

THE PRINCIPLES OF KEMALISM*

Turkish and Foreign Intellectual Impact on Mustafa Kemâl, Works by Atatürk, the Six Principles and the *Kadro's* Attempt to Systematize the Kemalst Revolution.

Prof. Dr. Türkkaya ATAÖV

Mustafa Kemâl Atatürk (1881 - 1938) is not generally-known as a "builder" of theories. It was his deliberate choice not to leave behind an "inflexible doctrine". He wanted his teachings to be dynamic views suiting the need to become contemporary in every way. Ideologies, no doubt, play a role in all régimes. Many states even seek to solve their problems with the impact of a particular doctrine. It is only natural that a movement like the Kemalst Revolution should have its own set of values.

This paper aims, first, to summarize Turkish and foreign intellectual impact on Mustafa Kemâl, to be followed by a short bibliographical display of his own writings, with a consequent definition of the Six Principles (*Altı Ok*) that he authored, with a further discussion of attempts, principally by a group of thinkers and writers around the monthly *Kadro* (The Cadre) to systematize Kemalst principles. It may not be wrong to say that the paper will mainly dwell on the *Kadro* Movement, the rest serving as prelude.

I

Atatürk had died a comparatively young man. He was less than thirty-five when the whole world first heard his

* A shortened version of this paper was read by the author as a basis for discussions during the "Atatürk and Nehru Week" in New De!hi India (1981).

singular achievements, and he was not yet forty when he started to play his historic role of emancipating the people he belonged to. Even in this young age, he seemed eqmipped with the intellectual accumulation that his time required.

Mustafa Kemâl certainly studied and weighed Turkish political thinking, which was a reflection of historic events. It is true that history generally develops as a consequence of actions and reactions of successive stages. This prevailing rule should also be applying to Turkey as well. But Turkish history of the Nineteenth and the early Twentieth Centuries has witnessed a remarkable rapidity; events advanced by leaps and bounds. Successive efforts to reform the political system could be observed in the first half of the last century. Sultan Mahmud the Reformer (1808-1839), who succeeded Selim the Martyr (1761-1808), was inclined towards regeneration. Besides annihilating the irregular troops of the Janissaries, he helped to bring about the *Hattı Şerif* of Gülhane (1839), which was a proclamation of reform. Nevertheless, the latter did not deal with the root causes of the increasing political and economic dependence of the Ottoman Empire on the great powers. A group of educated men, influenced by contemporary ideas, succeeded, after overthrowing Sultan Abdulaziz, in obtaining a grant of a new Constitution in 1876. Sultan Abdulhamid the Second, who under the presure of the prevailing conditions, had granted a new Constitution, withdrew it, sending Mithat Paşa (1825-1884), one of its architects, to exile and lowering upon Turkey a dark cloud of reaction. He suppressed independent thinking with every means available, including a system of espionage hitherto unknown. Banishments and secret executions were the order of his day. This suppression could not, however, prevent, in the 1890's, the emergence in Salonica, the birthplace of Mustafa Kemal, of the Committee of Union and Progress. It is well-known that in 1908 an open rebellion broke against the tyranny of Abdulhamid, who granted the desired Constitution, only to repeal it less than a year later. But the Macedonian troops, with which marched Mustafa

Kemâl, appeared before Istanbul and defeated the Sultan's garrison. But the new government's task was not less problematical. During the rule of the Committee of Union and Progress, which lasted less than a decade, Bosnia and Herzegovina were annexed by Austria-Hungary, Bulgarian independence led to further wars in the Balkans and Italy embarked on Libyan shores. The Turanian ideal, dreaming of a union of all Turks of Asia and Pan-Islamism, claiming the unity of all Mohammedans, were the thoughts of this period, characterized by threats from without.

It was again during these years that Mustafa Kemâl was entertaining a new conception - the conception of the Turkish ideal, which would survive the storm. Mustafa Kemâl was widely read in Ottoman history and the works of the Turkish intellectuals. No doubt, he analyzed the writers of the Tanzimat period (1839). Şinasi (1826-1871) was the first one who touched upon popular sovereignty. He published in 1859 the first volume of translations from various French poets, and more importantly in the following year, the first national non-official journal in Turkey. In about two years, he was joined by Namık Kemâl (1840-1888), one of the most brilliant writers of Ottoman Turkey, who could with grace, force and precision express many complexities of modern thought. Ziya Paşa (1825-1880) joined forces with Şinasi and Namık Kemal, and in 1867, his quarrel with Ali Paşa, the all-powerful Vezir of Abdülaziz, led to his flight from his native country. Namık Kemâl brought out several papers in İstanbul and London, as the mouthpiece of the "Young Ottoman Society". His revolutionary plays and poetry revealed a passion for liberty and love for his people. Mustafa Kemâl, in later speeches, quoted Namık Kemâl's verse, making optimistic changes in the couplets. The poet tried to build up the concept of popular sovereignty on the basis of accumulation of individual sovereignty over one's own affairs, but he had difficulty in coping with the Islamic interpretation that sovereignty belongs to God. He urged the Caliph, in accordance with Islamic law, to consult with members of his community, a relationship which may also be defined as a

"contract". The need to consult could very well be a justification for constitutional government. Namık Kemâl was trying to reconcile republican ideas with Islamic theocracy. That Islam could not be reformed to embrace contemporary Republican institutions was, nevertheless, the opinion of several Young Turks. Among them, Abullah Cevdet (1869-1932) envisaged a "Westernized" future Turkey, but even he could not suggest the abolition of the Sultanate and the Caliphate. Ziya Gökalp (1875-1924) was perhaps most influential on the intellectuals of Republican Turkey. Mustafa Kemâl and Gökalp had met, for the first time, in 1909 in a congress of the Union and Progress. It is true that Gökalp's theories of social organization, based on Emile Durkheim's concepts of sociology, had a hold upon the train of thought of the Turkish Revolution. However, Kemâl had an important disagreement with Gökalp on the racist concept of Turanism. Mustafa Kemâl was not only the leader, but also the ideologue of the Turkish Revolution.

