity", "the conception of people was partly formed by a religious conception", "judicial conception [was] not a separate thing from racial conception for Anatolian people" and the 88<sup>th</sup> article of the Constitution was "carrying this promise": "Until occurring of this consummation, not augmenting the numbers of minorities, i.e. those who claimed to be minority for they are not Muslim and those who [...] considered themselves outside the Turkish community, for this purpose taking the requests of non-Muslims, for their acceptance to Turkish citizenship, into account only exceptionally, is the essential ideology of Turkish internal policy." Besides Sevig, asserting unity of people was formed by "*âmalı milliyet*", that is wishes of people, added that minorities were alien to collective desires and ideals of the Turkish people.<sup>81</sup> As can be seen, it can be argued that, definition of "Turk" includes both ethnical and civic elements, and it (was) turned into an ambiguous notion in which political, religious and ethnical elements were all nesting.<sup>82</sup> For Turkish politicians, non-Muslims were a population that reminds 'past', that must remain in 'past', besides that would not be Turk properly because of their actions and the articles in the Lausanne. However, as Ekmekçiöğlü states, desire of the politicians not to repeat past, brought up the social inclusion of minorities in some way, and for this end, also the request of putting up their distinguishing identities. This inevitably meant to both inclusion and exclusion of minorities by Turkishness.<sup>83</sup> In other words, minorities were excluded from the official identity and by this way made invisible, on the one hand; and at the other hand they were made visible for their symbolisation of what the nation does not represent,

---

<sup>80</sup> In the principle that Gökalp relied, since "Turkish nation means solely Turkophone Muslims, Greeks, Armenians, Jews living in Turkey were only Turks in regard to allegiance, not in regard to nationality." See, Uriel Heyd, *Ziya Gökalp'in Hayatı ve Eserleri*, transl. Cemil Meriç, Sebül Yayinevi, İstanbul, 1980, p. 96-97. While İnel drawing attention to, non-muslims were influential in "taking care of keeping the Islam as a assembly identity in tow", Ünlü reflects, since Mustafa Kemal was defender of Westernisation and secularism after Lausanne, he aimed elimination of other ethnical groups, cultures and conscious within Muslim nation and called out the "Contract of Turkishness". He also states that, ever Muslim can be enrolled in this contract which was based on language and feeling, but no matter how much they made effort on this, this gate was closed to non-Muslims. See, Ahmet İnel, "Giriş", *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Volume 2 Kemalizm*, Ed. Ahmet İnel, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2002, pp. 22-23; Ünlü, *ibid*, p. 165.

<sup>81</sup> Vasfi Raşid Sevig, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Esas Teşkilat Hukuku Yüksek Polis Enstitüsünde Verilen Dersler*, Ulus Basımevi, Ankara, 1938, pp. 202-203, 208-209.

<sup>82</sup> Arus Yumul, "Azınlık mı Vatandaş mı?", *Türkiye'de Çoğunluk ve Azınlık Politikaları: AB Sürecinde Yurttaşlık Tartışmaları*, Compiled by Ayhan Kaya-Turgut Tarhanlı, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, TESEV Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006, p. 104.

<sup>83</sup> Lerna Ekmekçiöğlü, "Yeni Türkiye'nin Üvey Vatandaşları", *Toplum ve Bilim*, Issue 132, 2015, pp. 54-55.

that is, the “otherness” before the majority.<sup>84</sup> Başar, who, in this context, mentions “new reel Turkish nation type”, stated that, this “could not be non-religious by virtue of the old nation type was religious, while Muslim nations who were not from Turkish race, could join among us Turks, non-Muslim were excluded from the new type:” “Exclusion of non-Muslims from this type is entirely correct, a deed compatible with reality. In fact, a forcing in the form of calling them as Turk is a mistake. Yet, as the Turkish revolution desired to create a new and broad nation meaning, leaved the door of new real Turkish nation type open for non-Muslims, in this way bestowed them a great favour. These nations are compelled and obliged to either become Turk entering through this open gate with their entire goodwill or leave this community forever. They still, have not grasped the events that forced them to choose either of these two alternatives in the face of history.”<sup>85</sup> In fact, it is also possible to say that, there was a broad agreement on, this inclusion was resulted from necessity, would not yield desired outcome, and minorities’ “loyal service to Turkishness was impossible”. Kanat, who states at the last years of single party period that, “among the elements that damage unity and prevent formation of an ideal within the nation, minorities played an important role”, and evaluated the “existence of a religion or ideal among minority groups living in a community, different from those of majority” as a “reason for disease”. Author, who consider Ottomans’ “allowing the minorities of various beliefs and faiths to live within Turkish community” as “an inexpiable mistake”, commented that “striving with such cancer defects was a futile” effort: “For this, the only action to be taken, is to move radically, drain the wound, like an operator, with a single move. [...] Loyal and self-sacrificing service of foreign elements, who live in Turkish community, to Turkishness is impossible. They will certainly engage in destructive activities against Turkish nation in the course of time, and will certainly make an attempt on Turkish life at dangerous times. [...] Within Turkish homeland, there is no point in trying to create a Turkish community, that would have the same spirit, from those and these [...] elements, apart from those who know and feel themselves Turk”.<sup>86</sup>

One of the most important elements that affected the expressions towards minorities was the notion of “the dominant nation”. We mentioned that founders of Turkish nation-state had their one feet in imperial tradition. As Öğün expressed, Turkish nation-state, had rallied Muslim communities, members of defeated and humbled ‘dominant nation’, remnants of the empire, around Turkish identity. Since this ‘dominant nation syndrome’ and/or ‘dominant nation reflex’, considered non-Muslims as the real cause of the dissolution of the empire, throwing off a static poise ‘in itself’, reached the level of ‘for itself’, depending

---

<sup>84</sup> Yumul, “*ibid*”, p. 110.

