



**Centre International de Formation Européenne  
Institut Européen des Hautes Etudes Internationales**

Master (M.A) in Advanced European and International Studies  
Anglophone branch

**Role of Kemalism in Turkey's EU Accession Process**

**Author: Emre Demir**

**Academic year: 2009-2010**

**Supervisor: Prof. Matthias Waechter**

## **ABSTRACT**

### **KEMALISM AND TURKEY'S EU ACCESSION PROCESS**

The extended period for the European Accession talks came to a pivotal point on October 3rd 2005, when Turkey began dialogue with the European Union towards this issue. These dialogues showed the level of improvement Turkey made in terms of democratizing the government according to the European conditions set from December 17th 2004, in accordance with the Copenhagen criteria. The increase of democratization efforts also presented issues related to the future of Kemalism which has been deeply affected by these criteria. These criteria along with the propositions that these issues prevent Turkey from entry into the EU resulted in the heavy scrutiny of Kemalism. This study's objective is to address the issues of Kemalism as it related to the EU's criteria for membership and the reasons and methods for the EU's objection to the fundamentals of this ideology.

Keywords: Turkey, European Union, Kemalism

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	5
CHAPTER I: EU CRITERIA AND KEMALISM.....	10
1.1 Turkey-EU Relations.....	10
1.2 The Conflicting Points between the EU and Kemalism.....	11
CHAPTER II: KEMALISM.....	17
2.1 Ataturk’s Leadership.....	17
2.1.1 Ataturk’s Aims for the Long Term .....	17
2.1.2 Ataturk’s Principles.....	18
2.1.2.1 Republicanism.....	18
2.1.2.2 Nationalism.....	19
2.1.2.3 Populism.....	20
2.1.2.4 Etatism.....	21
2.1.2.5 Laicism.....	22
2.1.2.6 Reformism.....	23
2.1.3 The Concept of Kemalism.....	24
CHAPTER III:THE PROBLEMATIC ISSUES OF TURKEY AND THEIR ORIGINS.....	28
3.1 Kurdish Question.....	28
3.1.1 Origins.....	28
3.1.2 Period of Post – Military Coup of 1980.....	35
3.2 The Alevi Question.....	36
3.2.1 Origins .....	36
3.2.2 Period of Post – Military Coup of 1980.....	38
3.3 Military Forces and Politics.....	40
3.3.1 Origins.....	40
3.3.2 The Military Coup of 1980.....	44
3.4 Sovereignty and Its Challenges.....	48
3.4.1 The Lausanne Peace Treaty.....	49

3.4.2 League of Nations and Membership of Turkey.....	50
3.4.3 Turkey – EU Relations and the Challenges on Sovereignty.....	53
CHAPTER IV: KEMALISM AND NEO-KEMALISM.....	55
4.1 Orthodox Kemalism.....	57
4.2 Kemalism and Liberalism: Neo-Kemalism.....	63
CONCLUSION.....	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	71

## INTRODUCTION

Ever since the Ankara Agreement, which was the ECU association agreement of 1963, Turkey has the objective of joining the EU. The Turkish-European Union relationship has since been seen as a privileged relationship from Turkey's perspective, Turkey has always strived for membership even during difficult times in this relationship and during the accession talks of 2005, and a turning point was reached for the future of Turkey's EU membership. These talks were a result of strong efforts made by Turkey in improving the democratic structure of the government and its policies. These policies were aimed towards alignment with the Copenhagen criteria, which are designed to ensure human rights, democracy, law, the ability to stay competitive in the EU markets, and the existence of a strong market economy.

Since 1999, amendments have been made to over 20 percent of the constitution of 1982 by the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. Additionally, up to the current time, seven changes have been made that establish new policies towards peaceful assembly, operations of the National Security Council, rights to association, deal penalty abolishment, freedom of speech, and cultural and individual rights. On the other hand, these new policies, aimed at increasing democracy in Turkey, have created debates about the future of the Kemalist ideal. Therefore, Kemalism is under scrutiny as the EU states that these ideals create an environment of fear for the integrity of the Turkish state, the cultural homogeneity, the views of religion and the relationship between the state and the army.

The extended period for the European Accession talks came to a pivotal point on October 3rd 2005, when negotiations ignited once again between Turkey and the European. These dialogues showed the level of improvement Turkey made in terms of democratizing the government from the European conditions set from December 17th 2004, in accordance with the Copenhagen regulations. The increase of democratization efforts presented issues related to the future of

Kemalism which has been deeply affected by these conditions. The Copenhagen criteria along with the propositions that inherently spark debate within Turkey prevent Turkey from entering into the EU. This is the result of heavy scrutiny of Kemalism. My objective is to address the issues of Kemalism as it related to the EU's conditions for membership and the reasons and methods for the EU's objection to the fundamentals of this ideology.

Ever since the Ankara Agreement, which was the ECU association agreement of 1963, Turkey has the objective of joining the EU. The Turkish-European relationship has since been seen as a privileged relationship from Turkey's perspective, Turkey has always strived for membership even during difficult times in this relationship and during the accession talks of 2005, which was a turning point for the future of Turkey's EU membership. These talks were the result of strong efforts made by Turkey in improving the democratic structure of the government and its policies. These policies were aimed towards alignment with the Copenhagen criteria, which are designed to ensure human rights, democracy, law, the ability to stay competitive in the EU markets, and the existence of a strong market economy.

Since 1999, amendments have been made to over 20 percent of the constitution of 1982 by the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. Currently, seven changes have been made that establish new policies towards peaceful assembly, operations of the National Security Council, rights to association, deal penalty abolishment, freedom of speech, and cultural and personal rights. These new democratic policies have created debates on the future Kemalist ideology. Therefore, Kemalism is under scrutiny as EU member states believe that the followers of this ideology will start to fear for the integrity of the Turkish state, the cultural homogeneity, the views of religion and the relationship between the state and the army.

If one should define what Kemalism is, it could be summarized as Kemalism is modernization. The concept of Kemalism began as a flexible perception towards

the future. The 1950s saw the full development of this ideology. The military coup of the 80's played a significant role in the development of Kemalism which is mentioned frequently in the 1982 constitution as an essential model through the six principals.

This unique version of Kemalism, which will be described as orthodoxy, dominated the post-coup government's policy. Following the 1999 Helsinki summit, the orthodox ideology weakened due to the conditions set forth by the EU including the issue of the military in politics as well as the Alevi and Kurdish issues. Furthermore, the conditions aimed to place limits on Turkish sovereignty, which grouped with these issues, stood in opposition to the orthodox Kemalist position. Therefore, the orthodox Kemalists questioned the need to forfeit sovereign powers to have the opportunity of EU membership.

The European Union encouraged Turkey to establish more rights to the ethnic Kurdish population and to improve the relationship of the minority religions, including the Alevis. However, the orthodox Kemalists support the restrictions against these identities. The conditions set by the EU also encourage Turkey to establish a civilian controlled military. However, the orthodox Kemalists support the military's control of the state. The objective of this paper is to understand why and how the conditions of the EU are putting pressure on the Kemalist orthodoxy and how this affects the perception of Kemalism. The study suggests that the EU requirements could not be met through orthodox Kemalism. A new group of Neo-Kemalists was established, which can conform to the conditions of the EU, while basing itself on the original, forward-looking Kemalist ideal.

Additionally, Neo-Kemalists claim that Kemalism must be flexible and adapt to the modern times because the leader of this ideal, Ataturk, was rational and forward-thinking. In this context, a more liberal approach is taken towards the Alevi and Kurdish issues, and they suggest that the Kurdish language could experience more freedom in its use according to the ideals of Ataturk. Laicism is also seen to be under threat by the required religious activities, which is also a

shared concern with the EU. Neo-Kemalists also disagree with the Turkish military's involvement within politics and they believe that the Turkish society has matured to the point where the military should not interfere in civil society. Finally, the issue of shared sovereignty between the EU and Turkey is regarded in the same view of Ataturk's concept that some limitations may exist in this respect to ensure peace and stability.

It is necessary to have a historical perspective towards understanding and interpreting the basic fundamental aspects of Kemalism. Following Chapter 1, which summarizes the European Union's actions towards creating better understanding of Kemalism in light of Turkey's recent candidacy status in the EU. The explanation of the strategies and long-term objectives of Ataturk (the six arrows), will be presented in chapter 2. After these principals have been reviewed, chapter 3 will present and analyze the evolving conditions of the EU historically, which include such issues as Kurdish relations, Alevi issues and the military's relationship with the Turkish political system. Two time periods are used to analyze these issues: Early republic, 1923-1930 and Post-military-coup period of the 1980s. These periods respectively represent Kemalism and orthodox Kemalism. Therefore, the study utilizes this method in order to present the departure from the principals of Ataturk after the military coup of the 1980s. Additionally, the limitation of sovereignty, which is viewed in a historical context, is also included in chapter 3. Even though this specific issue does not show a departure from precious methods due to the 1980s coup, the orthodox Kemalist ideal reflects strong opposition towards the limitations of sovereignty and membership into the EU. Therefore this issue is analyzed to show these elements before EU membership has been considered.

Based on the historical review, Chapter 4 examines and describes the perceptions of neo-Kemalists and orthodox Kemalist in terms of these sensitive issues. This chapter suggests that following the Helsinki Summit and the decision to include Turkey as a candidate for EU membership, the hopes of this acceptance were increased, which led to an increase of reforms in Turkey. Therefore, pressure

emerged to reform the ideology of orthodox Kemalism. Additionally, the various perceptions of neo-Kemalist and orthodox Kemalists are presented to demonstrate the adaptation of the neo-Kemalists to the conditions set forth by the EU and how the orthodox Kemalist oppose the prospect of becoming a member of the EU. Finally, the conclusion will show the increase of neo-Kemalism, which aims to incorporate the progressive fundamentals of Kemalism with the criteria set forth under the Copenhagen and EU criteria.

## CHAPTER I

### EU CRITERIA AND KEMALISM

#### 1.1 Turkey-EU Relations

The first step toward Turkey's relationship with the EU began in 1959, when the administration under Adnan Menderes applied for associate membership to the EEC, following the application in the same year by Greece. On September 12<sup>th</sup> 1963, the agreement, which is known as the Ankara Agreement was signed. The Ankara Agreement envisioned a trade and customs union through three phases between Turkey and European Community and as stated in Article 28 of the agreement, negotiations could be made towards full membership after the commitments in the contract were met. An additional protocol was established outlining the details of the customs union, which was signed on November 23<sup>rd</sup> 1970.

In 1987 Turkey applied for full membership to the EU. During this time, Turkey's industrial sectors were increasing and the economic strategies were set to reflect a more outward policy. However, the European Commission had a negative response towards accession and stated that opening accession talks right away would not be productive<sup>1</sup>. Additionally, the commission emphasized the Turkish/Greek relations in regards to the Cyprus issue. It was also mentioned by the commission that accession for any members was impossible prior to the completion of the single market and stated that improvements were needed in the Turkish economy, politics, and social issues before accession would be considered by the EC. Despite this negative response, the relationship between Turkey and the EC became stronger after the weakening due to the commissions restriction of the 4<sup>th</sup> financial protocol and the military coup of the 1980s. After this strengthening of relations, the customs union agreement was established.

