

FROM OFFICIAL IDEOLOGY TO UNOFFICIAL INTERPRETATION: A THEORETICAL APPROACH TO THE RELATIONSHIP OF KEMALISM AND CULTURAL HUMANISM

*Yusuf Ziya BÖLÜKBAŞI**

Abstract

Kemalism, the founding ideology of the Turkish Republic, can be defined as Turkey's experience of modernization and becoming a nation-state. Kemalism had a holistic character in the Early Republican Period. After World War II, it started to be divided into different types and its function as an official ideology ended. The most common distinction regarding the types of Kemalism is right and left Kemalisms. Kemalism includes a nationalist idea system in building the modern nation-state. Identity policies have been implemented since the beginning of the 1930s, and the Turkish History Thesis and Sun Language Theory were essential here. Kemalism built a nation and realized it with an ethnocentric method pointing to nationalism. Thus, its place on the ideological scale is right-wing. However, leftist interpretations of Kemalism gained strength in the 1960s. Especially the intellectuals who came together around the *Yön* journal developed the leftist understanding of Kemalism. The present study aims to explain the mental transformation in the leftward evolution of Kemalism. In this study, in which the literature review method is used, Kemalism is accepted as a form of nationalism in terms of identity construction. The phenomenon that enabled the transformation from nationalism was the concept of Cultural Humanism, especially the Blue Anatolian Movement that emerged from it, which provided the transition from ethnocentrism to territorialism. In addition, after Atatürk's death, Turk-centered humanism was replaced by Western-centered Greco-Latin thought, and the left-wing identities of the intellectuals representing the Cultural Humanism movement were influential in the transformation of Kemalism's mental codes.

Keywords: *Kemalism, Cultural Humanism, Blue Anatolian Movement, Ethnocentrism, Territorialism.*

RESMİ İDEOLOJİDEN GAYRİRESMİ YORUMA: KEMALİZM İLE KÜLTÜREL HÜMANİZMA İLİŞKİSİNE TEORİK BİR YAKLAŞIM

Özet

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kurucu ideolojisi olan Kemalizm, Türkiye'nin modernleşme ve ulus-devlet olma deneyimi olarak tanımlanabilir. Kemalizm Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde bütüncül bir karaktere sahipti. II. Dünya Savaşı'ndan sonra farklı türlere ayrılmaya başlamış ve resmî ideoloji işlevi sona ermiştir. Kemalizm türlerine ilişkin en yaygın ayrım sağ ve sol Kemalizmlerdir. Kemalizm, modern ulus-devletin inşasında milliyetçi bir fikir sistemini içerir. Otuzlu yılların başından itibaren kimlik politikaları uygulanmış ve burada Türk Tarih Tezi ve Güneş Dil Teorisi önem arz etmiştir. Kemalizm bir ulus inşa etmiş ve bunu etnosentrik bir yöntemle gerçekleştirmiştir. Dolayısıyla ideolojik bağlamda yeri sağdır. Ancak Kemalizm'in sol yorumları altmışlı yıllarda güç kazanmaya başladı. Özellikle *Yön* dergisi etrafında bir araya gelen aydınlar Kemalizm'in sol anlayışını geliştirdiler. Bu çalışma, Kemalizmin sola doğru evrimindeki zihinsel dönüşümü açıklamayı amaçlamaktadır. Literatür taraması yönteminin kullanıldığı bu çalışmada Kemalizm, kimlik inşası açısından bir milliyetçilik biçimi olarak kabul edilmektedir. Milliyetçilikten dönüşümü sağlayan olgu, Kültürel Hümanizm kavramı, özellikle de ondan ortaya çıkan ve etnosentrizmden teritoryalizme geçişi sağlayan Mavi Anadolu Hareketi olmuştur. Ayrıca Atatürk'ün ölümünden sonra Türk merkezli hümanizm yerini Batı merkezli Greko-Latin düşüncesine bırakmış, Kemalizm'in zihniyet kodlarının dönüşümünde Kültürel Hümanizm hareketini temsil eden aydınların sol kimlikleri etkili olmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Kemalizm, Kültürel Hümanizma, Mavi Anadoluçuluk Hareketi, Etnosentrizm, Teritoryalizm.*



1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of ideology is a set of ideas systematized by intellectuals. It gives meaning to the lives of individuals who have lost their community character and become atomized in the process of the spread of capitalist economic relations and the transition to industrial society. The phenomenon of ideology, which is a product of modernism, has played a significant role in the lives of individuals, communities and states since the day it emerged. The Republic of Turkey is also based on an ideology as of its foundation, namely Kemalism. Kemalism, a holistic system of ideas in the early Republican period, was divided into different types in later processes. The most emphasized distinction between Kemalism is right and left Kemalism. In fact, according to Parla (1993: 10), the left interpretation of Kemalism is an "inconsistent synthesis" that tries to "reconcile the incompatible" and states that Kemalism cannot come together with the left or social democracy under any circumstances. In addition, Kemalism essentially points to a right-wing system of ideas (Bora and Taşkın, 2019: 529-530). The fact that the understanding of Turkism, which has continued since the Committee of Union and Progress, has transformed and became the most substantial support of the official ideology, the policies followed for nation-building -like the Turkish History Thesis- and the attempt to form a national bourgeoisie -Kemalism is seen as a bourgeois revolution- proves this situation. Being in the Western bloc after World War II and being included in the capitalist economic system supports this view. The fact that Kemalism is a right-wing movement is also defined through the figure of Celal Bayar. This notion enables the centre-right tradition in Turkey to portray itself as "Ataturkist". According to Bayar (1978: 15), Atatürk could have quickly established a socialist state after the War of Independence if he had wanted, but he did the opposite and distanced himself from communism. Thus, from the foundation period, Kemalism had a right core. On the other hand, some thinkers and approaches state that Kemalism is a leftist ideology.

Left Kemalism has been a movement represented by a small group of intellectuals who generally gathered around a journal in its historical course from the 1930s to the 21st century. It can be said that left Kemalism, which could not attain a political structure but shaped intellectual discussions and political events, formed a strong tradition of thought in two historical periods. In the 1930s, Kadro journal was the first example of this movement. In the 1960s, the intellectuals gathered in and around the journal Yön represented the left Kemalism (Alpkaya, 2019: 477-478). Yaşar Özkandaş expressed a different approach to leftist Kemalism. According to him, the left interpretation of Kemalism was carried out through two methods. The first one was the views stating that Kemalism was closed to socialism but had a social democratic stance. The most important representative of this was Bülent Ecevit. Ecevit said that Kemalism is based on classes and that the principles of statism and populism do not belong to the left in terms of their content. However, the Turkish revolution itself, which started with the War of Independence and led to the establishment of the modern state, can be seen as a leftist interpretation. Similarly, Ceyhun Atıf Kansu stated that Kemalism was not socialist but inspired by leftist ideas and stated that the First Group was on the left in the National Assembly established in Ankara against the occupation and that the term "People's State" was leftist rhetoric. The second approach stems from the interpretation of Kemalism in the sixties apart from its previous