<sup>85</sup> Başar, *ibid*, p. 244.

<sup>86</sup> Kanat, *ibid*, pp. 67-69.

on an ideological manipulation and turned to those considered as responsible.<sup>87</sup> In other words, although 'the *ancien régime*' was considered as one of the 'founding others' of the nation-state, the thought that those who lived in this state as "principal element" had lost their superiority because of 'internal' and 'external' "others", was one of the elements that negate attitude towards minorities. In this context, it was highly difficult for minorities to put up resistance in face of the founders who came from and adumbrate the understanding of dominant nation, and the Turkishness they built. This led to objectification of minorities before the dominant nation, for which one of the easiest ways was 'language', as can be seen in the campaigns of "Citizen, Speak Turkish!"<sup>88</sup> It is possible to frequently encounter to traces of the understanding of dominant nation, in 1930s, during which ethnical nationalism started to increase and a multi-layered definition of the nation had appeared.<sup>89</sup> We can argue that, during these years, this understanding showed itself with emphasises like "genuine Turk" and "principal element"<sup>90</sup>. In other words, "an autarkical psychology of uniqueness accompanied with praises about the eternal 'master nation' character of Turkish nation, dominated ideological and spiritual climate".<sup>91</sup> In Bozkurt, it is possible to see one of the most typical repercussions of this : "Both friends and foes must know that, in this country the humblest street sweeper, if he is a genuine Turk, is superior to those who are not from this race. Torn rawhide sandal of who are of our race is above foreign crowns. [...] In this country every job belongs to genuine Turk. [...] We consider those, who honestly embarked on Turkishness, accepted and adopted its culture, as one of us. Mere identity document is not enough for us." "The worst of Turk is better than the best of non-Turk. I gave this example to state difference between non-Turks and Turks." "We will see that, after a short calculation, Turkey's 95 percent are genuine Turks. [...] No one can command Turk, other than a Turk; no one can rule them, other than a Turk".<sup>92</sup> Let us state that, consideration of Turks as a community that created ancient civilisations and the idea that Anatolia was Turkish homeland from all eternity, along with

<sup>87</sup> Süleyman Seyfi Ögün, "Türk Milliyetçiliğinde Hakim Millet Kodunun Dönüşümü", *Türkiye Günlüğü*, Issue 50, March-April 1998, p. 35.

<sup>88</sup> Nurdan Türker, *Vatanım Yok Memleket Var İstanbul Rumları: Mekân-Bellek-Ritüel*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2015, pp. 114-115.

<sup>89</sup> Çağaptay states, during the 1930s historical remnant of Ottoman *millet* system played a determinant role, "notions of homeland, religion, history and ethnicity all defined Turkishness". See, Çağaptay, *ibid*, p. 184.

<sup>90</sup> It is possible to see traces of this, also in the Mustafa Kemal' speeches in previous years. For instance, frequently speaking of "primary element" in İzmir Economic Congress, he was emphasizing "genuine Turks" in Adana. See, "İzmir İktisat Kongresi Açış Söylevi 17. II. 1923", *Atatürk'ün Söylev Demeçleri II (1906-1938)*, Compiled by Nimet Arsan, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, Ankara, 1997, p. 106 ve "Adana Esnafılarıyla Konuşma 16. III. 1923" *Atatürk'ün Söylev Demeçleri II (1906-1938)*, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, Ankara, 1997, p. 130.

<sup>91</sup> Tanıl Bora, "Türkiye'de Milliyetçilik ve Azınlıklar", *Birikim*, Issue 71-72, March-April 1995, p. 37.

<sup>92</sup> Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, *Toplu Eserler IV*, Prepared by Şaduman Halıcı, Kaynak Yayınları, İstanbul, 2015, pp. 208-209, 219, 229-230.

an understanding of Turkish blood “remained pure amid all rumbles” and “with the purity of blood the core was firm”<sup>93</sup>, were influential in activation of understanding of the dominant nation.<sup>94</sup>

#### iv. “State of being economically backward” and minorities

Yalman who was pleased that “after our successful struggle we became for the first time master of our home” and stated that Turkish nation, passing the hardest of examinations, “earned the highest grade before history”, did not refrained from uttering a fact: “Our inheritances from past were all from negative and deficient side”.<sup>95</sup> Economy was the first among the fields that Yalman evaluated as negative and deficient. In this field, ‘experiences’ did not escape the attentions of both founders of Turkish nation-state and also of the social base. Minorities were considered as both the confederates of foreigners and western Powers, and also blameworthy of the backwardness of Turks and dissolution of Ottoman Empire. Especially abolition of the capitulations and gaining of an important step in the path of economic independence with the treaty of Lausanne, accelerated the Turkisation of economic life. In other words, founders’ “primary objective was to continue, War of National Independence as a ‘economic independence war’ and conclude this also with a victory. In this war, their aim was to reduce the status of minorities and foreign nationalities who were dominating the Turkey’s commercial and industrial life, either as merchants or civil servants and manager, to a minimum”.<sup>96</sup> Indeed, Mustafa Kemal, after describing the appearance of new Turkish state in the field of economy in the İzmir Economic Congress, needed to touch “internal elements”: “Gentlemen [...] everything that were granted to foreigners just as an imperial beneficence and that were given to non-Muslim elements within the country as special favour were considered as acquired rights. [...] Internal elements, in regard to their own organisations which they were able to preserve, always taking shelter in foreign encouragement, incentive and assistance, did not refrained from endeavouring for the annihilation of the state and principal element in order to excerpt a political body. Foreigners were encouraging internal elements on the one hand and intervening themselves from the other and in every intervention they were acquiring certain new concessions and rights again opposite to advantage of state and nation. Under this continuous proceedings, principal elements were having difficulty in providing money to state, within a homeland which already became