---

<sup>1</sup> Commission Opinion on Turkey's Request for Accession to the Community, Part II. Par.9 and Part III. Par.10.

Turkey was the first country to have established a customs union with the European Union on December 31<sup>st</sup> 1995 as a non-member of the EU. However, tensions rose between the EU and Turkey over the 1996 Kardak crisis between Greece and Turkey. These tensions were also shown in the statement issued to Turkey by the Agenda 2000, to show a strong commitment to solve the regional problems and to actively pursue a resolution towards the issues of Cyprus<sup>2</sup>.

The tension and apprehension towards Turkey's membership was felt during the Luxembourg European Council of 1997, where the countries of Europe met to discuss European enlargement. This meeting in Luxembourg was a critical event for Turkey since Turkey had anticipated a decision from the council towards its candidacy status. The meeting turned out to be a disappointment for Turkey however, the council made no mention of any future. Nevertheless, the meeting did set timelines for additional countries that applied for candidacy. It was concluded by the council that Turkey remained an eligible country for membership but needed to resolve the issues of human rights and minority rights before accession. Following this meeting, the prime minister of Turkey declared a halt to EU political discussion but some pro- EU officials continued with the established agreements already in place including the customs union agreement and the association agreement. A turning point was made in the Helsinki Summit of 1999 where EU officially accepted and announced Turkey as a candidate country and following this decision, in order to prepare Turkey for EU membership, a pre-accession strategy was started be applied

## **1.2 The Conflicting Points Between the EU and Kemalism**

After the 1998 Cardiff summit, annual progress reports were prepared along with the accession partnership documents which had been prepared since the 1999 Helsinki Summit<sup>3</sup>. The preparation of these documents met the Copenhagen

---

<sup>2</sup> 1998 Regular Report, part b, Relations between the European Union and Turkey

<sup>3</sup> Luxembourg Presidency Conclusions, 13 December 1997, part d. Review Procedure, par. 35.

criteria which are a necessity for EU accession. The function of the Copenhagen criteria is to establish requirements of countries to incorporate the institutions which create democratic government, human rights law, protection of minority classes, establishment of a market economy and the ability to manage the competitive environment present within the European Union. Moreover, the countries are required to have an obligation to the political, economic, and monetary objectives of the Union. Turkey has been making strides towards aligning its policies with that of the Copenhagen criteria and the EU since Turkey has been named as a candidate country. However, there are some disagreements with some parts of the Progress Report \Accession Partnership documents and Orthodox Kemalism. This is particularly evident concerning the Kurdish and Alevi issues as well as the issues relating to the military and political sovereignty for Turkey in the future.

The European Union has been demanding equal rights for the Kurdish and Alevi minority as well as the reduction of the military's influence over politics in Turkey since the 1998 Commission report on Turkey. Additionally, the Commission requests Turkey to recognize the identity of the Kurdish culture and to exhibit more tolerance towards the Kurdish identity<sup>4</sup>. In terms of the Alevi issue, it is explained by the Commission that a double standard exists for the religious minorities which are identified by the Lausanne Treaty, which includes the Alevi members. The double standard exists in the religious courses required in schools, which do not mention or recognize the identity of the Alevi minority. Furthermore, funding is only made available for mosques that are Sunni. The Commission continues to explain that the issue of the military containing no civilian control is a problematic issue. This is seen in the fact that the military has an influence over politics through the National Security Council and has been an issue throughout the progress reports generated since 1998 and the 2000-2003 accession partnership documents<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> 1999 Regular Report by the Commission on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession

<sup>5</sup> 2000 Regular Report by the Commission on Turkey's Progress towards Accession

Besides the official accession partnership and progress report documents for the European Union, other documents exist associated with the institutions of the EU that display the disagreement with the idea of orthodox Kemalism and the European Union. One such document includes the report generated by Arie Oostlander, who reports the Turkish philosophy as consisting of importance of the military's role, nationalism, and strict view towards religion. This underlying philosophy of the Turkish state is difficult to be accepted by the European Union and requires adjustment towards a more open, flexible culture as well as a more open-minded view towards culture, religion and the state<sup>6</sup>.

In addition to the report of Oostlander, several additional resolutions exist from the Parliament of the EU from various areas including the Economic and Social Committee report and the European Parliament resolution. The Economic and Social Committee report advises that the collective policies of the Turkish nation should permit the Kurdish right to teach and use the Kurdish language. The European Parliament resolution urges the Turkish government and the PKK to find a non-violent resolution to the territorial issues. These reports have a direct affect on the Kemalist principles of Turkey<sup>7</sup>.

In 2000, the government of Turkey responded to the Accession Partnership documents by preparing the National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis and issuing a revision in 2003. The results of the revision ensured that media broadcasts would be allowed to broadcast in other languages besides Turkish, and also ensured that in the short-term, civilians would control the judicial and the courts of the State Security. Additionally, in the long run, guarantees to recognize the rights to all ethnicities or origins<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> Arie Oostlander, *Report on Turkey's Application for Membership of the European Union* (COM(2002) 700-C5-0104/2003-2000/2014(COS)).

<sup>7</sup> Economic and Social Committee of the European Communities, *Opinion, Relations Between the European Union and Turkey*, CES 1314/93, Brussels, 22 December 1993.

<sup>8</sup> European Parliament, *Resolution on the Situation in Turkey and the offer of a ceasefire made by the*

An amendment was added to the Turkish constitution in October of 2001 which supported the advance of freedom and the repeal of the death penalty. Additionally, these reforms included changes to the NSC through the incorporation of more civilians, removing certain executive powers and eliminating the representative position of the NSC within the Cinema, Video and Music Board. Additional reforms establish that the Secretary General position could be available to civilians instead of being a position reserved exclusively for the military. Among these reform packages implemented, one of the most significant reforms was the package implemented in August of 2002, which removed capital punishment from the forms of punishment available to the legal system. Additionally, this reform strengthened cultural rights, allowed the possibility of re-trial, strengthen the protection of the freedoms of press and speech, protected the rights of minorities to hold property and strengthened to right to peaceful assembly.

After Turkey's candidacy status was confirmed in the 1999 Helsinki Summit, the reforms in Turkey started to increase dramatically. This increase in reforms is attributed to the prospect of Turkey becoming a member of the EU and the response of the politicians and people towards this prospect.

After the decision to include Turkey as a candidate, the changes in Turkey have shown a significant increase. These changes have included adherence to standards set by both the IMF and the EU, which have resulted in many political and economic changes throughout Turkey.

The prospect of becoming an EU member as well as other incentives resulted in large efforts by Turkey to democratize their policies, which sparked heated debates; particularly in regards to the Kemalism ideal. The results of these new positions in Turkey permeated the official records and it can be seen within the

---

*PKK* (B4-0060, 0076, 0086 and 0089/96), 18 January 1996.

document created by the Prime Ministry High Council for the Coordination of Human Rights Issues. This document included highly debated proposals which included such issues as lifting bans on foreign languages for expression. This resulted in the removal of Gursel Demirok who was the author of the proposal.

On October 18<sup>th</sup> 2004, the Prime Ministry's Human Rights Advisory Board also prepared a report which was highly debated. The debate was fueled by the suggestion that the report made towards the interpretations of the minority classes and the view of membership to the EU as furthering the ideology of Kemalism. Additionally the report suggested that many of the claims to identity further contributed to the division of Turkey. Needless to say, the report caused quite a stir to the point that the authors of the report were brought to trial by two NGOs – the Societal Thought Association, and the Rule of Law Association. This resulted in the dismissal of one author and a lawsuit for the other. This example shows the debate and controversy that was generated towards Kemalism and the prospect of EU membership in Turkey and Europe<sup>9</sup>. In addition to the general EU conditions imposed on Turkey, another element of these conditions exists which has raised concerns towards the limitations of power for Turkey that would be created by the sovereignty issue for EU membership.

The post-modern policy of the EU stands in disagreement with the idea of one country being a sovereign nation that maintains absolute control over its independence and territorial integrity<sup>10</sup>. The dynamic nature of the government of the EU delegates actions to the nation-states as well as to the institutions at the sub-national and supranational levels of the government. The distribution of power severely limits the states' sovereign influence over policy. For example, the local governments in Europe have control over 70 percent of the spending for public works and infrastructure. However, when it comes to market issues and

---

<sup>9</sup> Minority Report, Sabah (Turkish Daily), 18 October 2004.

<sup>10</sup> James Caporaso, "The European Union and forms of state: Westphalian, regulatory or post-modern?"  
*Journal of Common Market Studies* 34 (1996), 30.

control, the market as a whole is controlled through a supranational body of the Commission. Additionally, the European Central Bank maintains control over the monetary policy. Thus, the issue of sovereignty is an important issue to Turkey because of the long history of sovereignty that is naturally respected and defended.

It can be seen that the European Union demands on Turkey and their common practices present some conflicts with the Kemalist ideal, while creating significant levels of debate among the Turkish society. It is therefore important to understand Atatürk in a historical perspective in order to assess the interpretations of Kemalism. The following section will analyze whether the Kemalist ideal is a flexible or closed ideology.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **KEMALISM**

#### **2.1 Ataturk's Leadership**

During the initial period of liberation and the establishment of the Turkish republic, Ataturk established his governance in two ways, which are organized as the long-term objectives and the strategies used to accomplish these objectives. Therefore, these two issues will be explained and analyzed.

##### **2.1.1 Ataturk's Aims for the Long Term**

Typically, many people tend to focus on the way Ataturk achieved his goals as opposed to the overall objectives. It can be summarized that the Republic was not as it is now during the life of Ataturk, but how he envisioned it to come this far? Accordingly, the ideas and objectives of Ataturk will be explained in depth.

The fallen theocratic Ottoman dynasty left Ataturk and his followers with the task of constructing a new republic based on secular principles, while at the same time battling for liberation. Ataturk had the ability to understand the causes of the Ottoman decline and therefore established his own political ideology. Through this perspective, the decline was a result of the Sultan's personal rule, as well as the lack of participation in the country's affairs by the people. His conclusion was that awareness should be made by the people to the situation<sup>11</sup>.

The society within Turkey exhibited various desires and feelings despite the identification of them. Therefore, the Kemalist group was responsible for determining the real and legitimate feelings within society and guiding society according to this position because the society's overall conscience had not

---

<sup>11</sup> Metin Heper, *The State Tradition in Turkey* (Washington: The Eothen Press, 1985), 48.

developed. This perspective is a result of the positivist orientation of Ataturk. The belief of positivists is that the world is understandable and observable through neutral observation and unbiased approach. In the instance of Turkey, this perspective was seen in the modernization efforts which were led through the elitists by various reforms which were designed to lead people towards a modern form of society<sup>12</sup>.

## **2.1.2 Ataturk's Principles**

The principles of Kemalism, known as the six arrows, are believed to be the way for people to achieve a contemporary level of civilization. In 1927, CHP (Republican People's Party) embraced four of these principles or "arrows" which are seen as republicanism, laicism, nationalism, and populism. Additionally, in 1931, CHP via the party's third congress adopted the remaining principles namely, etatism and reformism. In 1937, these remaining principles were included into the Constitution. These principles are summarized in the following section.