Mustafa Kemâl had also studied all great movements of history abroad. While a young man in Macedonia, he was introduced to the French classics, especially the works of Rousseau, Voltaire and Montesquieu, through his close friend Fethi Okyar, whom he later encouraged to form an opposition party. While a young cadet in the War Academy, he studied the French Revolution thoroughly. Later, he made frequent references to episodes in this great event of history. According to him, it was the greatest of all revolutions, but it failed in providing the greatest happiness for the French. He studied the movement of independence and republicanism of the American Colonies as well as the development of British democracy. He analyzed Russian History and the Russian Revolution. He was interested in both the successes and the failures of Peter the Great. He said that his principles did not rest on Bolshevism. On the other hand, in numerous statements, he based the rights of man on his labour and produce. He studied, apparently, all great movements, but chose to follow a road that he thought emanated from the particular conditions of his country. Above all, he believed that

Turkey was the first country in the world of colonies and semi-colonies to bring to a successful end an anti-imperialist struggle taking place in the Twentieth Century.

II

Granted that such was Mustafa Kemâl's training and self-education, quite a number of foreign scholars and writers ask their Turkish colleagues as to which works were originally written by him. The Institute of the History of the Turkish Revolution, founded on April 15, 1941, and attached to the Languages and History-Geography Faculty of Ankara University, has shouldered the responsibility of collecting and publishing all what he has authored. Although most of his works have been published by such official establishments, quite a few private publishing houses and several individuals have brought out various volumes of interviews, talks and memoirs. A near-to-complete (Turkish and foreign) bibliography on Atatürk, including his own works, has been collected by Muzaffer Gökman, the former Director of the Bayazıd Library in Istanbul. This is a three-volume compendium of about 3,000 pages, the first volume of which has so far been published. It is printed by the Turkish Ministry of Education under the title of *Bibliography of Atatürk and History of His Revolution (Atatürk ve Devrimleri Tarihi Bibliyografyası)*. The next two volumes are expected to follow. A new, annotated bibliography, in two volumes, was published in 1981 by Türker Acaroğlu, who treats the best five-hundred Turkish and foreign books.

As to the original works by Atatürk, one may classify them as follows: (a) the great *Speech*; (b) talks, statements, declarations, telegrams and announcements; (c) memoirs; (d) treatises (and translations) on military science; (e) reports on the Gallipoli campaigns; (f) private letters; (g) hand-written and dictated notes; (h) unsigned articles. This categorisation reveals a diversified form of writing, which was perhaps inevitable in view of the fact that Atatürk was a superb orator, an able analyst of history, a narrator of important factual details and a formulator of

political testaments. He even has an unsigned book on geometry, and is also believed to have written poetry.

Foremost among his works is probably the six-day *Speech (Nutuk)*, delivered to a captive audience of delegates to the Second National Congress, that took place on October 15-20, 1927. This was a marathon feat of oratory. The length and the character of the *Speech* is unconventional, and its subject is a comprehensive account of one of the most remarkable events in the many centuries of Turkish history. It reveals the activity of the speaker from the time when he felt himself called upon to lead the nation from threatened ruin to freedom and power.

After eight years of uninterrupted battles on three continents, Turkey laid down arms when its ally Germany collapsed. The victorious powers reserved to themselves the right to occupy every strategic point in Turkey while the Turkish troops were still fighting in far away places such as the Hedjas or Tripoli. Allied men-of-war cast anchor before the Empire's capital. The stipulations of the Treaty of Sèvres (1920), which Mustafa Kemâl Paşa analyses in his *Speech*, prove that the powers which pretended to fight for freedom were planning a peace of annihilation for Turkey. They were after outright annexations, mandates, spheres of influence and new vassal states. The Greek troops, which landed at İzmir (Smyrna) on May 15, 1919, to erect Greater Greece, treated the Turks of the city as subjugated people. But Mustafa Kemâl reached the shores of Asia Minor in the north, exactly four days later. He described the circumstances then in the following words, which were also the opening paragraphs of his great *Speech* :

"I landed at Samsun on the 19th of May, 1919. The situation at the time was as follows: The group of powers which included the Ottoman Government had been defeated in the Great War. The Ottoman Army had been crushed on every front. An armistice had been signed under severe conditions. The prolongation of the Great War had left the people exhausted and impoverished. Those who had driven the people and the country into the general conflict had fled and now cared for nothing but their own safety. Vah-

deddin, the degenerate occupant of the throne and the Caliphate, was seeking for some despicable way to save his person and his throne, the only objects of his anxiety. The Cabinet, of which Damad Ferid Pasha was the head, was weak and lacked dignity and courage. It was subservient to the will of the Sultan alone and agreed to every proposal that could protect its members and their sovereign. The Army had been deprived of their arms and ammunition, and this state of affairs continued. The Entente Powers did not consider it necessary to respect the terms of the armistice. On various pretexts, their men-at-war and troops remained in Constantinople. The Vilayet of Adana was occupied by the French; Urfa, Maraş, Antep, by the British. In Antalya and Konya were the Italians, whilst at Merzifon and Samsun were English troops... The Greek Army, with the consent of the Entente Powers, had landed at İzmir..."