<sup>93</sup> Recep Peker, *İnkılâp Dersleri*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1984, pp. 16, 20.

<sup>94</sup> Typical repercussions of this can be seen in “The Turkish Historical Theory” ve “The Sun Language Theory”.

<sup>95</sup> Yalman, *ibid*, p. 38.

<sup>96</sup> Rifat N. Bali, *Cumhuriyet Yıllarında Türkiye Yahudileri Bir Türkleştirme Serüveni (1923-1945)*, 8<sup>nd</sup> Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2010, p. 234. Also see, Murat Koraltürk, *Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Ekonominin Türkleştirilmesi*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2011.

poor".<sup>97</sup> These sentences, along with revealing economic potential of "principal element", were also a summary of how the state of affairs of "principal nation" were look like. In this context, minorities' holding of capital and labor force and their activity in economy field were also influential in the perception towards them. Common opinion among administrators, press and collective memory of the period was that backwardness of Turks and Muslims in fields of capital and labor force was due to minorities. Engin draws attention this too, among the reasons behind the bringing up of the "conscious Turkish nationalism": "Among economic reasons, we can mention wreaking of other elements havoc on Turks continuously. While Turks were exposed to extreme poverty everywhere, within their property others were in wealth and prosperity. Those who went to war, died for the defence of country were Turks, those who carried the burden of heavy taxes and tithe were Turks, on the other hand those who live prosperously were foreign elements! Little by little these were started to be noticed by Turks, and necessity of forming unity, a national front in the face of internal economic strike, by means of favoring Turks and protecting Turkish economy".<sup>98</sup>

We previously stated that founders of Turkish nation-state started to appear in political arena by the beginning of the XX<sup>th</sup> century and continued various policies especially applied by the Union and Progress. In this context, steps taken by the beginning of the XX<sup>th</sup> century, in the path of Turkisation of economy, were maintained by founders of Turkish nation-state who were in the opinion that, sovereignty in political field must be also acquired in economic field. Indeed, Celal Nuri, who stated that, "Ottoman period estranged Turkish nation from economics" and while "sovereignty was belong Turks, economics were the non-Turks' lot", needed to add something opposite: "Hereafter, non-Turks in Turkey reduced to one to thirty. We will fill these economic gaps on our own. We need an intermediate bourgeoisie layer. This nation will create it, for this we will acquire manifold practices, cognitions, merits". Author was, of course, aware that "these needed time".<sup>99</sup> Indeed, during discussions held in Turkish Hearts, it was uttered that, economic life was at the hands of minorities especially in centers like İzmir, İstanbul, Mersin and Trabzon. Besides necessity of taking precautions by cooperating with Turkish industrialists and merchants was emphasized and connection between economic development and consolidation of Turkish culture was pointed out.<sup>100</sup> In other words, it was thought that Turkisation of economy would enhance the understanding of a pure homeland.

<sup>97</sup> See, "İzmir İktisat Kongresi Açış Söylevi 17. II. 1923", *Atatürk'ün Söylev Demeçleri II (1906-1938)*, Compiled by Nimet Arsan, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, Ankara, 1997, p. 107.

<sup>98</sup> Engin, *ibid*, p. 74.

<sup>99</sup> Celâl Nuri, "Önce Tasarruf, Sonra Tasarruf", *İkdam*, 21 April 1928; cited in *Atatürk Devri Fikir Hayatı I*, Prepared by Mehmet Kaplan, İnci Engün et alii, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 1981, p. 402.

<sup>100</sup> Sarımay, *ibid*, pp. 294, 297.