### **2.1.2.1 Republicanism**

During a speech given by Ataturk on August 13<sup>th</sup> 1923, the announcement was given that a republic was planned to be established. Ataturk stated that this new Turkish state belonged to the people and was for the people. Finally, the Republic of Turkey was announced on October, 29<sup>th</sup> 1923<sup>13</sup>. The new republic's glimpse could be seen on November 1<sup>st</sup>, 1922, which is the date of removal of the Sultanate.

Republicanism is issuing sovereignty to people through the collective will of the nation as opposed to the will of a specific leadership as was the case during the rule of Ottoman Empire. This new republic was established according to the will of the people and established public participation in governing the state.

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Metin Heper, *The State Tradition in Turkey* (Walkington: The Eothen Press, 1985).

<sup>14</sup> Ibid

The rise of republicanism was a result of the reaction towards the theocracy during the Ottoman rule. The rule of sovereignty belonging to the public in unconditional terms was not established for those who were sovereign, but for those who were not sovereign. The sultan was established and had acquired sovereign powers. The sultanate legitimized the powers held through theocracy and became the uncontested ruler within the government<sup>14</sup>. In 1876 a constitutional monarchy was established to challenge the sultan's power but failed because the sultan remained in power. This constitution also permitted the disbandment of the parliament by the Sultan. In addition, the people were not effectively represented due to the lack of influence by representatives in the face of the Sultan's power. Ataturk was well aware of the failures of this form of government and therefore established the Turkish Republic based on secularism. At this time, only three additional secular republics existed in the world including Switzerland, France and the United States of America<sup>15</sup>

### **2.1.2.2 Nationalism**

Ataturk viewed nationalism as an essential element for development. As he stated during a famous speech on March 20<sup>th</sup> 1923 that it should be understood that a country that has no identity is subject to the will of other nations<sup>16</sup>. Support for nationalism in Turkey was made through the Progress and Union parties during the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. One of the main proponents to nationalism during this time was Ziya Gökalp, who argued that the nationalism movement was begun during the late 19<sup>th</sup> century throughout the ranks of the intellectuals in the Ottoman period resulting from the cultural and political decline as compared to the Western development. It was believed during this period that nationalism could lead to better development.

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri II* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1961), 142-3.

Therefore, these select intellectuals during this time chose to follow the Western ideology and began to embrace nationalism. Although this nationalism during this time contributed to the ideology of Ataturk's nationalism approach, there are two concepts that are different in this context. The nationalism shown by Ataturk did not include an expansionist's idea, but the approach of the Unionists and Ziya Gökalp showed a more expansionist approach that maintained the aim of uniting the Turks of Central Asia and Anatolia through an ideology that exhibited a Pan Turanist approach<sup>17</sup>. However, the elites in the New Kemalist Turkey chose the nationalist approach to overcome the national inferiority complex preceding the fall of the Ottoman Empire and to increase the development of the country. The main objective was to install a national identity based on the concept of citizenship rather than religion<sup>18</sup>.

### **2.1.2.3 Populism**

The idea of populism according to Ataturk can be demonstrated best through the Grand National Assembly speech given by Ataturk in 1937, which explains that the essential aspects of the program prevents Turkey from focusing on specific groups within the body of citizens. Ataturk continues by explaining that the people are servants to all and differences between classes are not recognized. Therefore it can be seen that the views, that Ataturk suggested, show a society that is without class and includes an equal participation in government. Kili explains that the result of cooperation from various classes in the Turkish society led to the success of the Liberation War. This includes the bureaucracy of civil and military establishments, the landlords and local people, the poor and the palace members<sup>19</sup>.

Therefore, the goal of Ataturk was to maintain the unity and cooperation of this populism idea. Webster states that the policy of Ataturk was to establish a free vertical mobility of the society that was not adversely affected by free enterprises.

---

<sup>17</sup> Suna Kili, *The Atatürk Revolution* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2003), 98.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

The populism idea of Ataturk exhibits egalitarian characteristics which allow the participation of everyone within the governance of the country<sup>20</sup>. A few instruments that can be seen to sustain this view are seen in the implementation of women's voting rights during the general elections of 1934 and the municipal elections of 1930.

#### **2.1.2.4 Etatism**

It was realized by the winners of the liberation war(1922) that economic development was necessary for independence. During the Izmir meeting in February of 1923 concerning the Turkish economy, Ataturk stated that the primary reason for the decline of the Ottoman Empire was the lack of attention given to the economic affairs of the country. During the initial Republic period, the republic adopted several liberal policies in order to increase the economic development of the country<sup>21</sup>. Additionally, banks were set up and the private economy was encouraged. On the other hand, the liberal policy was deemed a failure from the effects of the period of depression in 1929. Cooper states that the private sector in Turkey had insufficient capital to support private business<sup>22</sup>.

In addition to this, the Turks were removed from participating in commercial activities during the Ottoman period. The commercial activities were controlled mostly through groups that represented minorities in Turkey. This resulted in the majority of Turks lacking in the technical know-how and experience needed to sustain development in the country. Along with these problems, other issues also were encountered during the 1929 Great Depression, which led to the policy makers of the time to seek out new alternatives for the policy towards the economy<sup>23</sup>. One example of a successful economy during the time was the

---

<sup>20</sup> Donald E. Webster, *Kemalism: A Civil Religion?* (1979), 48.

<sup>21</sup> Suna Kili, *The Atatürk Revolution* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2003), 98.

<sup>22</sup> Malcolm Cooper, "The Legacy of Atatürk" *International Affairs* 78, No.1 (2000), 117.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

economy of the Soviet Union, which was used as a model due to the government-backed economy

### **2.1.2.5 Laicism**

The Kemalist elite's view of secularism is described through the CHP's 1935 program as; Religion is the matter of the conscience and the CHP observes that the separation from the ideas of politics and religion is necessary for modern progress. Additionally, the CHP states that the matters of the state and the world should be separated as well<sup>24</sup>. Modernism needed to be accepted through a secular approach due to the redistribution of religious sovereignty from the state to the people. As a result, Kemalism was firmly founded upon secularism.

Kemalism attempted to reform the society's attitude, which was identified by the Islamic ties it had<sup>25</sup>. Therefore, Laicism was important in order to distance the practices of the former regime from the new regime. To achieve this, newly established Republic envisioned a state that intervened to separate the religion from social practices and affairs of the state. Laicism in Kemalism differs from the idea of secularism from the Anglo-Saxon point of view, which takes a neutral approach to religious affairs regarding the state. The Laicism in the Kemalist perspective actively seeks to separate the state from religion. Throughout the liberation war, Ataturk suffered the government's association with religion. The powers that be, insisted that the Caliph establish a fatwa through the Sheikh-ul-Islam to generate support in the fight against Ataturk. In this context, Ataturk established a secular approach and centralized this idea in the movements of reform<sup>26</sup>.

---

<sup>24</sup> Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 286.

<sup>25</sup> Ümit Cizre Sakallıoğlu, "Islam-State Interaction in Turkey", *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 28 (1996), 235.

<sup>26</sup> Yılmaz Çetiner, *Son Padişah Vahdettin* (İstanbul : Milliyet, 1993) 253.

One of the first advocates of secularism before Ataturk was Ziya Gökalp. Ziya Gökalp was known to use the term “la-dini”, which means non-religious, instead of the French derived term, laicism. Lewis states that this term created a certain level of confusion between irreligion and laicism creating strong opposition in Muslim circles, especially the clergy. The idea of laicism according to Kemalism however, did not mean complete neutrality from the state to religion, nor did it mean that atheism was supported. In fact, Ataturk was brought up by a religious mother, and he exhibited no interests in atheism. Ataturk viewed Islam in two concepts including a superstitious, artificial belief and a belief that Islam does not preclude progress or oppose consciousness<sup>27</sup>.

#### **2.1.2.6 Reformism**

Reformism was first established to increase the modernization and development for the newly established state. Additionally, reformation ensures the evolution of the government towards modernism and therefore allows Kemalism to innovate and to change where appropriate<sup>28</sup>.

The situation with the Ottoman case served as a lesson that without innovation, the state was subject to decline. Therefore, Ataturk learned from this and established many reforms to create a modern Republic of Turkey. Therefore, it can be said that one of the most important elements of Kemalism is reformism which leads to modernization. Kili states that it is important not only to ensure the modernization of the political system, society and the culture of politics, but it is also important to create sustainability for the modernization<sup>29</sup>.

---

<sup>27</sup>Vamık Volkan, *The Immortal Ataturk : A Psychobiography* (Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1984), 28.

<sup>28</sup>Suna Kili, *The Atatürk Revolution* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2003), 98.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

Selek states that reformism has been misunderstood as a means of revolting against the status quo; however, the basic form of reformism aims to establish new goals in a changing environment as well as to establish the methods necessary to achieve these objectives<sup>30</sup>.

### 2.1.3 The Concept of Kemalism

“I do not want doctrines. They would hinder our progress.”<sup>31</sup>

“I am not leaving behind a legacy as a cliché. My legacy is science and rationalism. Time is changing rapidly. Claiming that one could establish rules which could never be subject to change in such a world would be tantamount to denying development of science and the mind.”<sup>32</sup>

The words of Ataturk show his desire to leave an adaptable ideology instead a purely dogmatic one. The constitution of Ataturk’s principals are seen as a reaction to the older regime and a desire to free the society from the hold of the state and religion. The core of these principles includes scientific thought and pragmatism. However, the politics of a post-Ataturk state have resulted in the opposite effect. The dogmatic and stagnant effects can be seen increasingly over time. Therefore it might be asked how this flexible and pragmatic perspective was converted into ideology. It is stated by Murat Belge that the ideas of Ataturk were merely an outlook and not an ideology. He also asserts that Ataturk emphasized renovation and change. However, it is argued by Belge that following the death of Ataturk, this perspective became ideology. The goal of Kemalism of today is Westernization, but is being utilized within the circles of anti-Westernists as a tool of ideology<sup>33</sup>. Additionally, Kemalism has recently become an extremely

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Sami Selçuk, *Longing for Democracy* (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye publications, 2000), 11.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid

<sup>33</sup> Murat Belge, “Kemalist İdeolojinin Özellikleri,” *Radikal*, 7 October 2003.

conservative ideology in Turkey, although Kemalism is fundamentally based on continuous change<sup>34</sup>.

This change is explained through Metin Heper. That Kemalism was originally not an ideology, such as exists in Shilsian conceptualization. It is explained by Edward Shils that ideology which comes from a perspective is an ideology which has a lasting and authoritative structure that is established through certain principles and tries to answer each question. Those who hold the ideology claim to represent a sacred higher entity or idea. However, the outlook does not have an explicit and authoritative declaration. It generally is composed of various views which each emphasize specific elements that are part of the overall outlook.

Expanding the concept of ideology developed by Shilsian, Metin Heper states that Kemalism is not an ideology but a 'Weltanschauung'. Additionally he states that in the long term, it did not intent to implement a closed system of thought into society and he desired dynamic consensus rather than static consensus. Although Mustafa Kemal Ataturk is associated with Kemalism, he never was an ideologue. In fact Ataturk avoided the practice of dogmatism surrounding his views in the CHP of 1931<sup>35</sup>.