The danger from abroad now averted, Mustafa Kemal was moved to show his people how the new Turkey came about and on which foundations it was standing. The *Speech* was a grant account of his political and military performance. Several hundred pages that follow the above-quoted opening paragraphs put emphasis on the early years of the new state. Being the single major source of his leadership, it sets a high standard of factual detail.

The *Speech* ends with the following political testament addressed to the future youth of Turkey, instructing the coming generations on resistance to defeat, occupation and collaboration with the enemy :

"O, Turkish Youth! Your primary duty is forever to preserve and defend Turkish Independence and the Turkish Republic. This is the very foundation of your existence and your future. This foundation is your most precious treasure. In the future, too, there may be ill-will, at home and abroad, wishing to deprive you of this treasure. If, some day, you are compelled to defend your existence and the Republic, you must not tarry to weigh the possibilities and circumstances of the situation before taking up your duty. These possibilities and circumstances may turn out to be extremely unfavourable. The enemies conspiring against your independence and your Republic may have behind them a victory unprecedented in the annals of the world. It may be that, by force and fraud, all the fortresses and the arsenals of your beloved Fatherland may be cap-

tured, all its shipyards occupied, all its armies dispersed and every part of the country invaded. And sadder and graver, those who hold power within the country may be in error, misguided and may even be traitors. Furthermore, they may identify their personal interests with the political designs of the invaders. The country may be impoverished, ruined and exhausted. Youth of Turkey's future, even under such circumstances, it is your duty to save Turkish Independence and the Republic. The strength that you need is mighty in the noble blood that courses in your veins."

The *Speech* ends with these words. It was first published in book form, in 1927, in a two-volume edition printed in the old Arabic script. It appeared in the Latin alphabet in 1934 in three volumes. Immediately after completing this unique tour-de-force, Atatürk proceeded to change drastically the language he so ably used throughout his leadership. The Turkish Language Society has published in 1962 a purified but unabridged version of the same (*Söylev*) for the younger generations. The *Speech* has been translated into a number of languages, including English, French, German and Russian. Prof. Dr. Özdemir Nutku of Ankara University has created a Documentary Play based on it (1973). Nazım Özgüney and Orhan Asena (1970) have separately put the *Speech* into verse.

The Institute of the History of Turkish Revolution has published selected speeches and statements of Atatürk in five volumes (1945, 1952, 1954, 1964 and 1972). Several individuals (such as Prof. Dr. Herbert Melzig, Nafi Demirkaya and Behçet Kemal Çağlar) before and after the Institute's compilations, have published their own selections. It appears that the series, initiated by the Institute, will continue. Separate publications, such as *The Minutes of the Sivas Congress* (*Sivas Kongresi Tutanakları* by Uluğ İğdemir, 1969) or *Decisions of the Representative Council* (*Heyet-i Temsiliye Kararları* by Prof. Dr. Bekir Sıtkı Baykal, 1974) include hitherto unpublished speeches by Atatürk. Several of his talks have been printed by different government and party organs as well as by private publishers or individuals. *Directives on Education* (*Atatürk'ün Maarife*

Ait Direktifleri, 1939) by the Ministry of Education, Prof. Dr. Enver Ziya Karal's selection of *Thoughts from Atatürk (Atatürk'ten Düşünceler*, 1956), Mustafa Baydar's *Atatürk Says (Atatürk Diyor ki*, 1951), Dr. Utkan Kocatürk's *Atatürk's Thoughts and Ideas (Atatürk'ün Düşünceleri ve Fikirleri*, 1969), Çetin Altan's *Atatürk's Social Views (Atatürk'ün Sosyal Görüşleri*, 1965) and Fethi Naci's *Atatürk's Principal Views in One-Hundred Questions (100 Soruda Atatürk'ün Temel Görüşleri*, 1968) are cases in point. His selected speeches also appeared in Russian, Arabic and Bulgarian.

Atatürk's memoirs and diaries have been published in several places. His diaries, kept (in November-December 1916) while he was the Commander of the Sixteenth Corps in South-Eastern Anatolia was published by the Turkish Historical Society in 1972. Diaries of January 3-7, 1925, was printed in the December 10 and 15, 1925 issues of the *Vakit*. His memoirs, dictated to Falih Rıfkı and encompassing the years 1914 to 1919 began to be published in the daily *Milliyet* and *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* on March 14, 1926. The same writer re-published the memoirs in book form in 1965. The diary (in five note-books) that Mustafa Kemâl kept in Karlsbad (Germany) in June 30-July 27, 1918 is under the custody of his adopted daughter Prof. Dr. Afet İnan; it awaits publication.

His three original writings (1909, 1911, 1912) on military affairs and two translations (1909, 1912) appeared in a single volume in 1959. His *Reports on the Çanakkale Campaigns* were printed by the Turkish Historical Society in 1962. Ruşen Eşref published in 1930 an *Interview with Mustafa Kemal, the Commander of the Anafartas*.

His private letters were collected by Sadi Borak and published in 1961. Prof. Dr. Afet İnan put together his handwritten and dictated manuscripts in 1969. He has dictated several articles for the *National Will* and *National Sovereignty*, which he did not sign. Asım Us, one of Turkey's then leading journalist, republished in 1964 five articles on the Hatay (Alexendretta) question, which was dictated to

him for the daily *Vakit* (January 22-27, 1937). Atatürk is also the author of a book on geometry, printed in 1937 by the State Publishing House and recommended to the teachers of mathematics.

III

Although Mustafa Kemâl Atatürk did not want to "freeze" the philosophy of the new state within the confines of a particular doctrine, he nevertheless named six principles in the 1930's, showing a general direction with roots in realism. They were: Republicanism, Nationalism, Populism, Reformism, Secularism and Statism.