Indeed, a foreign observant, stated that, the “unique importance” of exclusion of Armenians and Greeks from Anatolia was not only the ensurance national unity: “During the time of the empire, Turks assuming only a few of the social professions, had left the rest and especially those professions that dominate economic life from İstanbul to the remotest village of Anatolia, at the hands of Greeks and Armenians. Only after the disappearance of this two races, Turks got the chance to assume these professions released from them, more precisely they had to assume these professions. After that, community became Turkish community”.<sup>101</sup> It must not be overlooked that, steps taken for Turkisation of economic field were not only led to handover of capital, but also it was tried to be carried out through judicial regulations<sup>102</sup> and Turkisation of labor force was given importance too. Bozkurt was stating that, for the ending of the “pain of revolution”, it was necessary that “genuine Turks” would become dominant in economic field: “In this country every work belongs to genuine Turk. Everything of this country belongs to Turk; job belongs to him, peasantry belongs to him, trade belongs to him, industry belongs to him, all assets belong to him, will belong to him”.<sup>103</sup> It is necessary not to consider steps taken for Turkisation of economy and labor force were solely a demand of founders; there was such an expectation among social base too. For instance, during the RPP’s provincial congresses, delegates criticising ‘those who live at our expense but serve to others’ and “employment of those who are not genuine Turk and Muslims”, uttered weakness of the organisation and incapability of local administrators: “Today, the mentality and ideology that dominates the country are Turkishness and Turkism. [...] However in the organisation of Regie Administration this was not given importance. Although muffling of cosmopolitan spirits was our very first principle, other elements were given a place”.<sup>104</sup> We can assert that, beforelong an important headway was made in the quelling of this criticism. It is possible to see traces of this in Sevük’s lines. Criticising the operation of business in Zonguldak by non-Turkic capital, he was happily emphasizing that “we found ourselves in ourselves”, “we made ours, what was not our” and “we conquered” capital and technic in the new period: “[Previously] seven hundred engineer and foreman, today they were reduced to seventy, they are nothing more than capital representatives. They were all replaced by Turkish engineers and Turkish foremen”. In short, “conquest of capital, conquest of technic, conquest of foreign market, domestic market; but above all, conquest of labor force, in other words

---

<sup>101</sup> Norbert von Bischoff, *Ankara Türkiye’de Yeni Oluşun Bir İzahı*, transl. Burhan Belge, Ulus Basımevi, Ankara, 1936, pp. 224-225.

<sup>102</sup> On this topic see, Derya Bayır, *Türk Hukukunda Azınlıklar ve Milliyetçilik*, transl. Ülkü Sağır, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017, pp. 192-207.

<sup>103</sup> Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, *Toplu Eserler IV*, Prepared by Şaduman Halıcı, Kaynak Yayınları, İstanbul, 2015, pp. 208-209.

<sup>104</sup> Mete Tunçay, “CHF’nin 1927 Kurultayının Öncesinde Toplanan İl Kongreleri”, *AÜ SBF Dergisi*, Volume 36, Issue 1, 1981, pp. 286, 287.

conquest of ourselves".<sup>105</sup> It is possible to see this "perception of conquest" and continuity of mentality towards minorities also in the Capital Tax, enacted at the last years of the single party period. Head of the Industry Investigation Committee, Aydemir's words to Avram Galanti, Istanbul deputy of period, and Baba Gomel, Head of the Izmir Jewish Association, who were disturbed from the Capital Tax: "We Turks, for centuries due to thousands of wars, did not find time for industry, saving money and capital. You, I mean all minorities, did this. We protected you from wars. You did not provide soldiers to army. Even with some means, you did not paid tax either. You accumulated trade, industry, import and export, money and capital at your hands. These were all done, at the cost of the blood that we spilled for centuries and for the sake of the protection of opportunities which were exclusively accumulated at the hands of you, minorities especially after the *Tanzimat*. [...] I wonder if we compare our blood that were spilled for centuries and the capital tax of a couple of millions paper banknotes that you will pay this turn, and even if we call this as "the Blood Tax", whether our account would be too tyrannical"? After asking this question, Aydemir offered an "account": "Let us recount, scaling your accumulated wealth and our blood and soldiery rights."<sup>106</sup>

### Instead of a Conclusion

In general, it is possible to assert that, the most important element which keep the state of "us" alive and ensure internalisation of this consciousness, is the "other". In other words, instead of naming "us", it is easier to define what is different from "us", the "other". Like every nationalism, Turkish nationalism too was purporting homogeneity. Tuğal states that, imagining what is different from you as an integrated unit, reducing it to be other, ease a groups drawing of the borders which define itself, as a hardline, and securing its unity. Therefore, every national expression, guaranteeing an attribution of wholism to "other", creates required conditions for imagination of its own identity in the same wholism.<sup>107</sup> In the ensurance of this wholism/homogeneity, religion, as had been seen in Turkish-Greek Population Exchange, was considered as the key of inclusion in to Turkishness. Therefore, entrance of non-Muslims from the door in, that is, living and partaking of those who belong to "other" among "us" became extremely hard. Besides, economic potential of "other", its causing of land losses, occupations and migrations led to increase of brisance against other in

<sup>105</sup> İsmail Habib Sevik, *Yurttan Yazılar*, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 1987, pp. 207, 215.

<sup>106</sup> Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *İkinci Adam 1938-1950 II. Volume*, 11<sup>th</sup> Edition, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul, 2011, pp. 235, 236.

<sup>107</sup> Cihan Tuğal, "1915 Hatıraları ve Ermeni Kimliğinin İnşası", *Hatıradıklarıyla ve Unuttuklarıyla Türkiye'nin Toplumsal Hafızası*, Compiled by Esra Özyürek, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2001, p. 141.