variations. It is seen that especially Marxism and Kemalism are tried to be synthesized. According to intellectuals such as Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu and Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Kemalism needed a new interpretation in the 1960s with the transformations Turkey underwent. During these years, Kemalism began to be seen as "Turkish socialism". In addition, the role of *Yön* magazine in shaping this approach is excellent (Özkandaş, 2019: 206-210). Avcıoğlu (1962: 3), the lead author of the journal *Yön*, thinks that the cadres carrying out the national struggle see salvation in populism and that this principle corresponds to socialism today. The Kemalist thesis was, in short, to try to modernize within independence. Superstructure revolutions such as the establishment of the secular order and the abolition of the sultanate and the caliphate were implemented, but the infrastructure revolutions were also not forgotten; industrialization by the state and land reform point to this. But after 1945, these revolutions started to reverse and the Kemalist understanding of revolution was interrupted (Devrim Bildirisi, 1969: 2). *Yön* magazine, in which Avcıoğlu was the editor-in-chief, also became an important medium where left Kemalism was covered. Examining Turkey's economic development problem in the political context, the authors of *Yön* tried to put forward a synthesis of socialism and Kemalism from an ideological perspective. For this reason, the nationalist aspect of socialism comes to the fore in the writings. This nationalism has a full independence and anti-imperial character. As a matter of fact, according to İlhan Selçuk (1962: 6, 1965: 3), one of the essential journal writers, Atatürk, fought against imperialism and ensured Turkey's full independence and thus, Atatürk was a real nationalist. This nationalism was based on reason and aimed to modernize Turkey. It is also inclusive, based on the principle of patriotism. It is necessary to distinguish Atatürk's nationalism from racist nationalism. This approach, drawn by Selçuk, constitutes one of the fundamental characteristics of left Kemalism. In addition, a significant development for leftist Kemalism is the "left of centre" transformation that the CHP, the representative of Kemalism in the political arena, experienced in the mid-sixties. With this transformation, the CHP has come to its current political line. Although İsmet İnönü stated that this situation is not a change, on the contrary, they have been on the left of the centre since the day they said they were secular and statist, that is, from the beginning of the revolutions (Turan, 2003: 85). Thus, according to İnönü, Kemalism always has a leftist content.

The brief overview above emphasizes the emergence and essential characteristics of left Kemalism, which is the unofficial interpretation of Kemalism, Turkey's founding-official ideology. As a result, how did this unofficial interpretation of Kemalism occur? Above, the cyclical characteristics of the emergence of left Kemalism were mentioned. This study aims to explain the transformation in the mental codes that paved the way for the leftist evolution of Kemalism, which did not have a leftist identity. In this context, in this study, in which a theoretical discussion will be made, the literature review method will be followed, and academic studies on the subject will be used. First of all, the concept of Kemalism will be examined. Then, Cultural Humanism and Blue Anatolianism Movement will be examined in the context of the trivets of the mental transformation mentioned. In the conclusion part of the study, the findings will be discussed on the basis of the research question.

2. OFFICIAL IDEOLOGY FROM EARLY REPUBLIC TO THE FORTIES: KEMALISM

2.1. An Evaluation on Kemalism

The practice of revolution that established the nation-state and the republican regime in Turkish history is called Kemalism. The British used the name Kemalism for the first time in 1919. The cadres carrying out the National Struggle, especially Mustafa Kemal Pasha, did not adopt this name (Perinçek, 2020: 13-14). The official use of the name Kemalism is said for the first time in the 4th Great Congress of the CHP held in 1935, and in its accepted introduction, it is called that "All these principles that the party follows are the principles of Kamalism" (1935: 2, Perinçek, 2020: 15-16). Thus, six principles will determine the destiny of the Turkish nation. These principles are nationalism, republicanism, populism, secularism, statism and revolutionism. They were accepted and legalized by being put into the Constitution in 1937. Kemalism has been maintained since 1919, and the Turkish society's search for ideology extends to the debates on Ottomanism, Islamism and Turkism. However, these discussions were limited to small groups. On the other hand, Kemalism has been a comprehensive movement as it not only presents an identity with revolutionary nationalism but also creates a new society and regime together with the other five principles (Ahmad, 2019: 217-218).

After a short historical narrative, it is helpful to include a few definitions of Kemalism. According to Tunaya (2002: 89), Kemalism is the ideology of the Turkish revolution that developed within the framework of the idea of national independence against the Western imperialist occupying powers, and it is the foundation and liberation movement shaped by the opinions of the leader of the revolution, Mustafa Kemal. Kışlalı (1994: 15), on the other hand, sees it as a progressive ideology that can adapt itself to innovations, unlike a stereotyped belief system. Kazancıgil (2019: 235) presents a different approach and states that Kemalism is a realist understanding shaped by actions with the transition from theocratic legitimacy to the concept of national sovereignty. According to him, Kemalism was institutionalized with the indoctrination between 1927-1931 and the addition of the principles to the Constitution in 1937. However, he states that before these dates, Kemalism transformed society with a series of reforms between 1924 and 1928. These reforms started with the abolition of the Sultanate in 1922. The proclamation of the Republic, the dissolution of the Caliphate, the adoption of the Law of Unification of Education, the abolition of the Sharia courts, the closure of dervish lodges and lodges, the Alphabet Revolution, the adoption of the Civil Code, the adoption of the Constitution and It can be listed in general terms as the removal of the phrase "the religion of the state is Islam" from the Constitution (Akşin, 2019: 185-188).

The most emphasized subject in the definitions of Kemalism has been the establishment of the nation-state. According to Köker (2019: 98), Kemalism is an ideology unique to Turkey and includes the idea of establishing a modern nation-state. Demirel (2019, 128-129) underlines that Kemalism is the ideology of the single-party period that found the Turkish nation and state and stated that it is a set of thoughts and actions defined around the Six Arrows. Kemalism has shown continuity and integrity since the early 1920s and was openly announced in CHP programs. A clear definition was made at the CHP V. Great Congress in 1939: "Kemalism is not an ideal. It is an

actualized set of reality". Perinçek (2020: 26) states that Kemalism is not an ideology, philosophy or theory but should be accepted as "the sum of the works of the Turkish revolution". Therefore, Kemalism should be defined as a "path" or "practice" (Perinçek, 2020: 27). Yakup Kadri What is the ideology of the revolution? Atatürk's answer to the question that he did not seek doctrine and that is attached to a particular ideology could harm the revolutions (Belge: 2019: 38) indicates this situation. Berkes (1965: 84-85), who shares a similar opinion, states that Kemalism is not an ideology but should be evaluated as the right path followed in the two-hundred-year modernization process that corresponds to a historical period and continues.

The phenomenon of Kemalism is also defined through some of the qualities included in its content. Özkandaş (2019: 21-25) points out that Kemalism has four essential features: (1) It is not a rigid, dogmatic and totalitarian ideology, (2) It is action-based, not theoretical, (3) It has a unique quality, and (4) It is an anti-imperialist movement. According to İnsel (2019: 14-15), Kemalism, the hegemonic current of thought in Turkish political opinion, is ideologically shallow and pragmatic; practice rather than theory is articulated with different currents of thought and aimed at national modernization. Parla (1993: 10) analyzes Kemalism by dividing it into two political and cultural. Cultural Kemalism is a secular, rational, cultural reformist and progressive ideology. Political Kemalism, on the other hand, is an authoritarian, statist, single-party, "chefist" based on a one-person rule and a political ideology and regime specific to a certain period. According to Bora (2017: 124-129), who thinks that it is essential to look at Atatürk's ideas to understand Kemalist thought, he has a nationalist and modernist ideology. Thus, Kemalism is a movement of ideas in which modernization and nationalism are synthesized. On the other hand, he states that Atatürk had realist, pragmatist, tutelary and Jacobin views and that his Speech contains a Jacobin and enlightened despotism (Bora, 2017: 128). Ünder (2019: 142) also states that Atatürk's political goal was to establish a solid and independent state in the international arena. Still, his method was Jacobinism, and his attitude towards the people was paternalistic. In the comments made so far, it is seen that there are ideological prejudices against Kemalism and Atatürk. It is necessary to compare Kemalism and Atatürk with contemporary ideologies and leaders and interpret them according to the socio-economic conditions of the period. First, one of the main features of Ottoman-Turkish modernization is Jacobinism. In addition, the bourgeoisie, the leading actor of change in Europe, did not exist in Turkish society. Therefore, it is an erroneous way of thinking to give a negative meaning to the Jacobin character of Kemalism.