Republicanism was understandably the first of these principles. Mustafa Kemâl entertained the ideas of a republican regime when he was a young cadet in the War College. The republican element was present not only in the legacy of the French Revolution, but also some limitation on the autocratic power of the Sultan was put within the Ottoman institutions. This occurred most notably in the first 1876 Constitution, which nevertheless left the Sultan with the right to initiate legislation and cast a veto. Not until the Young Turk Revolution was the Sultan required to swear fidelity to the people. But it was the Ankara Government which in 1921 gave the sovereignty of the people constitutional recognition.

Mustafa Kemâl, as a young officer first in Macedonia and then in Syria, could see that the Ottoman Empire was disintegrating. Only a national Turkish state could replace it. It was him who drew the map of the new Republic. The territories would compose of the areas predominantly Turkish, and the whole of Anatolia would constitute the majority of the country. The Hittites, the Frigians, the Greeks, the Romans and the Seljuk Turks had been, throughout history, sovereign on various different portions of Asia Minor and hence their eventual disintegration. Even while selecting Ankara as the new capital, he knew that he was acting in proper evaluation of historical facts.

With the establishment of the Grand National Assembly

in Ankara on April 23 1920, the Republic was already installed as a legal system and working organizations. Since the empire was no more, its religious and political figurehead was deprived of its importance and function. Hence, Republicanism was interwoven with Nationalism. For Atatürk, the Republic also meant a democratic state. He believed that popular sovereignty ought to be protected by new laws, a new cadre of legalists and a two-party system (which he tried twice). The principle of the supremacy of Parliament was so well established that the suggestion of allowing the President (no other than Atatürk himself) was rejected. (Later, the principle that the representation of the will of the people in the Parliament could not be denied was utilized by the Democrat Party governments [1950-1960] to justify their hold on power. And when the suggestion of giving the Prime Minister the power to dissolve the Parliament was considered during the discussions on the 1961 Constitution, it had to be immediately put aside on account of the conviction that the assembly was supreme.)

Nationalism was another principle-new for the Turkey of the 1920's. The policy which he considered to be clear and enforceable was nationalist policy. He said that there could be no greater mistake than to be a Utopian. By "nationalist policy", he meant: "...Within our national frontiers, to work for the real happiness and development of our nation and our country, relying above all on our own strength for the preservation of our existence, to refrain from inducing our people to pursue deleterious aims and to expect from the civilised world human treatment and friendship based on reciprocity." He described the Turkish motherland as "abandoned", looking like a "graveyard-without life and development". But he saw treasures beneath it, on which lived a gallant people. He said that the Turks had gone through a long and arduous struggle for the sake of the integrity of their country. His objective was the reinforcement and preservation of this integrity. For him, it was an unrealisable aim to unite even all the Turks in the world within the boundaries of a single state. This was a truth that bitter and bloody conflicts had clearly demonstrated.

He saw nothing in history to show that Pan-Turanism or Pan-Islamism could have succeeded and how these concepts could find a basis for their realisation. First of all, lust of conquest was out of the question. Our people had substituted the bond of Turkish nationalism for the religious and sectarian bonds. He said: "Ours is nationalist government. It is out-and-out materialistic, with a penchant for realism. It is a government which refrains from committing such crimes as following illusory ideals, not to attain them, but fancying that they will be attained, to lead the nation against rocks or to sink it in swamps and at last to sacrifice its existence." Just as Turkish nationalism was not racist and irredentist, it was based on "full and complete independence", by which Atatürk meant "unfettered independence in the political, economic, juridical, cultural, in fact, in every sphere. Lack of independence in any one of these spheres," he said, was "a negation of independence within the fullest meaning of the term." Our nationalism opposed all particularisms, respected the patriotism of others and favoured movements of national liberation. Decades had to pass before the United Nations would declare that nations had sovereignty over their own natural resources, but Atatürk's Turkey had proclaimed this a working principle, giving the state responsibility for production as well as protection. The Turkish Historical Society, (which interpreted history anew), the Turkish Language Society (which led the drive to purify the language) and the People's Houses (created in every province and district to become centers of culture and artistic/literary activities) were the natural results of the same principle of sober nationalism.

Populism was, in part, the result of Mustafa Kemâl's early reading in history, philosophy and government. He added a populist dimension to the democratic concepts of the French Revolution. He fully believed that the people were the real fountain-head of every secret of success and of every kind of power and authority. After the First Congress of History was over, a delegate said to Atatürk: "An Italian writer Count Sforza has described you as a dictator. "I, a dictator!" ejaculated Atatürk. He continued: "...Before

carrying out any idea, I convene the people's congresses, where I discuss them, and I give effect to them only after obtaining their sanction. There is the Erzurum Congress, the Sivas Congress-and the living proof, the Grand National Assembly... Let them say; we will march on!" Early in 1920 he stated that all power, sovereignty and governance rest directly with the people, whom he described a year later, in the following words: "...We are poor labourers, a poor people, striving to save our existence and independence. Let us know our character. We are a toiling people, forced to toil for our salvation and existence. Every one of us has, therefore, a right or a title, which we can earn only by virtue of work. Idlers and those who wish to live without work have no place in our society." He was the first to utter radical statements portraying the condition of the Turkish peasant in 1922: "Who is the owner and master of Turkey? The peasant, that is, the real producer! Therefore, he has the right and title to greater comfort, happiness and affluence than everyone else." He believed that the economic policy of the Government of the Grand National Assembly was directed towards the achievement of this objective. He went on: "...Let us gather together, with shame and reverence, before this exalted master, whose blood we have spilt for seven centuries in different regions of the globe, whose bones we have left behind in those lands, the fruits of whose toil we have expropriated and squandered, whom we have requited with scorn and contempt and whose kindness and sacrifices we have repaid with ingratitude, insolence, oppression and the desire to degrade him into a bondsman." Mustafa Kemal did not use the word "people" for or on behalf of any social class. The War of National Liberation was fought with the cooperation of all classes.