collective memory. All of these brought up both inlining and exclusion of minorities by Turkishness, on the one hand they were made invisible being pushed out of official identity, on the other they were made apparent in regard to symbolisation of what the nation does not represent, in other words "otherness" in the eye of the majority. We can assert that, this 'inlining' was mostly resulted from necessity, due to reasons like a pure homeland and anxiety of perpetuity. Minorities, being "other" not only fed Turkish identity; it also kept states of Turkishness alive. Fundamentally, being out of 'imagined community' and living on lands that belong to "us" increased obligations of minorities. On the one hand they were 'asked' to speak Turkish, on the other hand their 'flattening, outstretching and thickening of our beautiful language', led to saying of "oh citizen do not speak Turkish".<sup>108</sup> Besides, economic potential of minorities and their consideration as extensions of foreign powers contributed both Turkisation of economy and fortification of inside. Likewise, minorities, from time to time acted as buffers that would soften reaction of Turk-Muslim population against radical steps that were taken in the path of secularism. Especially, increase of religious appearance of non-Muslims both in education institutions and daily life, drew reaction of the founder of Turkish nation-state and this was utilised in the softening of the reactions of Turkish public opinion against steps taken in accordance with secularism.<sup>109</sup> Although they were citizens of the Republic of Turkey, at least "Turk in law", minorities were never approached apart from their ethnical and/or religious epithets. Reminding that, in the press, which assumed important roles in this matter, carrot and stick method was always applied to minorities, let us leave the floor to Burhan Asaf: "We did not searched ways to procure acceptance of our language to our own minorities even to a degree of decent and sufficient to shopping from a grocer [...] Those who are out of our language to could not be able to shop from a grocer, as yet will learn our language, as yet forget their own, as yet embrace our culture. [...] I hope, anti-Semitism in Germany will set an example for our rulers. It is necessary [...] to be as hospitable as Turks. Yet, end of each visit is either mingling with household or not to stretch visit, is not? Our minorities, never learned to mingling with household, so far. Because they did not want to learn. Yet from now on, their

---

<sup>108</sup> For instance, Ali Canib stated that, he considered "posters inscribed 'Citizen Speak Turkish!' which were brought on by some youngsters to invite non-Turkic elements to speak Turkish, [...] as inefficient, vain" and that on the contrary they spoiled Turkish. See, Ali Canib, "İrktaş Kendine Gel!", *Hayat*, Volume 3, No 76, 10 May 1928, pp. 1, 2.

<sup>109</sup> Grew who was the first US Ambassador to Republic of Turkey stated that, during his conversation with Foreign Affairs Minister Tevfik Rüştü Aras, about the reaction which was emerged in press and public opinion in response to conversion of three Muslim students, studying in Bursa American College, to Christianity, the Minister "frankly confessed that harsh precautions of government against American school was taken in an aim of self-defence because Bursa was the den of fanaticism and opposition against government." See, Joseph C. Grew, *Atatürk ve Yeni Türkiye*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, transl. Gülşen Ulutekin-Kamil Yüceoral, Gündoğan Yayınları, İstanbul, 2003, pp. 94-95, 97-98.

searching and finding of the sincere ways of this, no sooner than we show them, is to both their and our benefit".<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> Burhan Asaf, "Bizdeki Azlıklar", *Kadro*, Issue 17, May 1933, p. 52.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ÂFETİNAN, A., *Medenî Bilgiler ve M. Kemal Atatürk'ün El Yazmaları*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 1988.
- AHMAD, Feroz, *Jön Türkler ve Osmanlı'da Milletler Ermeniler, Rumlar, Arnavutlar, Yahudiler ve Araplar*, transl. Ayşen Gür, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017.
- AHMAD, Feroz, *İttihat ve Terakki 1908-1914*, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, transl. Nuran Yavuz, Kaynak Yayınları, İstanbul, 2010.
- AKÇAM, Taner, "Türk Ulusal Kimliği Üzerine Tezler", Ed. Tanıl Bora, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt 4 Milliyetçilik*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2002.
- AKÇAM, Taner, *Türk Ulusal Kimliği ve Ermeni Sorunu*, 3<sup>th</sup> Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1994.
- AKTAR, Ayhan, *Varlık Vergisi ve 'Türkleştirme' Politikaları*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2000.
- AKYOL, Taha, *Ama Hangi Atatürk*, Doğan Kitap, İstanbul, 2008.
- ARAI, Masami, *Jön Türk Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliği*, transl. Tansel Demirel, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1994.
- ARI, Kemal, *Büyük Mübadele Türkiye'ye Zorunlu Göç(1923-1925)*, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul, 1995.
- ASAF, Burhan, "Bizdeki Azlıklar", *Kadro*, Issue 17, May 1933.
- ATAY, Falih Rıfki, *Çankaya*, Bates Yayınları, İstanbul, 1984.
- AUGUSTINOS, Gerasimos, *Küçük Asya Rumları, 19. Yüzyılda İnanç, Cemaat ve Etnisite*, transl. Devrim Evci, Dipnot Yayınları, Ankara 2013.
- AYDEMİR, Şevket Süreyya, *İkinci Adam 1938-1950 II. Cilt*, 11<sup>th</sup> Edition, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul, 2011.
- BALİ, Rıfat N., "Resmî İdeoloji ve Gayri Müslim Yurttaşlar", *Birikim*, Issue 105-106, January-February 1998.
- BALİ, Rıfat N., "Azınlıkları Türkleştirme Meselesi" *Ne İdi? Ne Değildi?*, Libra Yayınları, İstanbul, 2014.
- BALİ, Rıfat N., *Cumhuriyet Yıllarında Türkiye Yahudileri Bir Türkleştirme Serüveni(1923-1945)*, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2010.
- BAŞAR, Ahmet Hamdi, *Bir Medeniyetin Sonu*, Cumhuriyet Matbaası, İstanbul, 1942.
- BARKEY, Karen, *Farklılıklar İmparatorluğu, Karşılaştırmalı Tarih Perspektifinden Osmanlılar*, transl. Ebru Kılıç, Versus Kitap, İstanbul, 2011.
- BAYRAKTUTAN Yusuf, *Türk Fikir Tarihinde Modernleşme, Milliyetçilik ve Türk Ocakları*, T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 1996.