The transformation of Kemalism into a hegemonic system of ideas was realized with its six principles that guided its practices and later turned into the state's official program. Especially four of these six principles (nationalism, secularism, revolutionism and statism) were effective in providing hegemony. Kemalism, the name of the search for a new order, considers this order as the construction of a secular, modern and Western Turkish identity and the Turkish nation as a homogeneous and harmonious whole (Çelik, 2019: 75-76). The most important of these principles is nationalism. It is considered appropriate in terms of the scope of this study to briefly examine the understanding of nationalism of Kemalism under a separate heading.

2.2. Anthropological Turkishness: Kemalism's Ethnocentric Identity Conception

Kemalism is not only nationalism, national liberation and independence struggle but also a project of creating a nation. This developed nation will be adopted by other societies and will continue to exist in the future (Berkes, 2007: 119). Nation design makes the identity construction process essential. Identity must be embodied in a particular place and updated at a specific time. Therefore, the phenomenon of identity is based on geography and history. With the National Struggle, there is geography, namely Anatolia. In this respect, historiography, which will transform this geography into a homeland and offer it deep roots, gains importance. Because historiography also plays a significant role in the construction of identity and the legitimacy of societies' rights over geography. From the second half of the 19th century, nations have been to produce founding and official history. At this point, there is a close connection between academic studies in history and nationalism adopted by the state (Yücel, 2020: 29-31). Defined based on modernism and nationalism, Kemalism is a kind of state nationalism based on the understanding of the continuity of the state, aimed at the level of contemporary civilizations (İnsel, 2019: 21). It is based on the integration of the state and the nation, more precisely, it establishes existential bonds between the state and the nation (Çelik, 2019: 85). The aim of Kemalist nationalism is to transform society, to create a Western-secular Turkish identity. First, an identity structure based on citizenship was introduced with the 1924 Constitution to achieve this. Then an ethnic-secular design was realized through the Turkish History Thesis and Sun Language Theory (Durgun and Yücel, 2019: 192-193).

Turkish History Thesis and Sun Language Theory appear as a reflection of ethno-secular identity construction. The Turkish History Research Society, which was established with the directives of Atatürk, started to work under the direction of Afet İnan. After the First Turkish History Congress was held on 2-11 July 1932, the Turkish History Thesis was announced. In his presentation at this congress, Afet İnan drew attention to the importance of history and geography in forming identity. İnan's work mentions the Turan sea, which does not exist today. According to him, the Turan Sea includes the present-day Caspian, Azov and Aral seas in the middle of the Altai and Pamir mountains, and today's Aral, Caspian and Azov seas in the east and west of the Altai-Pamir highlands of Central Asia. Due to the presence of this inland sea and high glacial mountains, the existence of early unmixed communities in the Central Asian plateau was claimed by İnan. She stated that the Turks, the autochthonous people of Central Asia, have a cultural heritage dating back to 9000 BC in the Altai-Pamir plateau. Saying that the Turks, who have a high culture, do not mix with other races due to the natural obstacles in Central Asia and maintain their existence as a single race, İnan also gave information about the anthropological characteristics of the Turks. According to her, Turks are a nation of the Aryan race with a brachycephalic skull. İnan said that this information was obtained as a result of a comprehensive study on the racial characteristics of the Turks. Besides, she drew attention to the linguistic and cultural similarities between the Turks in Turkey and the communities living in Central Asia (İnan, 1932: 18-24). Thus, the thesis of the Westerners - the idea of barbarian Turks belonging to the yellow race - was tried to be refuted. Reşit Galip also expressed similar thoughts. He defined the racial characteristics of the Turks as the Alpine race and referred to Roland Dixon in this regard. Pointing out the area stretching from East Turkestan

to West Turkestan as the homeland of Turks, Galip emphasized that the northern border is Lake Baikal, and the southern border is the Himalayan mountains. According to him, the Alpine race with a brachycephalic skull, the ancestor of the Turks, has shown the ability to establish great civilizations wherever it went throughout history. In Europe, where they migrated from the north of the Black Sea, they built the Western civilization, the Indian civilization by descending to the south, and those who went to Mesopotamia and Egypt built the civilization there. Finally, those who came to Anatolia established civilizations in Anatolia (Galip, 1932: 124-125). In the history thesis adopted in the 1932 and 1937 Congresses, it was emphasized that the Sumerians came to Mesopotamia via Babylon due to the drought in Central Asia and that they were from the Aryan/Turkish race due to the language they spoke and their anthropological qualities (Galip, 1932: 117).

The summary of the Turkish History Thesis is the idea that the Turks had a great civilization in Central Asia, where they first emerged and then spread it all over the world and carried the places they went. Thus, Turks were considered a nation that established civilization just like Westerners. In addition, it was emphasized that the Turks were the autochthonous society in Anatolia by providing the connection of Anatolian civilizations with the Turks. Although Kemalism had a project to create a nation, there was some confusion on this issue, and the nation's past, which was designed through its contribution to civilizations, was devoid of Anglo-Saxon and French origin sources. Hence, it invented an anthropological and archaeological history with a German-style construction. Thus, in addition to constructing the nation as a historical-cultural people, the primary purpose of Kemalist nationalism, which realized the brilliance of the pre-Ottoman era with the invention of its role in the establishment of civilizations, was to purify the identity of the cosmopolitan Ottoman-Islamic elements. At this point, the Gökaltın line of Kemalism oscillates between cultural nationalism and civilizational nationalism; After World War II, he had to return to the line of cultural nationalism due to cyclical effects (Aydın, 2019: 354-355, 365).

The Sun Language Theory, on the other hand, is a continuation of the Turkish History Thesis. The first congress was held in Istanbul on September 26, 1932, by the Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti. Here, the issue of purifying Turkish from words of Arabic and Persian origin and that the Turkish language is the language of the oldest civilizations are discussed. In the second congress held on 18-23 August 1934, the policy of secularization through language was continued. At the end of the third congress held in 1936, the Sun Language Theory was announced. According to this theory, Turkish has been shown as the ancestor of all languages, and the language of all civilizations that have existed from past to present has been Turkish. It took the "sun" ornament because the first human started to speak by looking at the sun (Çağaptay, 2009: 249-256). Thus, the anthropological construction of Turkishness, which began with the Turkish History Thesis, was reinforced with the Sun Language Theory and revealed its ideological framework through the new state identity concept and the policies it followed.

3. ANTITHESIS OF KEMALISM: CULTURAL HUMANISM

Although the Cultural Humanism movement, considered within Kemalism, has the same goals as Kemalism, it carries different orientations and symbolizes the transformation from ethnocentrism. In this context, first of all, it



is necessary to look at the understanding of Humanism and its development line in Turkey to understand Cultural Humanism, and then to include the Blue Anatolian Movement that emerged from this movement.