By *reformism* (or revolutionism), he meant that the nation could be and was determined to "go ahead on the path of civilization without rest and without fear". His own inimitable summary of his achievements was expressed in the following words: "A ruined country overlooking a precipice... bloody engagements... long years of war... and

then a new country, a new society, a new State, brought to pass by incessant reforms, which have won esteem both at home and abroad. This is a short epitome of the Turkish Revolution, as a whole." This summary is conspicuous by the absence of any reference to the man who brought about this great change. He said: "Our country will become out-and-out modern, civilized and new... The masses want to be prosperous, free and affluent... The nation has decided to adopt, thoroughly and in the same form and essence, the life and the means which contemporaneous civilization has assured to all nations. The nation is determined not to permit centuries-old varieties of lie and fraud to retard, for a moment, its efforts in the sphere of innovation and reform... We cannot live within an orbit, shut off from the rest of the world. For nations, which persist in conserving certain traditions and beliefs which cannot stand the test of reason, it is not only difficult, but also impossible, to progress." The modern Turkish society, with its new script, national history, purified language, progressing art, advanced music and technical institutions as well as equality of men and women were the products of this understanding. These reforms were, at times, criticized for dealing with the above-structure trivia. But in the context of Atatürk's time and place, they signified a cultural transformation, with profound symbolic meaning.

Secularism meant the emancipation from the dungeon of thoughts which Atatürk believed his people were imprisoned. The proper way for such release was free researching and debating of creative minds. Having felt the limits of non-secular life since childhood, Mustafa Kemâl broke with the hegemony of the mystic and scholastic thought. In his native Macedonia, he witnessed how the Turkish community was exploited; he saw the instrumentality of traditional and repressive framework in this exploitation. Atatürk's later scientific approach and democratic understanding of society are linked with his secular emphasis. Atatürk placed secularism as a fundamental pillar of his principles and equated it with the freedom of thinking, as a method in creating a society and bridging the gap with

the advanced states. He saw in secularism a democratic content, an emancipating thought and a new attitude enabling one to grasp universal values. Religion could no longer be decisive in creating social, political, economic, educational and artistic rules and establishments. Changes would be affected and solutions found on compromise as a result of the democratic process. No religion could possibly regulate such changes, and no progress could be made if left within the confines of beliefs labeled as "sacred". To fight injustice, repression or poverty or to understand the value of education, problems of production, constitutional choices or artistic options, the basis had to be, first and foremost, secular. Governing was like a science, just as building a bridge or erecting a factory. Secularism was, in short, not only possible, but also desirable and inevitable in our contemporary world. The practical results of this belief were the abolishing of the Ministry of Shariat, the *Mejalla*, the Shariat Courts, the *madrassahs* and some other pious foundations and the introduction of secular education. In a passionate outburst, Atatürk had said: "We have got to go on. And we are to progress whatever happens. We have no choice now. Civilization is a blazing fire that burns and destroys all who will not pay allegiance to her!"

Although *statism* became an officially adopted policy in 1931, the influence of the state in economic life was a reality since the proclamation of the Republic. In the early years of the régime, there was scarcity of capital, know-how and an experienced entrepreneur class. In a long interview with the daily *Vakit*, published on February 18, 1923, Mustafa Kemal put the economic question as the root cause of Turkey's rise and fall. Recalling Ottoman history in some detail, he expounded how a gigantic empire was built, using the Turkish element in it for extending both the Western and the Eastern frontiers. Obligated to adopt a domestic policy to suit such a conduct abroad, the rulers, he reiterated, took it upon themselves to protect the different languages, religions and traditions of the multi-national elements they had conquered, and to that end, granted them privileges and exemptions. As against this, the Turks participated in

protracted campaigns while they should be working in a manner to meet their vital needs in their own homes and in their own state. The crowned potentates carried the Turks from one land to the other, and to please the conquered people, they gave away many of the rights and resources of the Turks as favours, benefactions and bounties. Diaster followed when these royal favours were treated as acquired rights. The foreigners were not content with what they gained. The Grand Porte borrowed from them so much and on such exorbitant terms that it was impossible even to pay interest. At last, the finances of the Ottoman State was put under foreign control.

Atatürk drew several conclusions from the Ottoman experience. Addressing the residents of the emancipated town of Bursa, as printed in the daily *Vakit* of October 21, 1922, he said: "The victory in which you rejoice today was won by the determination and power of our nation and the bayonets of the Army of the Grand National Assembly. We will continue our struggle in the field of economy. We will become manufacturers..."

In 1923, he told another *Vakit* correspondent that the new Turkish State would be "an economic state". A year earlier, he had disclosed the principle of nationalization and sovereignty over the country's wealth: "One of the most important aims of our economic policy is, as far as our financial and technical means permit, to nationalize economic institutions and enterprises directly concerned with public interests..." This idea of exploitation of the country's wealth for the good of the people was accompanied by economic planning, which Turkey was the second state after the Soviet Union to apply. Atatürk even introduced the idea of such planning at the international level. In a statement to the daily *Cumhuriyet* of August 26, 1935, he said that it was essential for every country to bring its efforts for its own economic development in line with reasonable, well-conceived, over-all international plans. He believed that international potentialities be so combined as to allow every nation to develop in accordance with its own characteristics and that every nation be conceded the right to apply, within

its own confines and with due regard for its own peculiar conditions, the generally accepted ideas as to world economic prosperity.