- BAYIR, Derya, *Türk Hukukunda Azınlıklar ve Milliyetçilik*, transl. Ülkü Sağır, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017.
- BAYUR, Yusuf Hikmet, *Türk İnkılâbı Tarihi Cilt 1 Kısım 1*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 1991.
- BİLSEL, Cemil, *Lozan I. Cilt*, Sosyal Yayınları, İstanbul, 1998.
- BİRDOĞAN, Nejat, *İttihat Terakki'nin Alevilik Bektaşılık Araştırması (Baha Sait Bey)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Berfin Yayınları, İstanbul, 1995.
- BISCHOFF, Norbert von, *Ankara Türkiye'de Yeni Oluşun Bir İzahı*, transl. Burhan Belge, Ulus Basımevi, Ankara, 1936.
- BORA, Tanıl, "Türkiye'de Milliyetçilik ve Azınlıklar", *Birikim*, Issue 71-72, March-April 1995.
- BORA, Tanıl, "İnşa Döneminde Türk Millî Kimliği", *Toplum ve Bilim*, Issue 71, Winter 1996.
- BORA, Tanıl, *Cereyanlar Türkiye'de Siyasî İdeolojiler*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017.
- BOZARSLAN, Hamit, *Türkiye Tarihi İmparatorluktan Günümüze*, transl. Işık Ergüden, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2015.
- BOZKURT, Mahmut Esat, *Toplu Eserler IV*, Yay. Haz. Şaduman Halıcı, Kaynak Yayınları, İstanbul, 2015.
- BRUNEAU, Michel, *Küçük Asya'dan Türkiye'ye Azınlıklar, Etnik-Millî Homojenleştirme, Diasporalar*, transl. Ayhan Güneş, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2018.
- CALHOUN, Craig, *Milliyetçilik*, transl. Bilgen Sütçüoğlu, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007.
- CONNOLLY, William E., *Kimlik ve Farklılık Siyasetin Açmazlarına Dair Demokratik Çözüm Önerileri*, transl. Fermâ Lekesizalın, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul, 1995.
- COPEAUX, Etienne, "Türk Milliyetçiliği: Sözcükler, Tarih, İşaretler", Ed. Tanıl Bora, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce, Cilt 4 Milliyetçilik*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2002.
- ÇAĞAPTAY, Soner, *Türkiye'de İslâm, Laiklik ve Milliyetçilik Türk Kimdir?*, transl. Özgür Bircan, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009.
- ÇAĞAPTAY, Soner, "Kim Türk, Kim Vatandaş? Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi Vatandaşlık Rejimi Üzerine bir Çalışma", transl. Pemra Hazbay, *Toplum ve Bilim*, Issue 98, Fall 2003.
- DÜNDAR, Fuat, "İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Araştırmaları", *Toplumsal Tarih*, Issue 91, 2001.
- DÜNDAR, Fuat, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi İttihat ve Terakki'nin Etnisite Mühendisliği (1913-1918)*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2008.
- EKMEKÇİOĞLU, Lerna, "Yeni Türkiye'nin Üvey Vatandaşları", *Toplum ve Bilim*, Issue 132, 2015.
- ENGİN, M. Saffet, *Kemalizm İnkılâbının Prensipleri Büyük Türk Medeniyetinin Tarihi ve Sosyolojik Tetkikine Methal*, Volume II, Cumhuriyet Matbaası, İstanbul, 1938.
- ERDEN, Mustafa Suphi, *Türkiye ve İran'da Vatandaşlık ve Etnisite*, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017.