3.1. Concept of Humanism

Humanism, a historical metaphor, is explained within the framework of a different definition in each period. This word was first used to indicate the era of humanists. Then it expressed the return to the sources written in ancient Greek and Latin languages for the advancement of societies based on higher education. In addition to this, inspired by the word "humanismus", it represents the mentality expressed as "purely human" or something close to it (Rohde, 1943: 122). Burian (1943: 88-89) considers humanism a part of man. According to him, only the adjective of Greek and Latin language minstrel is a wrong term for this limb that develops in every age and climate. It is more appropriate to define it as the adventure of the human mind to perceive and understand the world. On the other hand, Lacombe (1943: 84-85) states that a general definition of humanism cannot be made and that it should be focused on its characteristics rather than the definition. Within this framework, humanism has three essential features: (1) A reality and meaning related to the human condition, (2) Individualism, and (3) Thinking together with the concept of nation, which is the form of evolution of modern society. These qualities need to be considered together with the superiority of reason, benefiting from ancient Greek-Latin cultural backgrounds and struggling with the medieval mentality.

Understanding the idea of humanism, it is necessary to look at its historical course. According to Behice Boran (1943: 255-259), the thought of humanism is in the 14-15th century, when production relations began to change and trade began to gain importance. It has emerged over the centuries. The transformation in the relations of production the collapse of feudalism and gave birth to a new class, the bourgeoisie. This new class began to challenge the privileges of the church and aristocracy. The capital accumulated in the bourgeois class brought socio-cultural and political, and economic transformation. This transformation showed itself primarily in the field of art and literature. It is not surprising that the first place where the idea of humanism started was the Italian city-states. Revenues from the Mediterranean trade were influential in the birth of the Renaissance movement. With references to the pre-Christian era, works of art related to ancient Roman and Greek civilizations were revealed. This indicates a radical change not only in art but also in the world of the mind. The feudal production and dogmatic mentality of the Middle Ages gave way to the rationality of ancient Greece and the institutional system of Rome. This situation prepared the necessary ground for people to get rid of church bonds and spread the idea of individuality. Of course, to do this, humanists had to resort to two sources: the opinions of putting ancient Greek and Roman texts into circulation and relying on the people. However, the bourgeois class became more potent due to the spread of capitalist economic relations. Eventually, with the realization of the revolution in France, they revealed bourgeois humanism. However, after this understanding started to fulfil the interests of its class, it became conservative and started to take a hostile front against the masses. In the 20th century, the idea of humanism differentiated and took a stance against bourgeois humanism. It is seen that humanism has evolved into an understanding that aims at the material and cultural liberation of the nations that are under the domination and

invasion of the imperialist states. A new version of humanism advocates economic equality instead of unequal capitalist economic relations and supports the freedom of everyone regardless of religion, language or race. It can be stated that these views, expressed by Boran, define humanism in the context of the progress of humanity and the transformations brought about by the approach based on the superiority of reason in political, social and economic structures.

3.2. The Movement of Humanism in Turkey

The reflection of humanism in Turkish political life can be seen to occur within the phenomena of Westernism and Westernization. According to Bora (2017: 97), humanism is defined as "the fundamentalist branch of Westernization". The period in which the humanist movement gained momentum is the Ottoman-Turkish modernization process that started in the 19th century. Especially in this process, Western and Classical Greek works began to be translated as an outcome of contact with the West. Although Ahmet Mithat Efendi was the first person to address humanism philosophically, Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil, Yahya Kemal and Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu became the representatives of this movement. Especially Yahya Kemal and Yakup Kadri put forward the Anatolian and populist Nev-Greek movement, which was shaped based on the Mediterranean consciousness. This idea aimed to show an Anatolian-centered civilization unity between Greeks and Turks. With the Nev-Greek approach, it is desired to imitate the progress of European civilization through Greek and Latin works. This approach did not find many supporters anyway. Yahya Kemal gave up these thoughts completely, but Yakup Kadri occasionally expressed this thought after the proclamation of the Republic (Durgun, 2015: 6-8). Türkdoğan (1999: 137), on the other hand, states that the first representative of the Hellenistic approach was Mustafa Rahmi, the deputy of Thessaloniki in 1909, and Rahmi's suggestion that classical Greek literature should be included in the Turkish curriculum. However, the most important representative of humanist thought during the Ottoman Empire was Tevfik Fikret. Baştınar (1943: 261) describes Fikret's humanism as follows: "Fikret's humanism is a fierce enemy of backwardness, tyranny, religious bigotry, an ardent supporter of culture and progress, combining the love of the nation with the love of humanity in his heart. It is because he considers himself sacred and keeps this spirit alive in all his poems". Fikret is an important person in terms of being the poet and thinker who influenced the Turkish intellectual the most.

The idea of humanism also showed itself in the proclamation of the Republic and the official policies of the modern Turkish state. The understanding of radical Westernization and the revolutions that took place can be considered within this thought. Two areas stood out in the relationship between Kemalism and humanism: Education and history. According to Karacasu (2019: 337), although there are differences from time to time in these two areas, Kemalism states that it carries out its relationship with humanism pragmatically. Especially the thirties were the period when these two policies were implemented and nation-building took place. Turkish History Thesis and Sun Language Theory should be emphasized in this respect. These policies, which are the two primary instruments of secular nation-building, actually tried to be realized not through the ancient Greek-Latin universe of humanism but the classical universe belonging to the Turks. Here, it is seen that Kemalism developed a Turk-centered approach

that would include the ancient Turkish world of thought by using the same method instead of turning to the ancient Greek-Latin heritage like the Western civilization. Emphasizing that Turks are the founding subject of all civilizations with the Turkish History Thesis, the connections between Anatolian civilizations and Greek civilization - Mycenaean and Minoan cultures - have eliminated the conflict between humanism and nationalism thoughts. A Turk-centered understanding of Central Asian origin and anthropological Turkishness has been the main policy of the Atatürk period. After the death of Atatürk, the state continued to work on humanism, but a vital mentality transformation took place. The Turk-centered understanding of the Atatürk period left its home only to the knowledge of Westernization based on the ancient Greek-Latin universe (Durgun, 2015: 10-13). According to some authors, this process, called cultural humanism, caused the change in the official ideology in Turkey. According to Türkdoğan (1999: 65, 136-139), Kemalist ideology, which centred on national history and Turkishness based on national culture, was cut from its national roots and transformed with Greco-Latin sources through the humanism movement in culture. In particular, the cadres who held power in the party put aside the history and language policies initiated during the Atatürk period and turned to Greek-Latin sources instead. The emphasis on the Hittites, Lycians, Phrygians, Aegean and Mediterranean civilizations and the continuity of their cultural heritage has been prioritized in the change process. In fact, like the Kemalist history thesis, the Islamic period is not included in this approach, there is a continuity between Kemalism and cultural humanism in this regard, but the shift of the centre from Turkishness to Greek-Latin and Anatolian civilizations represents a substantial break.