IV

It is true that many of Mustafa Kemál Atatürk's steps forward were seen in the Western family of nations, For instance, the concept of republicanism was bound up with the Greek and Roman republics. For centuries, the struggle of the city-states for freedom had kept the republican idea alive. In the age when Latin was the language of the cultured people, the Roman example had even greater effect. The Medieval doctrine was, of course, monarchic. But the break up of Medieval universalism opened the way for republicanism. Both the Renaissance and the Reformation were important for the revival of the republican ideology. Numerous republican strains may be traced from the English Puritan to the American Declaration of the Independence. And the ideas of 1789 claimed universal validity. It is also true that the ideas of revolution first appeared in the American colonies and in Europe. Nationalism, as expressed in Montesquieu's writings and the French Enlightenment or *Volksgeist* of the German romanticists belong to the West. The modern origins of secularism should also be traced to the later Middle Ages of Western Europe. And the first examples of secular administrations can be found in the early American states. The original home of populist ideas as well as the interventionist welfare state is also in Europe.

But the Turks considered Westernization as synonymous with modernization and "becoming civilised". The aim was to bring the Turkish society to the level of contemporary civilisation and culture. Atatürk aspired a new folk, with a rational outlook, characteristic of our age. He was imbued with goals of a series of transformations that included full independence, economic development, industrial take off, the rule of scientific method over thinking, effective and honest government and the amalgamation of democratic education with republicanism.

To become contemporary meant foremost the maturing of the economic structure and the advancement of industrial enterprises. But no economic progress serving the nation as a whole was possible without the full independence of the country. Atatürk knew that there would be foreign interests wishing to intercede once they were conceded some sort of political or economic presence in the life of the nation. The remodeling of a society on such an independent course necessitated trust in the principles of science. The re-styling of human relations could no longer be based on superstition, but the recognition of the right of science, culture and arts to rest on independent thinking. Such was also the philosophy of education during the Atatürk era.

Modernization is, of course, not a geographical term; it is the totality of socio-economic structure. History teaches us that civilisation was never under the monopoly of a single nation. When Julius Caesar referred to the cannibals in northern France, China in the Far East and India in South Asia were enjoying a magnificent civilisation. When Europe was buried in the obscurities of the Dark Ages, Islamic civilisation had already offered to the culture of mankind Avicenna and Averrhoes. Similarly, a group of Western European states held the torch of enlightenment during a particular stage of historical development. Westernization, if expressed politically, may mean the idea of democracy (in the sense of parliamentary and party government) and sovereignty (in the sense of subordination of all government organs to a sovereign state); economically, it may indicate the substitution of the factory for the hand loom and home craft.

But the correct evaluation of the West depends, like many other things, on the acceptance of contradictions within it. Such omissions, otherwise, put us in no better position than the blind men who attempt to define an elephant, each touching its trunk, leg or tail. The definition of anything, as a matter of fact, rests not only on its composing factors, but also on elements which exert an influence changing its characteristics, personality or identity. Just like a tree has the capacity to turn into coal and earth

as being composed of stems and leaves, the Western society too gathers in itself contradictions in terms of origins as well as present identity. One sees in the West inquisition and fascism on the one hand, and rationalism and socialism on the other. Such a conglomeration is, doubtless, a composite of contradictions. But one cannot be content with oversimplifications, either. We have to define the West as a community of states, situated generally along the North Atlantic coast, which has destroyed feudalism in the age of bourgeois democratic revolution and entered the path of capitalist development in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. To have entered this path some two-hundred years ago means that the West has been successful in realizing progressive steps required at those historical moments. The societies that accomplished this forward move certainly attained economic and political superiority over the rest of the world. But this superiority also manifested itself as colonialism and imperialism, against which Mustafa Kemal had fought and won.

This analysis is, however, no denial of Western contribution to humanism. But it certainly takes issue with the pretension that the West is the sole creator of universal culture. Mustafa Kemal never accepted the assertion that all the values which might be termed as humanistic contributions had originated from the West and that the non-Westerners were perhaps incapable of making any contribution. It was him who gave self-assurance and dignity to the Turks. He believed in the innate abilities of his nation. He said that the leadership derived its entire ardour, enlightenment and strength of conscience from the people. There was an attempt to systematize Kemalism as an original movement, that could be an example to the other developing nations.

V

The *Kadro* movement of 1933 and 1934 was an intellectual drive, introduced by a monthly review bearing the same name, to systematize the principles of Kemalism. It was brought out by six Turkish intellectuals, who believed that

revolutionary Turkey was based on principles peculiar to itself, but these theories needed to be elaborated as a system of thought. *Kadro* was published to serve this very purpose. This author's evaluation that follows is based on the original issues of the said review and also on private talks with two of its leading initiators, namely, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir (1887-1876) and Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu (1889-1974).