- GALANTİ, Avram, "Türkleşmek Yolu", *Atatürk Devri Fikir Hayatı II*, Prepared by Mehmet Kaplan, İnci Engnün et alii, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 1992.
- GEORGEON, François, *Osmanlı-Türk Modernleşmesi(1900-1930)*, transl. Ali Berktaş, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006.
- GEORGEON, François, "Türk Milliyetçiliği Üzerine Düşünceler Suyu Arayan Adam'ı Yeniden Okurken", transl. Tuvana Gülcan, Ed. Tanıl Bora, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt 4 Milliyetçilik*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2002.
- GÖCEK, Fatma Müge, "Osmanlı Devletinde Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Oluşumu: Sosyolojik Yaklaşım", transl. Defne Orhun, Ed. Tanıl Bora, *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt 4 Milliyetçilik*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2002.
- GREW, Joseph C., *Atatürk ve Yeni Türkiye*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, transl. Gülşen Ulutekin-Kamil Yüceoral, Gündoğan Yayınları, İstanbul, 2003.
- GÜLALP, Haldun, "Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin Kuruluşu: Kapitalizm ve Modernite", *Laiklik, Vatandaşlık Demokrasi Türkiye'nin Siyasal Kültürü Üzerine Çalışmalar*, Metis Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017.
- HAKKI, İsmail, *Mürebilere, Sühulet Kütüphanesi*, İstanbul, 1932.
- HEPER, Metin, "Atatürkçülük: Karizmanın Emredici 'Siyasal Çerçeve'ye Dönüşümü", *Betül Nuri Esen'e Armağan*, AÜ. Hukuk Fakültesi Yayınları, Ankara, 1977.
- HOBSBAWM, Eric J., *Devrim Çağı: 1789- 1848*, transl. Jülide Ergüder- Alâeddin Şenel, V Yayınları, Ankara, 1989.
- İHSAN, Ahmed, "Matbuat Hatırlarım", *Türkiye Nasıl Laikleştirildi*, Prepared by Hüseyin Durukan, Çıdam Yayınları, İstanbul, 1991.
- İLERİ, Suphi, *Sèvres ve Lausanne(Sevr ve Lozan)*, Arkadaş Matbaası, 1934.
- İLERİ, Celal Nuri, *Taç Giyen Millet*, Prepared by Şennur Şenel, Berikan Yayınevi, Ankara, 2008.
- İLERİ, Celal Nuri, *Devlet ve Meclis Hakkında Musahabeler*, Prepared by Halit Erdem Oksaçan, Emre Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007.
- İNSEL, Ahmet, "Giriş", *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt 2 Kemalizm*, Ed. Ahmet İnsel, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2002.
- JAFFRELOT, Christophe, "Bir Milliyetçilik Kuramı İçin", Ed. Alain Dieckhoff, Christophe Jaffrelot, *Milliyetçiliği Yeniden Düşünmek, Kuramlar ve Uygulamalar*, transl. Devrim Çetinkasap, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul 2010.
- KADIOĞLU, Ayşe, *Cumhuriyet İradesi Demokrasi Muhakemesi*, Metis Yayınları, İstanbul, 1999.
- KARABEKİR, Kâzım, *Ankara'da Savaş Rüzgârları II. Dünya Savaşı CHP Grup Tartışmaları*, Emre Yayınları, İstanbul, 1994.
- KANAT, H. Fikret, *Milliyet İdeali ve Topyekûn Millî Terbiye*, Çankaya Matbaası, Ankara, 1942.
- KARAY, Refik Halid, *Bir Ömür Boyunca*, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 2011.
- KARPAT, Kemal H., *Osmanlı'da Milliyetçiliğin Toplumsal Temelleri*, Timaş Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017.

- KARPAT, Kemal, *Kısa Türkiye Tarihi 1800-2012*, Prepared by Güneş Ayas, Timaş Yayınları, İstanbul, 2012.
- KARPAT, Kemal Kemal, “Modern Türkiye”, *İslâm Tarihi Kültür ve Medeniyeti Cilt 2* (P. M. Holt-A.K.S. Lambton-B. Lewis), transl. Hamdi Aktaş, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Kitabevi Yayınları, İstanbul, 1997.
- KARPAT, Kemal H., *Türk Demokrasi Tarihi*, Afa Yayınları, İstanbul, 1996.
- KASABA Reşat, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Dünya Ekonomisi, On Dokuzuncu Yüzyıl*, transl. Kudret Emiroğlu, İstanbul, 1993.
- KERİMOĞLU, Hasan Taner, *İttihat-Terakki ve Rumlar 1908-1914*, Libra Yayıncılık, İstanbul, 2009.
- KEYDER, Çağlar, *Türkiye’de Devlet ve Sınıflar*, 17<sup>th</sup> Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2011.
- KOÇAK, Cemil, *Recep Peker Konuşuyor, Disiplinli Hürriyet*, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul, 2018.
- KORALTÜRK, Murat, *Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Ekonominin Türkleştirilmesi*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2011.
- KREİSER, Klaus, *Atatürk*, transl. Dilek Zaptçioğlu, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2010.
- KUSHNER, David, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu 1876-1908*, transl. Zeki Doğan, Fener Yayınları, İstanbul, 1998.
- LEWİS, Bernard, *Modern Türkiye’nin Doğuşu*, transl. Metin Kıratlı, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 1993.
- LEWİS, V. Thmas, “Nationalism in Turkey”, *Nationalism in the Midle Eas*, The Middle East Institue, Washington, D.C, 1952.
- NAMİ, Kâzım, *Türkün Kitabı*, Kanaat Kütüphanesi, 1931.
- NURİ, Celâl, “Önce Tasarruf, Sonra Tasarruf”, *Atatürk Devri Fikir Hayatı I*, Prepared by Mehmet Kaplan, İnci Engnün et alii, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 1981.
- OBA, Ali Engin, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu*, İmge Kitabevi Yayınları, Ankara, 1995.
- ONARAN, Nevzat, *Ermeniler, Rumlar ve Kürtler Türk Nüfus Mühendisliği(1914-1940)*, Kor Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017.
- ORAN, Baskın, *Atatürk Milliyetçiliği, Resmi İdeoloji Dışı Bir İnceleme*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Bilgi Yayınevi, Ankara, 1990.
- Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Liman Kentleri, Bazı kuramsal ve Tarihsel Perspektifler*, Ed. Çağlar Keyder, Y. Eyüp Özveren, Donalt Quataret, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul, 1994.
- ÖĞÜN, Süleyman Seyfi, “Türk Milliyetçiliğinde Hakim Millet Kodunun Dönüşümü”, *Türkiye Günlüğü*, Issue 50, March-April 1998.
- PEKER, Recep, *İnkılâp Dersleri*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1984.
- NİŞANYAN, Sevan, “Kemalist Düşüncede ‘Türk Milleti’ Kavramı”, *Türkiye Günlüğü*, Issue 33, March-April 1995.
- ÖKE, Mim Kemal, “Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’ün Azınlıklar Hakkındaki Görüş ve Değerlendirmeleri”, *Atatürk Konferansları Dizisi*, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 1986.