Reformism was adopted through Ataturk and this reformation allowed the dynamism to be sustained. Ataturk responded to the question of why the party did not have an ideology by stating that if the party had an ideology, the part would have been frozen. This serves as proof that Ataturk never intended to have an ideology. Ataturk brought a modern perspective which flowed through scientific and logical thinking, but following the death of Ataturk, things changed. Kemalism eventually evolved into an ideology, which was seen in the dramatic military coup of 1980. Another example is that in 1961, the constitution of Turkey

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Edward Shils, "The Concept and Function of Ideology", *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 7 and 8 (New York: The Macmillan Company&The Free Press, 1972), 66 as quoted in Heper, "A Weltanschauung-turned Partial Ideology and Normative Ethics: 'Atatürkism' in Turkey," *Orient* 25, no.1 (March 1984), 85, note 16.

made no mention of Kemalism, but in the new Constitution of 1982, Kemalism was referred to as the guiding ideology. The second article of the constitution states the nation will display loyalty to Ataturk's nationalism<sup>36</sup>. In addition to this, the preamble of the constitution states that no opinion or idea that contradicts the spiritual and historical Turkish values, nationalism, the reforms, principles and concepts of modernization provided through Ataturk will be upheld<sup>37</sup>. This suggests that the direct reference towards the moral and historical values of Turkey shows a departure from the positivist approach of Kemalism. However this is not the case. The NSC of the military coup of 1980 combined the Kemalist idea to the 'Turkish/Islamic Synthesis' in order to deal with the polarization occurring in the political realm.

The military coup of the 1980s incorporated a unique ideology which incorporated into the society in order to maintain stability. This was known as the Turkish-Islamic Synthesis and was established through a group of intellectuals of the time known as the 'Intellectuals' Hearth'. The followers of this organization were considered very important and were elevated to high position within the government following the coup of the 1980s<sup>38</sup>.

This organization's members were under the impression that the Turkish history needed to emphasize Islam and the beliefs of Islam. It is stated that this emphasis placed many values in the Turkish mindset including a fear of God, respect, family values, and patriotism. It was also claimed by the members of this group that any departure from these values was an influence of Western culture and led to disorder in society. As a result of this, emphasis was placed on Islam through

---

<sup>36</sup> 1982 Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, part 1, Article 2.

<sup>37</sup> 1982 Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, Preamble. The phrase "no idea or opinion" was changed as "no activity" by an amendment done on 3 October 2001.

<sup>38</sup> Binnaz Toprak, "Religion as State Ideology in a Secular Setting: The Turkish-Islamic Synthesis," in *Aspects of Religion in Secular Turkey*, ed. Malcolm Wagstaff (Durham: University of Durham Centre for Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies, 1990), 10.

art, music, culture and education as means of establishing a cohesive societal structure to unite the Turkish society. The effects of this ultimately influenced Kemalism, which was seen before the influence as a flexible ideology with solutions for many aspects of societal and political problems. Toprak explains that the political and legislative discussions after the coup of 1980 were concerned with the issues of uniformity in ideology, uniting the nation, peace in society and stability in political structure. These objectives were to be met through efforts to socialize the upcoming generation of Turks with measures to de-politicize the nation via the Turkish Islamic synthesis<sup>39</sup>.

Several measures were established after this formulation was adopted. For instance, a declaration was sent to schools by the Ministry of Education claiming that Charles Darwin's theories were false and deceiving and the instruction of philosophy and logic in schools were voluntary instead of mandatory. Additionally, the Constitution of 1982, specifically Article 24, created a mandatory requirement for moral and religious education in schools. Cafes and shops were closed during Ramadan in several of the ministries and several languages were forbidden to be used in expression. The Higher Education Council had a significant influence over the decisions to re-structure the education system in Turkey in order to incorporate these measures<sup>40</sup>.

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **THE PROBLEMATIC ISSUES OF TURKEY AND THEIR ORIGINS**

This chapter explains how the ideology of Kemalism occurred regarding the concerns of the E.U. and requirements for acceptance as a member. The issues under scrutiny include the Kurdish and Alevi issue, the political influence of the Turkish military and the issue of Turkish sovereignty as it relates to the EU membership. The following section discusses these issues and the evolution of these issues over time. Additionally, this section will emphasize the early Republican period as well as the coup of the 1980s in order to understand the developments and perception of Kemalism following the coup of the 1980s.

#### **3.1 Kurdish Question**

##### **3.1.1 Origins**

The conclusion of the First World War led to significant effects upon the nations that were defeated. For example, Austria and Germany experienced a significant level of chaos in the economic and political environment through the incorporation of stiff peace agreements. The Ottoman Empire was also affected by this situation and the victorious states of the war sought to divide the nation based on behind-the-scenes agreements.

These agreements prescribed the division of all the lands, excluding the coasts of the Black Sea and Central Anatolia, between Russia, Britain and France. The Mudros armistice of 1918 initiated the invasion of the Allied Forces but the Bolshevik revolution led to the fall of the Russian Empire and the formation of the Soviet government. This newly established Soviet regime forfeited the idea of invasion into Anatolia and uncovered the secret agreement. The decision of the

French and British to continue the invasion created significant conflict in Anatolia due to the conflict of interests created towards which state would maintain control over the region. The Paris Peace conference of 1919 ended up becoming a forum for these battling groups, but the subject of this thesis revolves more around the issues of the Kurds and Armenians.

The aim of conquering Central Anatolia was shared by both the Kurds and the Armenians. During the Peace Conference, Armenia exhibited a stronger voice when compared to the Kurds, due to the fragmentation of the Kurdish tribes. Several Kurdish tribes were convinced by the government that they would have full autonomy, while others put their faith in Ataturk's promise of equality under the newly establish Turkish Republic, considering that the territorial integrity of Turkey be maintained. Therefore the Peace Conference created a strong division amongst the Kurdish regions in Iraq, Eastern Anatolia and the Caucasus. The area of Urumiye was established in Iran, while in Iraq; Mosul, Arbil, Kirkuk and Suleymaniye were established under British annexation including the population of Kurds<sup>41</sup>.

To realize these plans, the politicians in Britain needed to gather support from the tribes of Kurds within Iraq. As a result, during March of 1919 the Kurdish tribes were instigated by the British intelligence agents through promoting nationalism and independence ideas among the Kurds. Meanwhile, Ataturk understood the importance of distinguishing between the Turkish regions and the Kurdish regions as well as establishing a Kurdish state within the Kurdish occupied areas would have had a devastating effect on Turkish sovereignty and structure. This arrangement for the Kurds could ultimately result in a division of Turkey<sup>42</sup>.

Ataturk attempted to emphasize the problems that would occur with attempting to establish a separate Kurdish state within the region because of the difficulty to differentiate the Kurdish population from the Turkish population. Ataturk sent a

---

<sup>41</sup> Stanford Shaw, *From Empire to Republic*, vol. 2 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2000), 385

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

telegram to Kamil, who was a Kurdish deputy within the parliament of the Ottoman Empire that stated his grievances over the conflicts between Kurds and Turks in Diyarbakir stating that these conflicts have negative consequences for both of the brothers-in-race. During this time, Ataturk wanted to integrate the Kurdish population into the Turkish nation<sup>43</sup>.

The attitude of the Kurdish tribe to the movement of liberation varied significantly at this time. The reason for supporting this movement among the various tribes was the threat of an Armenian state being established in the Southeastern Anatolia region. As Serif Pasha, the Kurdish representative in Paris Peace conference, established an Armenian agreement giving the Armenians control over much of Southeastern Anatolia, the Kurds increased their level of involvement in the national struggle. Obedience by the Kurds was succeeded through the efforts of Ataturk and Kazim Karabekir, who was the 15<sup>th</sup> army corps commander located in Erzurum<sup>44</sup>.

On June 11, 1919, Ataturk sent a telegram to a notable in Diyarbakir known as Kasim Cemilpaşazade. In the telegram Ataturk explained that the elements of the society should work closely together in order to sustain the integrity of the Ottoman lands. Additionally, Ataturk stated that he supported the Kurdish people in terms of granting those rights and privileges as long as the integrity of the land was kept. Aside from the mutual desire to keep the region free from the Armenians, the unifying factors of this group were the Islamic beliefs and the patriotism to the Ottomans<sup>45</sup>.

The support by the Kurds to the National movement was also seen by the delegates that attended the Erzurum Congress between July 23<sup>rd</sup> and August 7<sup>th</sup> of 1919. Additionally, the Kurdish delegation showed up in numbers during the Grand National Assembly, where 74 deputies were Kurdish. The cooperation and

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Andrew Mango, "*Atatürk and the Kurds*," Middle Eastern Studies, Vol. 35, No. 4 (October, 1999), 6.

strength among the Turks and Kurds could be seen in the Sivas Congress during September of 1919. This Congress established the need to secure the territorial integrity of the nation by preventing the establishment of Greek and Armenian states. Additionally, the Congress stated that those who represented Islam in the territories were brothers and that all of these people exhibited respect and a willingness to make sacrifices for one another<sup>46</sup>.

Following the signing of the Mudros Armistice, the Allied forces occupied Istanbul during October of 1918. At this time, the Kurdish leadership was under the impression that they could obtain a portion of the fractured Ottoman Empire through the assistance of the British forces. In this context, the rise for Kurdish Independence was instigated and revolts began through many regions that were heavily populated by the Kurdish following the Turkish Republic foundation. Between 1919 and 1921, the Kurdish tribes initiated 4 major rebellions namely: Cemil, Milli, Çeto and Koçgiri rebellions. Even though these rebellions were eventually quelled, the threat posed by this rebellions got the attention of Ataturk and his followers<sup>47</sup>.

Much debate exists on whether Ataturk considered issuing Kurdish autonomy or not following these rebellions. It is illustrated by Stanford Shaw that Ataturk suggested this idea at the Izmit Press Conference in January of 1923. However, this report was removed from publication reporting on this conference. Additionally, he claims that the Grand National Assembly and Ataturk agreed to autonomy for the Kurdish during a speech given in February and July of 1922. Mango also states that this speech issued at the Press Conference gives clues to the intention of Ataturk to grant autonomy to the Kurds. The essential elements of the speech are given as follows: Therefore, where a population of Kurds exists within a district, the power of governance shall be given to them autonomously. Besides this, when people speak of Turkey, they should also speak of the Kurds. Currently, the Grand National Assembly of Turkey is composed of representatives

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

of both Turks and Kurds, as these two groups are joined in common cause and fate<sup>48</sup>.

This perspective towards the Kurds was also reflected within the Lausanne Treaty in Article 28-43 on July 24<sup>th</sup> 1923. The Articles state that restrictions shall not be imposed upon the language of any Turkish national through religion, commerce, press or publication in private or public. Additionally, the Article 39-5 states that the citizens have the right to use other languages besides Turkish in court<sup>49</sup>.