The paradigm transformed after Atatürk made itself felt more through the change in state institutions and bureaucracy. Hasan Ali Yücel established its relationship with cultural humanism. The foundation of this is based on Yücel journal, which dates back to 1935. At first, the Yücelists advocated a national understanding of humanism. Still, after a short while, it was thought that development would be achieved with Western-style humanism by abandoning the idea of neo-humanism in the axis of the Turkish History Thesis. With Hasan Ali Yücel to the Ministry of National Education, cultural humanism studies gained momentum. In 1936, the Department of Greek-Latin Language and Literature was opened at the Faculty of Language, History and Geography of Ankara University. During Yücel's ministry, this education was reduced to the high school level, and classical Greek and Latin languages began to be taught in three high schools in Istanbul. However, Yücel's most outstanding achievement was the translation of classical works into Turkish with the establishment of the Translation Office. Of course, not only ancient Greek-Roman classics but also Eastern classics, French and German works were published here, but within the scope of translation activities carried out between 1940-46, only 5% of 467 works were Eastern works. Most ancient Greek works were translated into Turkish (Durgun, 2015: 14-16). This translation activity introduced Turkish society to classical Greek and Western works and helped cultural humanists to fulfil their goals.

In addition to bringing the Translation Bureau and Hasan Ali Yücel to the ministry, Village Institutes also play an essential role in the education pillar of the Kemalism-Humanism relationship. Village Institutes were established

in 1940 and progressed in the direction determined by Hasan Ali Yücel and İsmail Hakkı Tonguç until 1946. However, it is known that those who were against the Village Institutes until 1954, when they were officially abolished after 1946, were effective in the administration and were closed for various reasons (Karaömerlioğlu, 2019: 286). According to Türkdoğan (1999: 66-67), the national education policy, which continued from 1923 to 1938, was based on a completely different axis, and a universalist approach was adopted with the motto of "one civilization and one culture". Especially here, Village Institutes played an important role, and village and town youth were detached from the sources of Turkish national culture and directed to Greek-Latin sources. There is also the effect of abandoning the Turkish History Thesis here.

The places where the cultural humanist approach took root the most were the journals. As mentioned before, Yücel journal was the beginning of this. *İnsan*, *Adımlar*, *Yurt* and *Dünya* and *Yeni Ufuklar*, the continuation of Yücel, became the channels where representatives of the humanism movement met. *İnsan* journal, founded by Hilmi Ziya Ülken, Nurullah Ataç, Sabahattin Eyüboğlu and Muzaffer Şerif, thought that genuine nationalism could be reached by giving priority to humanism in the relationship between nationality and humanism (Bora, 2017: 99). Nurullah Ataç (1943: 120) insisted on returning to ancient Greek-Latin sources. The reason for this is that the most significant poets, philosophers and works of today's languages have a past of at most five hundred years. In contrast, humanism should not deal with the actuality and save us from the mental world and baggage of existing languages. Socialism, regarded as the ideological other of the Republic during World War II, began to represent itself in the movement of humanism. *Yurt* and *Dünya* journal were of great importance, even though they included articles against the journals *Adımlar* and *İnsan*. *Adımlar* journal claimed that the ideas of national culture and humanism did not contradict each other and saw the source of Turkish humanism in public regarding Yakup Kadri (Bora, 2017: 99-100). The issue that writers and academics such as Behice Boran, Ziya Onkut, Orhan Burian, Nurullah Ataç, O. Lacombe and G. Rohde, who wrote various articles about humanism in the journal *Adımlar*, especially emphasize, is that today's humanism has anti-imperialist, populist and egalitarian. These ideas stand against and criticize bourgeois humanism.

There is an intricate relationship between humanism and socialism. The representatives of the humanism movement position themselves within Kemalism, but they also stay close to socialism—however, the threat from the Soviets during and after World War II reintroduced the idea that communism posed an ontological threat. Here, the extreme westernization tendency of humanism opened the door to socialism was a problem. The purge of leftist academics from the FLHG of Ankara University in 1948 weakened the current of humanism. Niyazi Berkes, one of those who were purged, stated that Westernist intellectuals were as guilty of these purges as they were, as they remained silent. According to Bora (2017: 100), it was claimed that leftism was masked by humanism due to his opposition to communism. However, the leftist intellectuals of the period did not use humanism as an instrumental. On the contrary, they saw socialism as a higher level of humanism. As a matter of fact, from the forties to the seventies, the humanism movement "was an intellectual medium where a critical thinking breathed, trying to democratize and 'soften' both Kemalism and socialism, while also examining the possibilities of reconciling these two" (Bora, 2017:

100-101). The idea that humanism provides the resonance between Kemalism and Socialism should be underlined by the effect of both the official ideology and the transformation of socialism. In this context, it is necessary to mention the Yeni Ufuklar journal, which is the continuation of the Yücel journal. The journal, published by Orhan Burian and featuring Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Halikarnas Balıkcısı and Vedat Günyol, became a place where the views expressing evolutionist socialism based on Western Marxism in the sixties were embodied. In addition, in a period when anti-communism was very high in the fifties, it formed the left reflection of social criticism based on literature (Bora, 2017: 101-102).

It is considered necessary to attribute particular importance to two writers in the journal Yeni Ufuklar in the context of the relationship between humanism-Kemalism-socialism. The first of these is Vedat Günyol. Günyol is counted among the most important representatives of humanism of the period, who took part in the translation bureau and the Blue Anatolia Movement, as well as the journal Yeni Ufuklar. The idea of humanism lies at the heart of his inferences about national identity and origin. For Turkey to fully reach the level of civilization within the framework of the target set by Atatürk, it must adopt the principles of humanism. While the West has realized humanist thought by fighting bigotry, Islamic societies are far from this. Therefore, it is necessary to return to the period before dogmatism, that is, to the ancient Greek-Latin works, as the West did. In Turkey, real westernization started with Atatürk's revolutions, but bigotry and reactionism rose in the post-Atatürk period, and revolutions were reversed. Reactionaries were attacking the Republic like Said-i Nursi. The biggest reason for this has been the governments that concessions from their secularism policies. The policies of the Democrat Party reversed Atatürk's revolutions, the reactionaries got more substantial, and Turkey took its place on the side of the imperialist countries. For this to change, it is necessary to return to Atatürk's revolutions, especially to the principles of statism and secularism. In addition, humanistic culture and education covering all civilizations in Anatolia, the Islamic past and the values brought by the history of even Central Asia is necessary for Turkey. Ultimately, according to Günyol, the idea of humanism is a worldview made necessary by social conditions. However, this understanding of humanism, unlike the imperial approaches of the Western world, proposes to be defined and applied based on socialism (Aktaş, 2020: 156-181). Another name that should be mentioned in this regard is Sabahattin Eyüboğlu. Eyüboğlu sees humanism as a tool to democratize Kemalism by redefining it. Based on the people and a populist attitude in the field of art and culture, its emphasis on the purity and cleanliness of the people has been an essential factor in the CHP's settlement in the "Left of the Center" and gaining a social democratic identity (Bora, 2017: 102-103). The authors of the Yeni Ufuklar journal should be positioned separately as they are the representatives of the Blue Anatolian Movement, the eclectic complement of the official ideology in the forties and fifties. This is because they are the only group openly dealing with identity, history and geography within the cultural humanism movement. In this respect, it is necessary to examine the fundamental views of the Blue Anatolian Movement and the conceptions of history, geography and identity of Halikarnas Balıkcısı and Sabahattin Eyüboğlu. This is because they are the only group openly dealing with identity, history and geography within the cultural humanism movement. In this respect, it is necessary to examine the fundamental views of the Blue Anatolian Movement and the conceptions of history, geography and identity of Halikarnas Balıkcısı and Sabahattin Eyüboğlu.