- QUATAERT, Donald, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Avrupa İktisadi Yayılımı ve Direniş(1881-1908)*, transl. Sabri Tekay, Yurt Yayınları, Ankara, 1987.
- REFİK Ahmet, *Çocuklara Türk İstiklâl Harbi*, Hilmi Kitaphanesi, İstanbul, 1929.
- SADAK, Necmettin, "Türkleşmek Mecburiyeti", *Atatürk Devri Yazarlarının Kaleminden Altı Ok(1919-1938)*, Prepared by Şaduman Halıcı-Murat Burgaç, Kaynak Yayınları, İstanbul, 2016.
- SEVİG, Vasfi Raşid, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Esas Teşkilat Hukuku Yüksek polis Enstitüsünde Verilen Dersler*, Ulus Basımevi, Ankara, 1938.
- SEVİNÇ, Murat Sevinç-DEMİRKENT, Dinçer, *Kuruluşun İhmal Edilmiş İstisnası 1921 Anayasası ve Tutanakları*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017.
- SEVÜK İsmail Habib, *Yurttan Yazılar*, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 1987.
- SEVÜK İsmail Habib, *Tunadan Batıya*, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul, 1944.
- SMITH Anthony D., *Kuram, İdeoloji, Tarih*, transl. Ümit Hüsrev Yolsal, Atf Yayınları, Ankara 2013.
- STEINHAUS, Kurt, *Atatürk Devrimi Sosyolojisi*, Transl. M. Akkaş, Sarmal Yayınevi, İstanbul, 1995.
- ŞENEL, Alaeddin, "Milliyetçilik Nereden Nereye? Tarihsel Bir Bakış/Açık Oturum", *Marksizm ve Gelecek*, Issue 5, 1992.
- TANRIÖVER, Hamdullah Subhî, *Dağ Yolu I* (Prepared by Fethi Tevetoğlu), Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 1987.
- TOPRAK, Zafer, "Antropolojik Dilbilim, Dil Devrimi ve Sadri Maksudi", *Toplumsal Tarih*, 219, March 2012.
- TİMUR, Taner, *Türk Devrimi ve Sonrası*, İmge Kitabevi Yayınları, Ankara, 1993.
- TİMUR, Taner, "Uluslaşma Süreci, İttihatçılık ve Devrim", Ed. Sina Akşin, Sarp Balcı, Barış Ünlü, *100. Yılında Jön Türk Devrimi*, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, İstanbul, 2010.
- TUĞAL, Cihan, "1915 Hatıraları ve Ermeni Kimliğinin İnşası", *Hatırladıklarıyla ve Unutuklarıyla Türkiye'nin toplumsal Hafızası*, Compiled by Esra Özyürek, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2001.
- TUNÇAY, Mete, "CHF'nin 1927 Kurultayının Öncesinde Toplanan İl Kongreleri", *AÜ SBF Dergisi*, Volume 36, Issue 1, 1981.
- TÜRKER, Nurdan, *Vatanım Yok Memleket Var İstanbul Rumları: Mekân-Bellek-Ritüel*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2015.
- ÜNGÖR, Uğur Ümit, *Modern Türkiye'nin Şifresi Doğu Anadolu'da Ulus, Devlet ve Şiddet(1913-1950)*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2016.
- ÜNLÜ, Barış, *Türklük Sözleşmesi, Oluşumu, İşleyişi ve Krizi*, Dipnot Yayınları, Ankara, 2018.
- ÜSTEL, Füsun, *İmparatorluktan Ulus-Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği: Türk Ocakları(1912-1931)*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1997.
- ÜSTEL, Füsun, "Makbul Vatandaş"ın Peşinde II. Meşrutiyet'ten Bugüne Vatandaşlık Eğitimi, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2004.

- YALMAN, Ahmet Emin, *Gerçekleşen Rüya, Cumhuriyetin On Beşinci Yıldönümü Arifesinde Memleket Meselesine Dair Düşünceler*, Tan Matbaası, İstanbul, 1938.
- YEĞEN, Mesut, *Müstakbel Türk'ten Sözde Vatandaşa Cumhuriyet ve Kürtler*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006.
- YILDIZ, Ahmet, *"Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyebilene" Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin Etno-Seküler Sınırları(1919-1938)*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2001.
- YUMUL, Arus, *"Azınlık mı Vatandaş mı?", Türkiye'de Çoğunluk ve Azınlık Politikaları: AB Sürecinde Yurttaşlık Tartışmaları*, Compiled by Ayhan Kaya-Turgut Tarhanlı, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, TESEV Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006.
- YUSUF, Akçuraoğlu, *Türk Yılı 1928*, Prepared by Arslan Tekin, Ahmet Zeki İzgöner, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 2009.
- ZÜRCHER, Erik Jan, *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*, transl. Yasemin Saner Gönen, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1995.
- ZÜRCHER, Erik Jan, *"Yıkımın ve Yenilenmenin Mimarları: Kemalist Jenerasyona ve Jön Türklere Dair Bir Grup Biyografisi Denemesi"*, *Mete Tunçay'a Armağan*, Compiled by Mehmet Ö. Alkan-Tanıl Bora-Murat Koraltürk, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007.