One of the two leading intellectuals of the *Kadro* movement was Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, whose life looked as if it was an axis of the great movements of his time. Apart from his brilliant autobiography, *The Man in Search of Water (Suyu Arayan Adam)*, his works on Enver Paşa (three vols.), Mustafa Kemal (*The Unique Man*, three vols.), İsmet İnönü (*The Second Man*, three vols.) and Adnan Menderes (*The Drama of Menderes*) may actually be considered a series connecting the events and problems of the last one-hundred years, written in a resplendent style. Born in Edirne (Adrianople), a historic town on the farthest European frontier of Turkey, he found himself as a young (bare seventeen) teacher serving in the Caucasus and embroiled in the Pan-Turkic movement of the early 1910's. He had gone to the Turkish-speaking Azerbaijan to help unite the Turks on the basis of language and race, but he himself had fallen there under the influence of another movement, namely, the Bolshevik Revolution, which had engulfed the Caucasus in the early 1920's. Consequently, he participated in the First Congress of the Asian Peoples in Baku (September 1920) and in the Azerbaijan Soviet. Becoming a member of the Turkish and the Soviet Communist Parties, he spent some years in Moscow studying economics at the newly-established Asian Peoples University. Upon returning to Turkey, he started writing in the progressive *Aydınlik (Enlightenment)*.

But gradually adopting himself to the Turkish environment, he started to believe that new Turkey would probably follow a line of development peculiar to itself, that it will not experience a classical capitalism, but will resort more and more to state leadership and intervention. He

expressed these views (in page 24), as early as 1924, when he and Prof. Sadreddin Celâl published *Lenin and Leninism*, on the occasion of the passing away of the Soviet leader. Such views later led to schism with his own party and the Comintern. This did not, however, prevent his arrest and conviction to ten years by a court in front of which he defended universal socialism. He re-gained his freedom in about a-year-and-a-half, just enough for him to prepare two works entitled "Alternatives of Economic Development for Present-Day Turkey" and "Alternatives of Political Development for Contemporary Turkey". He was arrested once more, but acquitted at the end, the four-months imprisonment in between giving him the opportunity to prepare a paper on "The Periodical Cycles of the Turkish Currency and the Need for a Central Bank".

Şevket Süreyya was already systematizing some workable hypothesis for Turkish economic development when he was given a position in the Ministry of Education. The elementary train of thought, traceable in the future issues of the monthly *Kadro*, was summarized in a talk by him, on January 15, 1931, delivered at the Turkish Club in Ankara. In his talk, which Şevket Süreyya entitled as "the Turkish Revolution and Its Principles", he underlined that Turkey was still going through a revolution, that this was neither an administrative change, nor mere reform, and that it had international significance in terms of its originality and influences. He defended the view that it possessed all required theories, which was not yet systematized. He suggested that a dynamic cadre of thinkers ought to arrange, organize and classify the principles of our revolution and lead it to further conquests to meet the demands of the time. This talk is generally regarded as the beginning of the *Kadro* movement.

The other creator of the *Kadro* was Yakup Kadri, a leading novelist and a prominent man of letters. Some foreign critics have told this writer that Yakup Kadri was among the greatest writers of our century. Each one of his novels was a penetrating study of a different era. In *The Rented Mansion (Kiralık Konak)*, he analyzed the declining

life of the Tanzimat; in *The Night of Decision (Hüküm Gecesi)*, he appraised the breakdown of the Union and Progress Movement of the Parliamentary period; in *Sodom and Gomora*, he brought to the open the life of İstanbul under occupation; in *the Alien (Yaban)*, he contrasted the Anatolian peasant with the educated towns-people; and in *Ankara*, he compared the two states of the city during and after the War of Liberation. Yakup Kadri assessed each decade, with its political and social characteristics, coupled with the perception of an analytical man-of-letters who could draw superb literary profiles. Yakup Kadri was the link between Atatürk and the board of writers of the monthly review. It was him who defended the views of this group of six intellectuals in front of Mustafa Kemal. Part of Yakup Kadri's memoirs may also be found in *the Artificial Diplomat (Zoraki Diplomat)*, covering his ambassadorship to Albania, Iran and Switzerland.

The *Kadro* movement recognized Atatürk as the leader of the Turkish Revolution. However, the elite had failed to arrange methodically the principles that governed the deeds of the leader. The need for systematization, first mentioned by Şevket Süreyya in a talk in 1931, was further elaborated in his *Revolution and the Cadre (İnkılap ve Kadro)* and in the issues of the monthly review.

What were the theses elaborated in them? Contemporary society (in the world) had a signal and dominant contradiction, that is, the struggle between capitalism and its product, the proletarian class. According to this view, the colonies and the semi-colonies were only passive and dependent entities. The socialist theory expected them to play a subordinate, an inferior role in support of the working class. *Kadro* differed in this interpretation. It maintained that Turkey could pass through a dissimilar route than one saw in the contemporary industrialized societies of the West. *Kadro* maintained that (a) Turkey could avoid the intensive class struggles that Europe had experienced, and that (b) the colonies and the semi-colonies could play a much more substantial, significant and self-reliant role than envisaged by the dominant socialist thinking of the

time. According to the *Kadro* movement, then, there were *two*, and not just one, international contradictions or conflicts. In the second conflict, Turkey had already taken its place; moreover, Turkey was leading a movement. It had already taken a position, in favour of the colonies and the semi-colonies against the Western metropolises and had solved that conflict (within its own national boundaries) in favour of the former. *Kadro* maintained that the most distinctive mark of Kemalism was its anti-imperialistic character. By virtue of what it had accomplished, this country was already an example, a leader to the group of societies that resembled it. Mustafa Kemal had emphasized as early as 1923: "The present struggle of Turkey does not belong to Turks only. The cause defended by us is the very cause of all oppressed nations of the East." And again he said: "I see the awakening of the Eastern peoples as I now see the sun rising at daybreak. Imperialism and colonialism will be swept of the globe, and in their place will rise an era, inspired by a new understanding of concordance and collaboration, where there shall be no discrimination of colour or race."