3.3. Between Cultural Humanism and Kemalism: Blue Anatolian Movement

The Blue Anatolian Movement is represented by a small group of intellectuals born within the enlightenment movement of the cultural Kemalism period, generally belonging to the leftist movements, and gathered in the humanist movements and magazines. They are considered a group influenced by German pastoral nationalism based on Anatolian romanticism, mainly thanks to their familiarity with Greek and Latin languages, their philosophy and philology education, and their robust pens in the field of art and literature. They have established a distant relationship with politics, and this is due to their left-Marxist past or their accusation in this way (Şenol, 2009: 108-109). Nevertheless, although Blue Anatolianism could not be socialized in an ideological context, its relations with Kemalism and its substantial contributions to the construction of history and culture were more than expected. The connections he established with Kemalism were realized not only in the academic field but also at the institutional level. This link is Hasan Ali Yücel, the Minister of National Education, and Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, a member of the Board of Education and Discipline. In particular, their activities in the Translation Office, their interest in ancient Greek-Latin works and their inclusion in the education system seem to be effective in the relationship between humanism and Kemalism. But cooperation and contribution in the academic field are more important. Essentially, the historiography of the Blue Anatolianists and the Kemalists is similar, with the only difference being that the idea of Anatolia has replaced the concept of Turk in Kemalism. Therefore, Blue Anatolianism, like Kemalism, is a kind of nationalism aimed at the goals of enlightenment, progress and Westernization. However, this nationalism is different from the ethnic nationalism created by Kemalism. It is more of a culturally based nationalism. Anatolian geography is the basis of this nationalism. Blue Anatolians have no problems concerning Turkish identity, and groups Turkified by the official understanding of history make their job easier. In addition, the policy initiated by Kemalism within the framework of secular Turkishness free from the Ottoman-Islamic past provided the necessary ground for the Blue Anatolianists, and they formed their thoughts on this ground (Karacasu, 2019: 334-337).

Nationalism, the main idea of Kemalism, and the bond they form with it can lead to a false impression that the primary motivation source of Blue Anatolianists is nationalism. For them, if nationalism is necessary, it is a choice in choosing the best among the bad. Blue Anatolianism can be seen as a citizen-centred territorial nationalism conception based on Anatolian geography (Şenol, 2009: 119). Nevertheless, Blue Anatolianists have a certain current of thought, like humanism. However, the pragmatics of Kemalism caused him to maintain his relationship with Mavi Anadolu until the fifties. Since this period, the hardening of the conservative and nationalist veins of Kemalism caused the weakening of its relationship with Blue Anatolianism, which includes humanist and leftist ideas. However, both movements' anti-clerical, that is, nationalist attitude towards religion, constituted the continuity in the academic field (Karacasu, 2019: 342-343).

The Blue Anatolian Movement expressed its opinions at the time when the pains of the transition from a semi-agricultural society to a semi-industrial society emerged in the fifties when Turkey experienced significant political, social and economic transformation. They could have written articles on the development issue based on the

Marxist school they came from. Still, to avoid conflict with the official authorities, they formed a "cultural-religious community", in Şenol's words. The ritual of this community was boat trips on the Aegean and Mediterranean coasts - the Blue cruise-its temple was Bodrum, and the Wailing Wall was the ruins of ancient civilizations in Anatolia (Şenol, 2009: 110-111). To understand the basic information about the Blue Anatolian Movement, it is necessary to briefly evaluate the views of the members of this movement on history, civilization, identity and geography. This movement has no institutionalized structure or political organization. They have a small intelligentsia and the intellectual group around them of different views¹. However, when Blue Anatolianism is mentioned, the first thing that comes to mind is the Halikarnas Balıkcısı, Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Azra Erhat and Vedat Günyol. Here, the views of Halikarnas Balıkcısı and Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, who have their ideas on the conception of history, will be given.

Cevat Şakir Kabaağaçlı, known as "Halikarnas Balıkcısı", was born in Crete as a member of a family belonging to the Ottoman political aristocracy. His taking the name of Halikarnas Balıkcısı begins with his influence from Bodrum, where he was exiled in 1925, and using the ancient name of the region. Halikarnas Balıkcısı stands out as the person who presented original ideas about history and gave its name to the movement within the Blue Anatolian Movement. First of all, Balıkcı's views are based on the Anatolian civilization and the necessity of adopting the knowledge of this civilization. In this respect, the West sees Anatolia as the mainstay of all civilizations. Because according to him, the qualities of today's Western civilization are colonialism, Christianity, science and reason. The source of this mind is known as the ancient Greek civilization. However, the reality is that the civilization known as the Greek civilization belongs to Anatolia in every respect. The founders of the Mycenaean and Minoan -Crete- civilizations on which the first alphabet, the first Olympic games, craft and technique, and even the Greek civilization were based are of Anatolian origin. Not only the Greek civilization but also the founders of the civilizations in Mesopotamia are of Anatolian origin. The history of humanity begins in Anatolia with him. The critical point in Anatolia was the Aegean and Mediterranean coasts. In this context, the name the Mediterranean is the sixth continent on earth. The cradle of civilization in the Mediterranean is the Eastern Mediterranean, the Anatolian coasts. However, according to his understanding of history, the first human appeared in Central Asia. He had to migrate to Central Asia for various reasons and came to the West and settled in Anatolia, where he provided the establishment of civilizations. These civilizations can be listed as Sumerians, Hittites, Greeks and all Mediterranean civilizations. Balıkcı includes the element of hybridization in the formation of civilizations. According to him, no civilization can belong to a single nation. The civilizations in Anatolia are the common property of all communities in this geography. In this respect, Herodotus is our compatriot. Migration and hybridization are two very effective factors in the formation of civilizations. The people who came from Central Asia and mingled with the people they met on the way and in Anatolia built this civilization. For this reason, present Turkey presents an ethnic and cultural unity. Turks have established peace and tranquillity in Anatolia for 900

¹ Mehmet Şenol, in his work cited in the present study, states that Blue Anatolianism has a wide audience based on Atilla İlhan and his assessment. The mentioned names draw attention with their political attitudes and attitudes as well as giving direction to Turkish literary, artistic and cultural life. It seems sufficient to name a few here: Fakir Baykurt, Edip Cansever, Necati Cumalı, Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca, Nurullah Ataç, Orhan Burian, Orhan Veli, Bedri Rahmi, Özdemir İnce, Ceyhan Atif Kansu and İlhan Selçuk. For detailed information, see: Şenol, 2009: 112-113.

years. However, in the words of the Fisherman, Turks and Turkish people were not formed by a single race. For Turkey to modernize and progress, it must be based on the geography it has and the history of this geography. Turkey, with its struggle against the imperialist and capitalist West, has the third world leader, namely Atatürk, who is the source of inspiration, and the Anatolian geography, which is the primary source of Western civilization (Balıkçısı, 2017: 11-41).

Looking at Balıkçı's ideas, a helpful idea can be obtained in the context of the relationship between Kemalism, humanism and Mavi Anatolianism. First of all, Balıkçı's conception of civilization is based entirely on Anatolia. He advocates a territorial identity approach. This feature of it coincides with Kemalism. In addition, the reference to the migration from Central Asia indicates the common denominator between the Fisherman of Halicarnassus and Kemalism in terms of its similarity with the Turkish History Thesis. However, Balıkçı's emphasis on hybridity does not match with Kemalism, which has an ethnocentric approach. Kemalism proposed an anthropological Turkishness, while Balıkçı developed a cultural and territorial vision. Besides that, Balıkçı does not refer to Greek civilization like cultural humanists. According to Balıkçı, Greek civilization is also an extension of Anatolian civilization. Thus, Balıkçı Anatolianizes all the communities and civilizations Turkified by the History Thesis. Bora (2017: 90) states that the "history thesis" of the Halikarnas Balıkçısı is a kind of variation of the official history thesis; the weight centre has shifted from Central Asia to Anatolia.