Ataturk's perspective towards various ethnicities and character of the Turkish people as well as the integrity of the ethnicities living together and the establishment of Kurdish independent governance can be seen throughout many of his speeches up until the year of 1923. The committee meetings for establishing a new constitution however, did not mention the issues of local governance. The issues related to Kurdish self-governance were thrown out of discussion. Suna Kili explains that little mention of the administration of the provinces was made concerning the Constitution<sup>50</sup>.

Mango observed the causes for Ataturk's back step in vision in terms of the autonomy of the Kurdish people. He states that it was necessary for Ataturk to exercise absolute power in order to establish a modern, secular Republic. In this context, any deviation from this power would lead to the failure of Ataturk's plan to establish a contemporary Republic from the Ottoman Empire's remains. Ataturk stated that sovereignty which relies on weapons should only exist temporarily during times of upheaval. This period therefore was appropriate for this action. Many rivals existed in the country for Ataturk including a liberal opposition which incorporated a multi-party political system following the fall of the Greeks, the people who actually participated in the battles but regretted the

---

<sup>48</sup> Stanford Shaw, *From Empire to Republic*, vol. 2 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2000), 385

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Andrew Mango, "Atatürk and Kurds", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (October 1999), 6

removal of the Caliphate and the rivalries that existed between Ataturk's colleagues<sup>51</sup>.

The Sheikh Sait uprising occurred when the CHP was challenged by a strong voice. The rebellion occurred for a variety of reasons including as a reaction to the newly established centralized form of government, the increasing nationalism of the Kurdish population, and the departure from the support for the Kurdish nationalism movements. Due to the common ground between these opposing entities included salvaging the Caliphate, Ataturk's ideas ultimately led to a strong division between those concerned with the National Liberation War. Many attempts were made to quell the Kurdish uprising, and in March of 1925, Martial Law was issued in the region which allotted powers to the government to take action against opposition. In this period, it was important for Ataturk to stop any rebellions based on ethnicity claims and therefore all measures were taken to prevent these rebellions<sup>52</sup>.

The ultimate goal of Ataturk was to establish a consciousness based on citizenship as opposed to religion. As was true in the case of Turkey, when a nation is established, the conventional ways of government should be discarded to operate amongst other nations. Therefore, Ataturk established the foundation of Turkey along with the political development of the country<sup>53</sup>.

The single party system of the 1930s begins to show signs of success, and Turkey was becoming more modern. In addition to the society at large, the population of Kurds had particularly become more aware of their ethnic heritage and became a political entity. From 1950 to 1960, the Democrat Party rules and adopted many liberal policies. The result of this liberal approach led to a relaxation of the policies implemented during the period of the single party. The rule of the Democratic Party began to introduce a more liberal time for Turkey regarding politics and the economy. This resulted in a significant opportunity for the

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

Kurdish population to state their positions. The military coup of 1960 had little or no effect on the liberal policies of the time and even though the military led country attempted to incorporate Kurdish names for towns along with the Turkish names, the constitution of 1961 exhibited liberal characteristics which safeguarded basic human rights including freedom of association and speech<sup>54</sup>.

After the 60s, the existence of Kurdish ethnicity had become more obvious and apparent. In 1961 elections, the New Turkey Party (YTP) pulled 30% of the eastern votes in Turkey and this party was consisting of the important persons of Eastern cities. Workers Party of Turkey, having a Marxist programme, was the official political party in Turkey which firstly accepted Kurdish existence in the East of Turkey<sup>55</sup>.

In general, Kurdish people in the East of Turkey were in collaboration with Marxist and socialist movements and political parties since such unities and parties recognized their conditions and actuality. In addition to this, such unities and parties were accusing the capitalist movements in the country, which were disagreeing with the existence of Kurdish ethnicity and were seen as the reason for financial failures in the East of Turkey. This motivation of Kurdish people caused to the rise of socialist and separationist unities throughout the 70s. Among such groups, the most notable one was the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK). In 1977, the party held the first official meeting at Diyarbakır. The operations of this party were stopped because of the military coup in 1980. However, they continued to conduct several activities after 1984<sup>56</sup>.

---

<sup>54</sup> Suna Kili, *Assembly Debates on the Constitutions of 1924 and 1961* (İstanbul. Robert College Research Center, 1971), 60.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> Henri J. Barkey and Graham E. Fuller, "Turkey's Kurdish Question: Critical Turning Points and Missed Opportunities," *Middle East Journal*, 51:1 (1997), 64-5

### 3.1.2 Period of Post – Military Coup of 1980

Kurdish people became more active and apparent after 1960s and it was in 1980 when the coup d'état occurred in Turkey. The target of this new movement was to set Kemalist ideology in the nation as the army comprehend it. Barkey and Fuller stated that military coup which seized control at the beginning of 80's adopted highly aggressive and restraining actions against Kurdish people. The notables of the military coup stressed the unity and consistency of Turkey and paid attention to the Turkishness. Besides, the constitution which was put into force after this coup was stressing a hard opposition towards Kurdish groups. In the Article no. 26, it is forbidden to use any minority languages, which were banned by law, to voice and explain ideologies and thoughts. Afterwards, a new law that bans the practice of Kurdish language was legislated. According to the Article 134, Turkish Language Society and Turkish History Society were institutionalized again<sup>57</sup>. During this period, there were rumors among people that the language used by Kurdish people is fictitious; the predecessors of Turkish and Kurdish people are the same. However, such precautions were not enough to remove the crystallization of Kurdish people<sup>58</sup>.

In the beginning of 1990s, the tight control on the Kurdish matter had become more flexible. When Turgut Özal was the president, highly significant happenings occurred. During his presidency, he stated his Kurdish backgrounds and preferred to adopt more generous policies towards Kurdish society and he tried to improve the relations between political parties. Turgut Özal had epochal ideas in the beginning of 90s, including the integration of Kurdish language in the education and providing Kurdish people the right to hold an electronic media in Kurdish language. As a result, the prohibition on Kurdish language was put an end in 1991. Afterwards, Süleyman Demirel, the Prime Minister, stated his recognition

---

<sup>57</sup> 1982 Constitution of the Republic of Turkey.

<sup>58</sup> Henri J. Barkey and Graham E. Fuller, "Turkey's Kurdish Question: Critical Turning Points and Missed Opportunities," *Middle East Journal*, 51:1 (1997), 64-5

of Kurdish ethnicity. However, these somewhat helpful actions had stopped as Turgut Özal died in 17th of April 1993 when he was still the President of Turkey. Subsequently, Süleyman Demirel became the President after the elections in Parliament and Tansu Çiller was elected as the Party Leader, thus the Prime Minister. Süleyman Demirel, as a President, started to decline Kurdish reality in Turkey, although he recognized this case before. On the other hand, Tansu Çiller was incompetent about politics and had expertise on financial issues. Therefore, the policies of Turkish government against the Kurdish had become stricter which was a kind of reaction to the increasing military activities in the East of Turkey<sup>59</sup>.

Situation of Kurds in Iraq got relatively better and Kurdish people in Turkey fancied their autonomy. As a result, the hateful disagreement between Turkish Military and Kurdistan Workers' Party became more obvious. This disagreement reflected in the politics in 1994. The Democracy of People Party (HADEP), having Kurdish supporters, was banned and eight members of the parliament were put in prison. So, the expectations about the compromise were disappeared<sup>60</sup>.

## **3.2 The Alevi Question**

### **3.2.1 Origins**

Throughout the history, Alevi people have always maintained a low profile in Turkey, despite this community has not recognized as a creed beginning from the declaration of independence in Turkey. The main reason behind this approach was the laic-secular roots of Kemalist ideology which denied the Caliphate and being against the theocratic practices. As Bodrogi stated, these people were thinking that the state does not include religious activities in its political issues and this is the reason why they are not recognized as the government diminished Sunni acts and practices in a radical way<sup>61</sup>.

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61</sup> Krizstina Kehl – Bodrogi, *Syncretistic Religious Communities in the Near East*, (New York: Brill:

During the Ottoman Empire, the most ignored people were the Alevis. Beginning from the 16<sup>th</sup> century, many Alevis either left the country or isolated themselves from the society. This situation continued until the Independence War. Mustafa Kemal's efforts to protect the country were highly welcomed by the Alevis since they wanted that the Independence War will destroy totalitarianism in the Ottoman Empire. Alternatively, Mustafa Kemal realized the effectiveness and established nature of Alevi community and it could be useful for him to use these features in the Independence War. In 1919, Mustafa Kemal and his company met with Hacibektaş Dervish Lodge to talk about the war of independence and gain their support in terms of finance and politics. In this alliance, Çelebi Cemalettin Efendi, chief of the lodge, was notified immediately about the developments in the war of independence and Turkey. This chain of information was also noted by Mustafa Kemal in his speech named "Nutuk" as the state notified all communities including Alevis about the secular essence of Kemalist ideology which refuses Caliphate and does not accept theocratic regimes. As Bodrogi stated, these people were thinking that the state does not include religious activities in its political issues and this is the reason why they are not recognized as the government diminished Sunni acts and practices in a radical way. According to Van Bruinessen, Alevis with Kurdish identity has never made cooperation with Sunni Kurds<sup>62</sup>.

From the beginning of 60s and throughout the 70s, the world had experienced modernism, urbanization and dispersal in politics. Alevi youth were isolated for years and they entered the politics in the left wing with opposing groups. They started to be influenced by Marxist ideas. During this period, Alevi people were started to define themselves with Marxist ideologies by various means such as the specific moustache types and they changed their focus from Alevi issues to class conflict and revolution. In these years, Alevis were in close cooperation with leftist groups. On the other hand, Sunni people were supporting the right wing.

---

1997), xii.  
<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

These cases caused intensification of struggles between two communities and as a result blood was shed in various fights in Maraş, Malatya and Çorum<sup>63</sup>.

On the contrary, the ideas of Alevi youth as mentioned above did not apply in politics; as a result, the identity of Alevi people was displaced by leftist and Marxist ideology. According to many people living in this period, disappearance of this identity was just a matter of time. There were some efforts to revive this identity back this was an empty attempt. In 1996, a group of Alevis established the Union Party of Turkey, but it was never able to gain voice in the parliament and could not be effective in terms of politics<sup>64</sup>.

### **3.2.1 Period of Post – Military Coup of 1980**

One of the consequences of the military coup in 1980 was the end of gentle attitude of Alevi community. Alevi people decided to promote and not raise their voice against Turkey with Kemalist ideology on the condition that the state does not include religious acts in politics. This balance which was maintained by Alevi community for years was destroyed by the coup in 1980 and the activities occurred after the coup<sup>65</sup>.

After the coup, the state was started to be governed by Islamist ideas and this was a big disturbance for the Alevi. Alevi people were against the Islamist movements because of their past experiences during the Ottoman Empire. Such Islamist activities meant the politicization of Alevis. According to Çamuroğlu, Alevi acts in various areas such as media and politics were the consequences of protective nature of Alevi people and they did not agree with the Islamic actions in the state. In this issue, Ahmad stated the impact and effect of Islamic ideas on politics and public in Turkey as they were highly increased after the military coup<sup>66</sup>.