According to the *Kadro*, the historical mission of Turkey was two-fold: (1) to be a successful example, for the entire dependent peoples, in frustrating imperialism; and (2) to eliminate the gigantic contradictions and conflicts that the typical industrialized Western capitalist countries have experienced. In short, *Kadro* believed that such great internal upheavals could be avoided. In the Western countries, where private enterprise was the center of economic activity, no miracle had yet been achieved to prevent inter-class conflict, *Kadro* maintained. One can see a drive to create a "classless society" without going through class struggles in Atatürk's speeches and attitudes as much as in the objective flow of the Turkish experience. But this required a systematization and a methodology that should be developed by an active group of cadres of leadership. This strategy necessitated, above all, an interventionist state that would bring together all significant economic activity that involved advanced technique and big capital. It meant planned statism encompassing not only economic

life, but also education, health, construction and similar topics important for the society at large.

The *Kadro* defended these views issue after issue, ably and without falling into contradictions. Its main contribution, namely, the analysis pertaining to the significance of movements of national liberation and Turkey's place in them, may be summarized as follows: (1) The movements of national liberation are, by virtue of their historical origin, the results of an economic and political conflict between the colonizing countries on the one hand, and the colonies as well as the semi-colonies on the other. This conflict emanates from the very conditions created by the application of machinery to industry and the concentration of such industry in the hands of a few foreign centers. (2) The aim of the movements of national liberation is to eliminate this contradiction, namely, the dependence of a group of countries and peoples on a set of others. (3) The removal of this conflict is possible not by an introverted passivity of the dependent societies, but by the active and armed, national struggle of the same against the dominant states. (4) The ownership of the means of production lies at the basis of the conflict. To avoid falling from one contradiction to another, (following victory at the end of a national struggle) it is necessary to put advanced technology and important economic activity under the control of the whole society. In short, the purpose of the movements of national liberation are two-fold: externally, to eliminate political and economic dependence of foreign centers; and internally, to do away with class domination and hence with class struggles. (5) Another historical mission of the national liberation movements is to bring to an end feudal relations and remnants of institutions that suit the Middle Ages as much as to prevent the birth of a new class war between capital and labour. *Kadro* aimed not at the prevention of the struggles of the working men, but the domination of the private entrepreneurs. It was their belief that any movement of national liberation unable to eradicate these two contradictions would, in the final analysis, be termed as deficient, incompetent and reactionary. (6) The Turkish national liberation movement, likewise, aims at a classless society

nationally and the removal of the world conflict internationally. (7) All the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, irrespective of race and language, are expected to unite in this double aim. (8) A movement of national liberation is not only a political, economic or a legal matter; it is an act of re-birth of all nations participating or expected to participate in such a movement. (9) Such movements hold high the independence and sovereignty of the nation. What is at stake is not only the conquest of such independence and sovereignty, but also their maintenance and development. Such an aim, by virtue of its nature, is against individualistic, group or class hegemonies. (10) Turkey is a representative of national liberation, because that country has taken up arms against colonialism, which is one of the greatest conflicts of our time, and has also brought down from power the forces which represented the very conflict in the domestic scene.

A detailed defense of these views were taken up by the *Kadro*. It tried to define, for the first time among the Third World countries, the place, the importance, the characteristics and the probable results of the national liberation movements and modern Turkey's connection to them. *Kadro* has considered itself a Kemalist publication. It believed itself to be loyal to the mission of explaining to the Turks and the world at large the system of Mustafa Kemal's thought and actions. It defended the progressive and the constructive aspects of the Turkish Revolution.

There is no doubt that the most distinctive mark of Kemalism was its anti-imperialistic character. The Turkish Revolution has been a source of inspiration for the elites and the people of the former colonies in Asia and Africa. Turkey's option for statism in the early 1930's related to ideological commitments lying at the basis of the new Republic. It also derived from a pragmatic consideration of the country's economic experiences during the first decade of Republican rule. It was assumed that the state enterprises would be more "national" than capitalist formations and that the state would not encourage the exploitation of the worker. Moreover, the Western economy, ba-

sed on free enterprise, was going through a big crisis, which made it easier for the *Kadro* writers to defend their principle of "transition to independent economy". Premier İnönü's inaugural speech on the Sivas railway line, in which he emphasized "moderate statism", indicated a search for a new scheme of economic policies. An article written by İnönü for the *Kadro*, entitled "The Statist Character of Our Party", reiterated the necessity for the state to lead the process of industrialization. Also, there was no sizable private capital, at that time, that could be nationalized. Owing to the effects of world economic crisis, Turkey had suffered extreme price falls in agrarian products. Finally, Atatürk's fact-finding tour of the country between October 1930 and March 1931 had convinced him of the need of state intervention to lift the peasant out of his poverty. At its 1931 Convention, the principle of statism was identified as a distinguishing feature of the Republican People's Party, and in 1937, the same became a Constitutional article. The State Plan, completed in 1932, laid emphasis on state financing of investments, production and marketing in textile, mining, chemicals, paper mill and ceramics. Turkey avoided the web of international loans and secured a growth rate of about 9 %.

The *Kadro* movement was a significant attempt to secure the systematization of the Turkish Revolution. It was protected by Atatürk and İnönü, but criticism and complaints about the *Kadro* were often made to both. Some Left-wingers described it as a diversion from the Left, and some Right-wingers considered it outright Marxist. Discussion over it did not cease even after the *Kadro* stopped publication in 1934.

Whatever impact Kemalism might have made in the world, especially in terms of providing a model for anti-imperialistic struggle and of development, the Turkish nation had found in Mustafa Kemâl Atatürk what it was waiting for the last two-hundred years. Some nations produce, at critical periods, just the man to match the challenge of time. Such was the fortune of Turkey. With clear vision, Atatürk refashioned a nation.