Another writer that should be examined within the scope of the Blue Anatolian Movement is Sabahattin Eyüboğlu. As mentioned before, he was one of the two important names that came to the fore in the context of the relationship between humanism and Kemalism. The duties undertaken by Eyüboğlu and some of the events he experienced are interesting in terms of the current study. He worked as a member of the Board of Education and in the Translation Office. He was dismissed from the academy during the DP administration, and later on 27 May, he returned to his duty at the university. After 12 March, with Azra Erhat and Vedat Günyol, other vital representatives of Blue Anatolianism, he was tried and acquitted of founding a secret communist organization. As Aktaş (2020: 196-197) states, the influence of his German teacher Erich Auerbach on Eyüboğlu's ideas is enormous. Auerbach criticizes the politics of the thirties as a "fanatic nationalism". In this respect, Eyüboğlu constructed his ideas in the form of cultural nationalism. According to him, the new state was established not based on race and religion but the basis of homeland and language unity. It does not differ much from the official history thesis in some points; instead, its difference is seen in its unique interpretation of official history. According to him, when Atatürk said that all civilizations are Turkish, he did this not with a racist approach but to adopt the history of humanity and modernize it. Historical and cultural policies, seen as the progress effort of a society that has not been able to develop and break its shell for so long, have been used to construct cultural integrity, not a racial one. In this respect, covering up the Ottoman past is a correct approach. Ultimately, the whole point was to reveal the dominant character of Anatolian geography in the history of civilizations. According to him, it is a big mistake to see ourselves as guests in Anatolia, where we came with four hundred horse riders. Hittites, Phrygians, Greeks, Persians, Romans, Byzantines and Mongols ruled in Anatolian lands, but none of them could own these lands; on the contrary,

Anatolia incorporated these societies. Finally, Anatolia became the property of the Turks. Because the Turks conquered and were conquered, they both melted. Like every cultural humanist, Eyüboğlu winks at the ancient Greek civilization, and the basis of this approach is to see ancient Greece as an extension of the Anatolian civilization (Eyüboğlu, 2018: 7-11, 195-198).

It is striking that there is a parallelism between Eyüboğlu's Anatolian-centered conception of history and Balıkcı's ideas. Both authors suggested that ancient Greece, which they saw as the origins of Western civilization, was an extension of Anatolian civilization, so an Anatolian-centered understanding of history and identity should be developed for progress. Similar to Balıkcı's views, the notion of race and the advocacy of a territorial approach against ethnocentrism occupy an essential place in Eyüboğlu's thoughts. These views occupy a central position among the Blue Anatolianists. The other thinker of this movement, Azra Erhat, also repeats Balıkcı's thoughts. She establishes connections between the Trojan War, the Dardanelles War, Hector and Atatürk (Aktaş, 2020: 199). After all, she proposes to replace Atatürk's famous aphorism "How happy is the one who says I am a Turk" with "How happy is the one who says I am an Anatolian" (Bora, 2017: 90). Thus, an evolution extending from Turkishness to Anatolianness settled in the world of thought of the official ideology in the post-Atatürk period.

4. CONCLUSION

Kemalism is regarded as the name of Turkish modernization and nationalism as well as the founding ideology of the Turkish Republic. Mustafa Kemal, who set out with the discourse of complete independence during the National Struggle, fulfilled his purpose and became the founder of the modern state and nation. Kemalism, known as the effort to modernize the state and society in the direction determined by Atatürk, experienced essential transformations in the later period. Kemalist principles, which were accepted as the governing principle of the state during Atatürk's lifetime, were interpreted in different ways after Atatürk. Kemalism's most significant achievement was to build a nation. Especially after overcoming the wounds of war and the pains of the establishment, efforts to create identity and ideology were seen in the thirties, and Turkish History Thesis and Sun Language Theory were introduced in this way. Emphasizing the racial characteristics of Turkish identity with an anthropological and archaeological historiography method, these approaches consist of placing the Turkish element in the centre of the Western-secular Turkish identity that Atatürk wanted to build. In other words, the dominant method of the early republican period was ethnocentrism, and a western ethno-secular Turkish identity was sought to be developed. This constitutes the essence of Kemalism, and it is considered a world view that tries to provide modernization with a Turk-centered approach and nationalism. Mustafa Kemal, the state's founder, took the surname Atatürk as the "father of the Turks" and used the figure of the grey wolf. Many famous aphorisms he said about Turkishness indicates Atatürk's nationalism. Atatürk's Turkism -a different interpretation and outside of the Turkism that has been transformed since the sixties - and the fact that Kemalism is the name of Turkish nationalism -similarly, a nationalism other than the current Turkish nationalism and Kemalism interpretations is meant to be explained- shows its place in the ideological plane. Positioning communism and Islamism as the ontological other, Kemalism is thus seen as Turkish nationalism. Therefore, it is impossible to say that Kemalism belongs to the left.

However, left Kemalism is a fact. The issue focused on in this study is to discuss the mental transformation that led to the birth of the leftist interpretation of Kemalism. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the cultural humanism movement.

After Atatürk's death, Kemalism began to transform. The Cultural Humanism movement constituted a crucial break in this transformation. This movement, which started in the 15th century in Europe, is a concept that defends individualism, reason and the pre-religious community and describes the process of change in the fields of art, literature and philosophy. In Turkish history, it appeared as Westernization movement. The strengthening of this movement corresponded to the post-Atatürk period. Translation activities that started during Hasan Ali Yücel's Ministry of National Education and later the establishment of Village Institutes are seen as the pillars of cultural humanism. According to cultural humanists, modernization was not possible with Turkish nationalism. Therefore, the method followed by Western societies was suggested instead of Turkish nationalism. This method goes back to the ancient Greek-Roman sources that provided the birth of rationality in Western societies.

Humanists in Turkey also have the necessary resources for this: Anatolia. In this way, the Blue Anatolian Movement emerged from the cultural humanism movement. Blue Anatolianism, an Anatolian-centered understanding of history and identity, replaced Turkishness and Anatolia, even though it repeated the official discourses of Kemalism in some respects. In other words, it provided the transition from an ethnocentric approach to a territorial understanding. Thus, the Turkish nationalism of the official ideology was replaced by a nationalism based on patriotism through this movement. However, there is another issue that needs to be mentioned here. That is, intellectuals in cultural humanism movement adopted the Marxist-left tradition. The pressure of Kemalism on the left and the fact that Turkey took its place in the Western bloc with the threat of the Soviets after World War II caused the leftist intellectuals of the period to find themselves in cultural humanism. Indeed, the cultural humanism movement was represented in a few journals with a small group of intellectuals. Here, in his writings on humanism, the subjects of imperialism and anti-capitalism were discussed. Thus, as seen in left Kemalism, magazines and the topics covered effectively brought these intellectuals together