---

<sup>63</sup>www.alevibektasi.org.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> Reha Çamuroğlu, “Some Notes on the Contemporary Process of Restructuring Alevilik in Turkey,” in

Syncretistic Religious Communities in the Near East (New York: Brill, 1997), 25.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

The nature of military coup in 1980 was to create a Turkish-Islamic movement in the country. With this idea, the military tried to remove leftist and Marxist ideas in the country which had high influence on the youth during these times. In this context, the military aimed to use Islam as a tool to fight with leftist and revolutionary ideas. The main reason behind using Islam in this way is that it was supported by high numbers of people<sup>67</sup>.

To support this movement, the state put religious courses in the high school curriculum, increased the power of Directorate of Religious Affairs, and established many mosques all around the country and Sunni people were started to have tasks in high offices. Thus, these strategies were continued after the coup when civilian governments gained power. This strategy can be seen in various aspects. For example, Arabic was integrated in high schools in Turkey as a foreign language, small mosque were established in the government buildings and a law came into force which forbidding offensive activities against the prophet, Islam and various Islamic figures<sup>68</sup>.

From that time forward, the government attitude against the Alevi community has always been the same. According to the Directorate of Religious Affairs, it is not a creed but a culture which was formed in Islam. Also, the directorate was inviting this community to the mosques. Considered as having more cultural prosperity than the mosques, Cemevi is the place of praying of the Alevis. On the other hand, some hidebounds were even stating Alevi community as separatist as PKK<sup>69</sup>.

---

<sup>67</sup> Martin Van Bruinessen, "Kurds, Turks and the Alevi Revival in Turkey," Middle East Report, July –

September (1996), 8

<sup>68</sup> Feroz Ahmad, "Islamic Reassertion in turkey", Third World Quarterly, 10:2 (1988), 763.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

### 3.3 Military Forces and Politics

#### 3.3.1 Origins

Beginning from the Ottoman Empire, the politics in Turkey have always been interfered by the military and this situation continued even after the end of the Empire. In 1909, Young Turks coalition, aiming the reformation of the Empire, was founded and the officers having duties in the Ottoman Empire joined the Independence War. In the first years of counteraction, military had played an important role. During these years, many of commanders in the military were also members of the parliament. However, Mustafa Kemal was against the intervention of army in political issues. He could be the main figure of the independence of Turkey, but the independence was not only brought by his sole efforts; many organizations and people included in this resistance. During these times, there were breaks among individuals and such breaks caused significant conflicts after the war<sup>70</sup>. As William Hale stated, the main problems that Mustafa Kemal had to solve after the war were caused by politicians and military officers of Ankara. In the first place, Mustafa Kemal gave permission to his associates to have power in the parliament during the war. However, he later banned them to have duties in both military and government. The main reason underlying this ban and efforts to separate the line between politics and army was his competitors in the military. Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Kazım Karabekir, Refet Bele and Cafer Eğilmez were high ranked military officers and they were a threat against his dominance in the country. These officers were very powerful and their opposition could not be ignored in these times. Therefore, Mustafa Kemal assigned them in various military tasks in Anatolia<sup>71</sup>.

In a short time, Ataturk introduced various laws in order to separate military officers from political issues. In 1923, Turkish Grand National Assembly passed a

---

<sup>70</sup> Tim Jacoby, "For the People, of the People and By the Military: The Regime Structure of Modern

Turkey," *Political Studies*, vol. 51 (2003), p. 673.

<sup>71</sup> William Hale, *Turkish Politics and the Military* (London: Routledge, 1994), 66-7.

new law. According to this law, commanders were not allowed to have voice in the sessions of the Assembly as long as they keep their duties in the military. Eventually, the law gave the Grand National Assembly the power of rule. As a result, the government was placed above the military in terms of political issues. In 1924, the President became responsible for the Chief of General Staff and excluded from the cabinet. Afterwards, this law was supported by the Military Penal Code which forbid military officers in various political activities such as having place in parties, organizing political sessions, addressing political speeches and making statements in the media about political issues<sup>72</sup>.

Besides the opposition of various military officers for Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, there were various motivations behind these precautions such as Atatürk's ideas which stated that it is not possible for the military officers to use their energy in both politics and military at the same time. According to his beliefs, military officers should pay attention to their judgments free from politics and this can only be achieved by not involving in government issues. Political issues were handled by many civil officers and they should not be intervened. For this reason, it was not the task of military officials to give speech and involve in politics<sup>73</sup>.

On the other hand, some of the statements made by Mustafa Kemal about the power of military were found unclear. His statements in 1931 issued in Army Club can be shown as an example. During his speech, he showed his support for young military officials to protect the country by defining the army as the leader of country to protect against the anti republican forces. In this speech, he also stated that the army as the most important place to be recognized at first during hard times and as the main element of country to make the ideals come true. In addition to this, according to the Army Internal Service Law, military is responsible to protect the nation and the republic since it is defined in the Constitution of the Republic. Despite this confusing atmosphere about the role of military, the army did not involve in politics until 1960 after the efforts of

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

dominant figure of Mustafa Kemal and gentle vision of Chief of the General Staff Fevzi Çakmak, who supported Atatürk's ideas about army<sup>74</sup>.

The conditions became different in 50s. After the elections, DP came into power as a result of its benefits and offers to the individuals in the agriculture industry. The party obtained most part of the votes from people engaged in agriculture. The main problems of Turkey in the 1950s were high inflation and low wages of the public industry which caused the removal of connection and cooperation between military and civilian authorities. As a result, military officers were offended and they were angry about this situation. On the other hand, this was not the only reason behind the army's anger to take the nation over, according to Szyliowicz. He states that the government forced army to follow a strict socialization program which harmed the nature of army and as a result of this program; the army felt the pressure of Kemalist ideas. The military coup occurred, as a result of this anger. The reasons were authoritarian attitude of DP officers, religious activities of the political party in the politics including the permission to the *tarikats* acts, establishing high numbers of mosques and enacting the use of Arabic in call to prayer<sup>75</sup>.

Afterwards, the army did not establish the junta. CHP obtained many positions in the assembly with the rule of military. Important figures in the military were assigned to several positions. Eventually, the state was started to be governed by the CHP. Officers who made the coup acted quickly in terms of giving the authority to the civilians. Hence, the new constitution was made and the elections were made after one year of the coup. The Constitution introduced in 1961 and has been accepted as more liberal since it paid attention to the labor rights, free enterprises and right to speak in politics. On the other hand, the National Security

---

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> Kemal Karpaz, "Military Interventions: Army-Civilian Relations in Turkey Before and After 1980," in Metin Heper and Ahmet Evin (eds.), *State, Democracy and the Military Turkey in the 1980s* (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 139.

Council was firstly introduced with this Constitution and it still influences the agenda of Turkey<sup>76</sup>.

In order to strengthen the rule of military in the state, various measures were taken by the coup-makers. Firstly, National Security Council was founded and its authorities were defined in the Article 111 of the Constitution. According to the law and decisions of defined military officers, the number of ministers to be joined the Council was assigned. It was the authority of the Council to state its ideas to the Parliament with the aim of joining the decisions taken by the government. Also, the authorities of the National Unity Committee were specified as the permanent members of the Senate, according to the Constitution. In fact, the army had experienced some breaks between its officers regarding the form of the coup. According to many low ranked officers, the coup should be a longstanding military power in terms of governing. On the other hand, high ranked officers decided to clean the country from illegitimate acts and gave up the rule to civilians. The coup was made as the high ranked officers decided. As a result, radicals were forced to abandon their positions in the National Unity Committee and they were exiled. Alparslan Türkeş was among the officers who turn back to the country in 1963. Then he was included in Republican Peasants' Nation Party. This political party was called later as the Nationalist Action Party. It was mainly supported by rightist individuals with extreme nationalist ideas to protect the country from leftist and Marxist ideologies which were increased in the universities and labor unions<sup>77</sup>.

In the late 1960s, the above mentioned two groups experienced bloody fights considering the politics. There were eight political parties in the Parliament which caused the destruction of legislation. For this reason, the military intervention occurred in 1971 by the National Security Council. The aim of the military was to

---

<sup>76</sup> Joseph S. Szyliowicz, "Elites and Modernization in Turkey," in Frank Tachau (ed.) Political Elites

and Political Development in the Middle East (New York: Wiley, 1975).

<sup>77</sup> Ergun Özbudun, Contemporary Turkish Politics: Challenges to Democratic Consolidation (London:

Boulder and Lynne Reinner Publishers, 2000).

make political parties understand that the nation is above them and they had to take important measures in order to stop this conflict in the Parliament. Consequently, Süleyman Demirel, the Prime Minister, left his position and the army formed a government and Nihat Erim was elected as Prime Minister<sup>78</sup>.

This coup gave more powers to the military in terms of politics since an Article was added to the Constitution which enlarges the role of National Security Council. Various words in the Constitution were changed such as “submit” to “recommend”, “force representatives” to “force commanders”. Therefore, the abovementioned institution became more powerful in judicial and political issues. In addition to such actions of the army, the power and rights of military courts became more active than before. Eventually, the State Security Courts were founded in order to handle the cases regarding the protection and defense of the regime<sup>79</sup>.

### **3.3.2 The Military Coup of 1980**

The coup occurred in 1980 had the similar reasons as the coup in 1971. Generals were angry about the financial conditions in the country and several conflicts which were break out to destroy secularism. Main polarization parties were Nationalist Action Party, National Salvation Party and various communist organizations. The military intervention broke out because of the problems occurred in Konya during the rally of NSP. In this rally, most of the participants did not stand up during the national anthem and this was against the nature of the Republic<sup>80</sup>.

In reality, there were different consequences between this coup and the ones before in terms of actions taken during the coup and afterwards. Firstly, military

---

<sup>78</sup> George Harris, *Turkey: Coping with Crisis* (Boulder: Westview press, 1985).

<sup>79</sup> Ergun Özbudun, *Contemporary Turkish Politics: Challenges to Democratic Consolidation* (London: Boulder and Lynne Reinner Publishers, 2000).

<sup>80</sup> Metin Heper, *The State Tradition in Turkey* (Walkington: The Eothen Press, 1985).

was not together with the CHP. The memorandum made after the 1971 intervention caused the removal of links between CHP and the army. After İsmet İnönü's death, Bülent Ecevit was selected as the chairman of this political party in 1972. Therefore, the program of the party had mostly changed. In his leadership, Ecevit followed various policies considering the nationalist ideas which were not agreed by the military. For this reason, this coup did not happen with the support of CHP<sup>81</sup>.

The military intervention made in 1980 offered more powers to the military. Firstly, some arrangements made about the structure of military juntas, according to the same article, definition the authorities and foundation of National Security Council were broadened. Moreover, the numbers of military and non-military individuals in the Council were balanced. The President, Prime Minister, National Defense minister, Interior Affairs and Foreign Affairs were the civilian authorities of the National Security Committee. Besides, the Council of Ministers had to pay attention to the introductions and statements of the National Security Committee with the priority. Also, the army extended its power and role with an accompanied law. The Law no. 2945 on the National Security Council defined the national security and its features in an extended way. In this law, the features of national security were listed as follows; protection of the constitutional system, politics, social life, culture and finance of the nation in global sense and defense the integrity in the country<sup>82</sup>.

The Law no. 1402 on the State of Emergency was adjusted in the same year of the coup to give privilege to military commission members. Thus, civilian courts were made unable to make appeal to the decisions of military. In this law, the big differences between the military and Bülent Ecevit in terms of ideas can be seen

---

<sup>81</sup> Kemal Karpat, "Military Interventions: Army-Civilian Relations in Turkey Before and After 1980,"

in Metin Heper and Ahmet Evin (eds.), *State, Democracy and the Military Turkey in the 1980s* (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 139.

<sup>82</sup> Ergun Özbudun, *Contemporary Turkish Politics: Challenges to Democratic Consolidation* (London: Boulder and Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2000).

because of this law was enacted as a reaction to coordinate structure proposed by him which forced the military to get approval from the government after decisions given by martial officers<sup>83</sup>.

Another incident that could be regarded as uncommon was General Kenan Evren was elected as President in the referendum. In this referendum, if one voted yes for the constitution, it counted as a yes for his presidency. Turkish citizens were disgusted with bloody conflicts in the country and voted for the Constitution, which intentionally led to the presidency of Kenan Evren. In his presidency, two establishments were founded; High Board of Supervision and the Higher Education Council. These two institutions had been considered as the most domineering acts of the military in this coup. High Board of Supervision was an institution established in order to monitor and inspect public institutions and to have an eye on their ideological relations. The Higher Education Council was founded with the aim of arranging appointments, higher positions and activities of universities in Turkey. Considering these two establishments, the military was trying to impose a strict control in the nation<sup>84</sup>. Furthermore, political leaders at the time of the military coup were banned from performing political acts for the period of 10 years. This ban was abolished in 1987 by Turgut Özal who was the Prime Minister at the time. .

Turgut Özal became Prime Minister in 1983. He shared the executive power with the President, Kenan Evren, who was responsible for the security and foreign affairs and Prime Minister had the authority in economic and financial issues<sup>85</sup>. Term of office for Kenan Evren ended in 1989 and Turgut Özal was elected as the President. His government style was kind of different in various aspects and this fact led to crises between the government and army. The army resentment became apparent after Turkey joined the Gulf War. To Özal, this war was a chance to cooperate with the West and take advantage from the new world order after the Cold War. Eventually, Necip Toruntay, the Chief of General Staff, gave up from

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

<sup>84</sup> Metin Heper, *The State Tradition in Turkey* (Walkington: The Eothen Press, 1985).

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

his position. Actually, he was against Özal's ideas to join the war. According to several critics, this resignation was an important element which may lead to advancements in Turkey in terms of politics. According to Hale and her colleagues, in the past, if a chief was against the acts of government, the only way to solve this issue was the military coup. This time, however, the chief resigned because of a conflict between the government and the military on a security issue, which is naturally a power area of army in Turkey<sup>86</sup>.

On the other hand, such ideas were not more than hopes since the Welfare Party came into the power in 1996. At first, the military did not intervene in politics and decided to wait the upcoming events. But, according to various reports, the government was trying to change Turkey back to the *Shari'a*. The political party was highly assigning its followers in government institutions. In addition to this, religious activities in Turkey such as the increase in the number of prayer leaders, religious schools and illegal courses panicked the National Security Committee<sup>87</sup>. Necmettin Erbakan who was the leader of Welfare Party and also Prime Minister of Turkey, organized a dinner for the notables of religious organizations in the country and this was considered as the spark of new political crisis in the nation. Süleyman Demirel, the President, made efforts to address this issue in the National Security Committee meeting. In the middle of 1997, Supreme Military Council sacked various sympathizers of Political Islam. The conflict between the government and the army brought to an end after the resignation of Erbakan in June, 1997. Süleyman Demirel authorized Mesut Yılmaz, chairman of the Motherland Party, to develop the new cabinet<sup>88</sup>.

---

<sup>86</sup> Gülistan Gürbey, "Özal Dönemi Dış Politikası", in Devlet ve Siyaset Adamı Turgut Özal (İstanbul, 20 Mayıs Eğitim, Kültür ve Sosyal Dayanışma Vakfı, 1996).

<sup>87</sup> Ahmet Evin, "Demilitarization and Civilization of the Regime," in *Politics in the Third Turkish Republic*, eds. Metin Heper and Ahmet Evin (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994).

<sup>88</sup> Metin Heper and Aylin Güney, "The Military and Consolidation of Democracy: The Recent Turkish Experience," *Armed Forces & Society*, 26: 4 (2000).

### 3.4 Sovereignty and Its Challenges

During the national struggle, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk was the only responsible for foreign affairs. In all cases, he rejected the idea of English or US mandate originating from the public and officers of Anatolia and Rumeli Defense of Rights Organisation. This organization was the backbone of the struggle. Main elements of foreign issues in this period were outlined in Erzurum Congress, which held in July, 1919 and Sivas Congress in September, 1919. They were the opposition towards giving in, division and mandate<sup>89</sup>.

Vali states the basic objectives of Turkey in its foreign affairs that Turkey was well aware and had high desire to have independence due to its geography which experienced various wars in the past and its isolation among the world's leading countries and also Turkey was the most sensitive country in the world in terms of its freedom and sovereignty<sup>90</sup>.

In the first years of the Republic, the foreign policy was defined with some basic key terms such as "friendship with every nation" and the idea was Turkey has no permanent enemies. In Ataturk's words, the main principle in the policy was "peace at home, peace at abroad". On the other hand, one of the main features of the policy at these times was westernization. To Mustafa Kemal and his associates, the only way to achieve civilization in the nation was westernization. With this ideology, they were actively making efforts to become a part of the West<sup>91</sup>.

After the declaration of independence, Turkey government tried to keep independence and dominance alive as well as adopting to the Western ideas. However, the public was full of prejudice about the Europe and the West, although there were other issues to be solved. Afterwards, this prejudice changed

---

<sup>89</sup> Metin Heper, *The State Tradition in Turkey* (Walkington: The Eothen Press, 1985).

<sup>90</sup> Ferenc A. Vali, *Bridge Across the Bosphorus* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1971).

<sup>91</sup> Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (Montreal, 1964).

as the assurance to the Western institutions after the World War II since the Soviet authorities were not in favor of Turkey and it was a threat in the Eastern borders of Turkey.

### **3.4.1 The Lausanne Peace Treaty**

The Lausanne Peace Treaty led to the noble glory of national struggle in Turkey in 1923. Before the commencement of the Conference, İnönü gave a speech. In his speech, he stressed the demands of Turkish government which were the recognition and acceptance of Turkey as a state with freedom and sovereignty and giving the right which were granted to other countries attending the conference. The capitulations were the main problem in the conference since the allied forced wanted them to continue but Turkish side had ignored and rejected this issue as a part of national struggle. Eventually, Turkish side had the capitulations abolished. The dispute between Turkey and Greece about the compensation, the agreement on the Dardanelles and Bosphorus issue and acceptance of the borders of Turkey defined after the National Pact. On the other hand, many serious issues were ongoing and they caused several problems in the upcoming years, including the Mosul issue, exchange of populations in between Greece and Turkey and the debts inherited from the Ottoman Empire<sup>92</sup>.

The Treaty was highly important for Atatürk and for his ideas on sovereignty since the problems related to the Dardanelles and Bosphorus could have endangered independence. With this treaty, Turkey gained its independence. However, the sovereignty was restricted by the above mentioned issues. The solution was found eventually as the matters related the Dardanelles and Bosphorus would be left to an international committee which was established under the Leagues of Nations. If the agreed terms were broken, Britain, France, Italy and Japan could intervene<sup>93</sup>. For this reason, it is possible to say that Atatürk

---

<sup>92</sup> Mehmet Gönlübol, *Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası* (Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 1996).

<sup>93</sup> Seha L. Meray, *Lozan Barış Konferansları: Tutanaklar, Belgeler* (Ankara: Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1972).

and İsmet İnönü, the chief of Turkish side in the conference, restricted the sovereignty to have independence and freedom in many aspects.

### **3.4.2 League of Nations and Membership of Turkey**

In the course of the Treaty of Lausanne, two main and serious challenges existed; exchange of populations and the Mosul issue. These problems were not solved completely. For this reason, a common committee was established in order to resolve the exchange of populations and the individuals forming this committee were assigned by the League of Nations. On the other hand, the Mosul issue came to a dead end since it was decided to be settled in the upcoming months. Unfortunately, the doubts of Turkish side about the fairness of this commission became true after they declared their ideas about the minority conflict in the League of Nations. The head of the Turkish side stated Turkey as not included in the League and it is not adequate to discuss the case in the League. Turkish delegation made efforts to prevent the involvement of the League but it was agreed that the League of Nations will be the body which will solve the problem. On the other hand, Turkish side and the public had intensive doubts about the fairness of this organization and it was thought that this was a mean of the allied forces to impose their decisions<sup>94</sup>.

Such doubts about the fairness of the League were supported in the Mosul issue. For the Turkish delegation, this problem was too sensitive and it was impossible to be settled during the conference. However, it was concluded that the League of Nations was selected as the authority for the settlement, in case that it could not be resolved by British and Turkish delegations after nine months of the Lausanne Treaty. Since this issue could not be reached an end in Lausanne, the League of Nations became the authority to decide on the problem. However, there was a serious dispute in between Turkey and the League of Nations regarding the rule of the League which will be the final agreement. In Turkish side, there were

---

<sup>94</sup> Yücel Güçlü, "Turkey's Entrance into the League of Nations," Middle Eastern Studies, 39:1 (January, 2003.)

increasing arguments that the Mosul question was a part of politics and it could be inappropriate to settle this case by legal authorities. Moreover, the League stated that they are the ruling organization according to the Treaty, if the case could not reach a settlement between two parties. As a result of this dispute, Turkish side withdrew its officers in the conference. Therefore, the League announced its decision in 1925 regarding the grant Mosul to Iraq<sup>95</sup>.

In this context, the world was waiting for Turkey to react in this decision which was taken without the presence of Turkey. It was very interesting that Turkish side reached a consensus on define its borders as defined by British delegation. The main motivation underlying this decision was the longstanding conflicts on this issue. After these events, Turkish government reached an agreement to involve in the League of Nations. This decision was taken in 1932 and there were many reasons for it, in spite of the existence of a serious problem within the country. Throughout the 20s, Turkish government tried to apply collective security policy in the nation. This newly decided policy had the potential of defining the global politics since it could be considered as a part of international approach. The only motivation behind this policy was Mustafa Kemal's consistent approach of globalization by adopting Western ideas. As Turkey joined the League, it was considered as the break of isolation of Turkey and that was a step for Turkey to become as a sovereign state in the face of Western States.