As a result, the cultural humanism movement functioned as the transformative device of Kemalism. The left interpretation of Kemalism emerged at the end of this transformation. Based on Hegel's dialectic, the thesis was Kemalism, the antithesis was cultural humanism, and the synthesis was left Kemalism based on the thesis-antithesis-synthesis trilogy. Thus, left Kemalism, the unofficial interpretation of Kemalism, which is the official ideology, can be said to be the product of this mental transformation. Naturally, it is wrong to connect left Kemalism only to this mental transformation. Many factors can be counted here - the DP administration, the strengthening of the anti-colonial movements, the weakening of the US hegemony, the strengthening of the left in Turkey, etc. - but this transformation in the theoretical context is remarkable in terms of forming the mental codes of left Kemalism.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, F. (2019), *İttihatçılıktan Kemalizme*, Çev. Fatmagül Berktaş Baltalı, 4. Baskı, İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.
- Akşin, S. (2019), *Kısa Türkiye Tarihi*, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- AKTAŞ, Hacire (2020), Türk Edebiyatında Mavi Anadolu Hümanizmi, *Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Van.
- Ataç, N. (Ağustos 1943), Adımların Hümanizma Anketi, *Adımlar*, 1(4), 120-121.
- Alpkaya, F. (2019), Bir 20. Yüzyıl Akımı: ‘Sol Kemalizm’, (Derleyen: Ahmet İnsel), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm İçinde* (s. 477-500), Cilt 2, 9. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Aydın, S. (2019), Cumhuriyetin İdeolojik Şekillenmesinde Antropolojinin Rolü: Irkçı Paradigmanın Yükselişi ve Düşüşü, (Derleyen: Ahmet İnsel), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm İçinde* (s. 344-370). Cilt 2, 9. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Balıkçısı, H. (2017), *Anadolu’nun Sesi*, 8. Baskı, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Baştuğmar, Z. (Aralık 1943), Büyük Türk Hümanisti Tevfik Fikret, *Adımlar*, 1(8), 260-262.
- Bayar, C. (1978), *Atatürk’ün Metodolojisi ve Günümüz*, İstanbul: Kervan Yayınları.
- Belge, M. (2019), Mustafa Kemal ve Kemalizm, (Derleyen: Ahmet İnsel), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm İçinde* (s. 29-44), Cilt 2, 9. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Berkes, N. (1965), *200 Yıldır Neden Bocalıyoruz*, İstanbul: Yön Yayıncılık.
- Berkes, N. (2007), *Batıcılık, Ulusçuluk ve Toplumsal Devrimler*, İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.
- Bora, T. (2017), *Cereyanlar: Türkiye’de Siyasi İdeolojiler*, 5. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınevi.
- Bora, T. ve Taşkın, Y. (2019), Sağ Kemalizm, (Derleyen: Ahmet İnsel), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm İçinde* (s. 529-555). Cilt 2, 9. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Boran, B. Ş. (Aralık 1943), Hümanizmanın Sosyal Şartları, *Adımlar*, 1(8), 255-259.
- Burian, O. (Temmuz 1943), Adımların Hümanizma Anketi, *Adımlar*, 1(3), 88-89.
- Çağaptay, S. (2009), Otuzlarda Türk Milliyetçiliğinde Irk, Dil ve Etnisite, (Derleyenler: Tanıl Bora ve Murat Gültekinil), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik İçinde* (s. 245-274), Cilt 4, 4. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi Programı (1935), Ankara: Ulus Basımevi.
- Çelik, N. B. (2019), Kemalizm: Hegemonik Bir Söylem, (Derleyen: Ahmet İnsel), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm İçinde* (s. 75-92), Cilt 2, 9. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

- Demirel, A. (2019), İsmet İnönü, (Derleyen: Ahmet İnsel), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm İçinde* (s. 124-133), Cilt 2, 9. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Devrim (21 Ekim 1969), *Devrim Bildirisi*, 1, 12-13.
- Durgun, Ş. (2015), Türkmerkezli Yaklaşımdan Avrupa Merkezli Yaklaşımına Geçişte Hümanizma. *Akademik Hassasiyetler*, 2(4), 1-25.
- Durgun, Ş. ve Yücel, G. (2019), Türk Milliyetçiliği: Tanım, Teori ve Süreç. (Derleyen: Ömer Baykal). *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Siyasi Düşünce İçinde* (s. 181-209), Ankara: A Kitap.
- Eyüboğlu, S. (2018), *Mavi ve Kara*, 9. Baskı, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Galip, R. (1932), Türk Irkı ve Medeniyet Tarihine Umumi Bir Bakış, *Birinci Türk Tarih Konferans Müzakere Zabıtları İçinde* (s. 99-162), 2. Baskı, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- İnan, A. (1932), Tarihten Evvel ve Tarih Fecrinde, *Birinci Türk Tarih Konferans Müzakere Zabıtları İçinde* (s. 18-41), 2. Baskı, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- İnsel, A. (2019), Giriş, (Derleyen: Ahmet İnsel). *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm İçinde* (s. 17-27), Cilt 2, 9. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Karacasu, B. (2019), “Mavi Kemalizm” Türk Hümanizmi ve Anadoluçuluk, (Derleyen: Ahmet İnsel), *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm İçinde* (s. 334-344), Cilt 2, 9. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Karaömerlioğlu, M. A. (2019), Köy Enstitüleri, (Derleyen: Ahmet İnsel). *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm İçinde* (s. 286-293), Cilt 2, 9. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kazancıgil, A. (2019), Anti-emperyalist Bağımsızlık İdeolojisi ve Üçüncü Dünya Ulusçuluğu Olarak Kemalizm, (Derleyen: Ahmet İnsel). *Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm İçinde* (s. 235-247), Cilt 2, 9. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kışlalı, A. T. (1994), *Kemalizm, Laiklik ve Demokrasi*, İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi.
- Lacombe, O. (Temmuz 1943), Adımların Hümanizma Anketi, *Adımlar*, 1(3), 84-87.
- Özkandaş, Y. (2019), *Bir Dönemin En Başat Çizgisi: Kemalizm*, Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Parla, T. (1993), *Ziya Gökalp, Kemalizm ve Türkiye’de Korporatizm*, 2. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınevi.
- Perinçek, D. (2020), *Kemalist Devrim-5 Kemalizmin Felsefesi ve Kaynakları*, 4. Baskı, İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.
- Rohde, G. (Ağustos 1943), Adımların Hümanizma Anketi, Mevrure Osman Tosun (çev), *Adımlar*, 1(4), ss. 121-123.
- Selçuk, İ. (3 Ocak 1962), Bizim Milliyetçiliğimiz, *Yön*, 1(3), 6.
- Selçuk, İ. (29 Ocak 1965), Milliyetçiliğin Temelleri, *Yön*, 4(96), 3.

- Şenol, M. (2009), Medeniyet Tartışmalarında Mavi Anadoluçuluk Akımının Yeri: Mavi Gezi Teknelerinden Anadolu'ya Bakmak, *Muhafazakâr Düşünce*, 6(21-22), 105-124.
- Tunaya, T. Z. (2002), *Devrim Hareketleri İçinde Atatürk ve Atatürkçülük*, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Turan, Ş. (2003), *İsmet İnönü'nün, Yaşamı, Dönemi ve Kişiliği*, 2. Baskı, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Türkdoğan, O. (1999), *Milli Kimliğin Yükselişi: Niçin Milletleşme*, 2. Baskı, İstanbul: Alfa Basımevi.
- Ünder, H. (2019), Atatürk İmgesinin Siyasal Yaşamdaki Rolü, (Derleyen: Ahmet İnel), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm İçinde* (138-156), Cilt 2, 9. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Yücel, G. (2020), *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Terkibinde Mekân*, Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.