In the 30s, the world felt the pressure of fascist movements and problematic conflicts. The resistance to the Spanish Civil War was supported by Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin in military and political ways. Also, the tension between them increased as a result of a sinking ship by Italians which was belonging to the Spanish in Turkish seas. As a reaction to this issue, Mediterranean countries organized a meeting in order to reach an agreement about security issues in the region. In this meeting, the Turkish side was acted in line with the directions of Mustafa Kemal and according to his statements; the delegation gave permission to the French and British governments to use naval bases in Turkey in the clash

---

<sup>95</sup> Baskın Oran, *Türk Dış Politikası*, vol. 1 (İstanbul: İletişim, 2001).

against the Italian attack. Therefore, it can be said that this decision reflected Turkey's cooperative security policy in the international arena. Italy in 1932 was a serious threat for the Dodecanese Islands which were very close to the Anatolia. This case made the Turkish side feel more insecure and as a result, they wanted to fight with this threat collectively<sup>96</sup>.

Afterwards, the World War II broke out and that was a big problem for Turkey in terms of its policies. As a result, the policy makers decided to maintain an impartiality policy that led to many achievements thanks to conjuncture during these times. Although there were some pressures to make Turkey included in the war, Turkey was neutral. However, the government declared war against Germany in the last months of the war with the sole aim of obtaining approval of San Francisco Conference for being an essential member<sup>97</sup>.

The WWII and the following Cold War led to the foundation of security cooperation and political groups among countries. With its high importance and important powers, NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) was established as a result of these events in the world. The European countries were feeling the need of cooperation in many areas to protect themselves from the serious threats and so, Turkey align with these cooperative organizations because of its westernization policy. These were the reasons behind Turkey's decision to become a NATO member. Turkey felt the post-war pressures mostly from the Soviet Union as they wanted Turkey to revise the Montreux Convention which granted Turkey the sovereignty on the Straits. The Soviet side was issuing their desire for cooperative action in the Straits. On the other hand, Turkey was totally against this idea. Apart from the security reasons, the US assistance to the NATO members was a considerable issue for Turkey. According to Karaosmanoğlu, Turkey was determined to join NATO mainly because of favoring Western ideas

---

<sup>96</sup> Yücel Güçlü, "Turkey's Entrance into the League of Nations," *Middle Eastern Studies*, 39:1 (January, 2003.)

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

and the principles in the European countries. For these reasons, Turkey submitted its application to become a NATO member in 1950; however, it was rejected<sup>98</sup>.

The idea of NATO membership experienced the same challenges as it is in the idea of EU membership today. Turkey was located in an insecure position in the world. Because of its geographical position, Turkey was not considered as Atlantic. The dominating religion in the country was Sunni Islam. These three were the reasons for rejection. Therefore, the community decided to grant Turkey partnership status rather than membership. In the course of these events, the Korean War broke out. This war, later, became a key element for Turkey to obtain NATO membership and it was a chance for the nation to show its determination about cooperative security. Turkey mobilized about 4.500 soldiers to the war. This was the third highest in number after the US and South Korea<sup>99</sup>.

### **3.4.3 Turkey – EU Relations and the Challenges on Sovereignty**

The relations between Turkey and EU have always been an important issue for Turkey as the nation pays high attention to its sovereignty. In these relations, both parties have experienced main defining moment in their histories. These are as follows; the Ankara Agreement, Customs Union Agreement and Turkey's application in 1987 for being a full member.

In 1959, Turkey applied to the EEC which was the application made after Greece. In fact, Turkey applied with the sole aim of westernization as the government was trying to become connected with the Western organizations. On the other hand, the government of Turkey was trying to stop Greece to join such organizations. As a result of this application, the Ankara Agreement made between two parties in 1963. During the course of agreement, Turkish side did not want to make an

---

<sup>98</sup> Feroz Ahmad, "The Historical Background of Turkey's Foreign Policy," in Lenore G. Martin and

Dimitris Keridis (eds.) *The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2004).

<sup>99</sup> Ferenc A. Vali, *Bridge Across the Bosphorus* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1971).

agreement on free trade since it can be a threat in the future in terms of subordination. One of the basic issues that the government wanted was the prospects of being a full member in the future.

In 1995, Turkish government aligned with the Customs Union in order to force the EU to accept Turkey as a member. In doing so, Turkey has been the only nation which made a Customs Union with European Union without being a member. Thanks to this agreement, Turkey protected and kept its sovereignty alive in foreign markets. The Customs Union meant that Turkey has to adopt the tariff rates defined by the EU and conduct its business activities in accordance with the law enacted by the EU. Thus, Turkey protected its sovereignty and created an opportunity for the possible full membership in the future.

In this paper, Kurdish and Alevi issues created by the imposition of conditions were examined. Moreover, the the position and acts of the army considering the politics in Turkey and restrictions on sovereignty. In this chapter, my aim was to show the split from Kemalist ideas beginning from the military coup in 1980 on specific issues namely Kurdish and Alevi questions and military's involvement in politics. In the final chapter, the issue of how the sovereignty was limited in particular areas before Turkey was approved as a candidate to join the EU. This issue is one of the most important arguments of people with Kemalist ideology as they think that Turkey limited or forced to limit itself according to the wish of the EU in its foreign policies and for this reason, it is not acceptable for Turkey to join the EU. In the next chapter, the orthodox ideas related to the restrictions on sovereignty of Turkey and also main fields that lead to problems between the conditions defined by the EU and understanding of Kemalist ideology.

## CHAPTER IV

### KEMALISM AND NEO-KEMALISM

Edward Shils explains internal and external roots of alterations in ideologies, despite social, systematic and ideological alterations undergo changes very slowly and difficultly and it can only be seen during the course of time. The main factor that causes ideologies to change is the intellectual conceptions. Due to these conceptions, discrepancies and gaps in ideologies are utilized. According to Shils, it is not easy for the world to adapt itself in parallel with the necessities of ideologies. In theory and fact, ideologies cannot revise themselves and it is not possible for people who face the daily facts to adopt themselves to the pressures coming from such ideologies. Although there have been many resistances, ideologies modify themselves or are modified by third parties, lightly or thoroughly<sup>100</sup>.

In the early years of the newly founded Turkey, after the declaration of independence, there had been many attempts, which can be considered as light, to modify or refresh Kemalist ideology, namely ‘Conservative Kemalists’, ‘*Kadrocu* Kemalists’ and ‘Re-constructivist Kemalists’. The Conservative Kemalists were adopting modernism in terms of politics. On the other hand, they had conservative ideas on cultural themes. They supported the separation of religion from politics; however, the religion should be a part of social and national issues in Turkey as it is a longstanding tradition in Turkey. Re-constructivist Kemalists aimed to change the people and cultural elements according to the secular approaches. To do this, they desired to remove all moralities depending on religion. In return, they wanted to develop a class-free society with secular ideas. In this group, an effective and democratic government can be achieved by instructing people with revolutionary and secularist approaches. They made big efforts to create people with secularist

---

<sup>100</sup> Edward Shils, “The Concept and Function of Ideology”, *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 7 and 8 (New York. The Macmillan Company&The Free Press, 1972).

and revolutionary ideas to govern the nation. Therefore, they took the responsibility of inculcating and changing people according to contemporary ideas. In order to accomplish such aims, they changed the names of specific things having religious references. For the re-constructivist Kemalists People's houses were the Temples of Ideal and their Holy Book was Nutuk, the speech delivered by Atatürk<sup>101</sup>. On the other hand, *Kadrocu* Kemalists aimed at establishing an ideology for the non-completed Turkish revolution. *Kadrocu* Kemalists believed society cannot be improved with democracy, individuality or liberalism. They had different sympathy areas than re-constructivists. In terms of desiring for a class-free society, they had similar ideas with re-constructivists. For these reasons, they supported the rule of authoritarianism handled by a single political party. Generally, *Kadrocu* Kemalists expressed their opinions on politics and finance. In its essence, however, they wanted to create a cultural identity since they did not accept the Ottoman identity. For this reasons, they had sympathy for the Central Asia<sup>102</sup>.

Nonetheless, such efforts were not strong and they could not raise among the Kemalist groups. Thus, they did not have extraneous determinants. They do not constitute a binding issue for this analysis. In recent years, the external factor exists in terms of changes in ideologies, as explained by Shils. This is the change caused by the EU and its requirements. People who support civilization in every area also promote being a full member to the EU. On the other hand, orthodox understanding of Kemalist ideology does not suit well with the EU requirements. Eventually, this factor led society to revise their ideas on Orthodox Kemalism. Recently, being a candidate for the EU has been an appropriate extraneous anchor and the most of the society support the idea of EU membership because of its positive outcomes. İlter Turan supposes that if the most part of society wants the extraneous aid for changes in a nation, it is highly to become productive. For this

---

<sup>101</sup> Temuçin Faik Ertan, *Kadrocular ve Kadro Hareketi* (Ankara. T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1994) 117-32.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid.

reason, such organizations should be regarded as aid and reward, not restrictions<sup>103</sup>.

Futhermore, orthodox Kemalists felt the need of revising their ideas in this ideology. Because of the requirements defined by the EU, the society feels the need of revisions in Kemalist ideology and this is a serious and vital issue for orthodox Kemalists. In this chapter, the Orthodox and neo-Kemalist ideas on specific and serious issues which have been disturbed by the EU are examined, namely the Kurdish and Alevi questions, the position of military in politics and the EU candidacy.

#### **4.1 Orthodox Kemalism**

People who support the general understanding of Kemalist ideology belong to this group and this understanding, generally, has become effective in Turkey's policies in the last 50 years. At most, Turkish military defends these views and practices them in. The upcoming examination related to the military behaviors against the some requirements of the EU is depending on notable military officers' statements on several subjects. Uniformity in the trainings of military, semi-private working conditions and authoritarian attitudes coming from the military roots depicts the image of military in the eye of public.

By contrast with the general opinion, the military in Turkey did not adopt and defended Kemalist ideology during the offices of Mustafa Kemal and İsmet İnönü. However, the army actively supported Kemalist ideology after the transition to the multi-party system in Turkey. With this system, pluralism occurred in many parts of the society which disturbed the army. Therefore, they started to pay attention to the Kemalist ideology in military education institutions. First, the army was not content with the religious acts and statements of the Democrat Party. Secondly, leftist ideas and organizations emerged in Turkey

---

<sup>103</sup> Turan, İlter. "The Turkish Political System: Instability and Hurdles," in *Turkey: The Road Ahead?*,

ed. Bertil Dunér. Stockholm: The Swedish Institute of International Affairs, 2002.

during 60s and 70s and this was not acceptable for the army either. As a result, the military increased the amount of courses which are related and dedicated to teach Kemalist ideology in schools. Afterwards, 1980 military coup occurred to introduce and generalize Kemalist ideology as the basis of Republic of Turkey. Mehmet Ali Brand, a Turkish journalist, states that in the 40s, Kemalist ideology was not much involved in military education; however, the number of courses devoted to Kemalism increased from 5% to 8-9% during the 60s. Kemalist ideology was an important element for the military to maintain the existing conditions and fight against the extremist ideas among the citizens. Particularly after the 1980 military junta, the military utilized conservative Kemalist ideologies to recover the society from extremism<sup>104</sup>.

In those days, this understanding or interpretation of Kemalism was adopted by military in all issues related to the relations between Turkey and the EU. The first reaction of the military to the requirements of the EU was aggressive. The National Security Committee reacted in an aggressive way to the report called as “The Measures that Turkey Needs to Take in the Light of the Copenhagen Political Criteria” and developed by Prime Ministry Human Rights Coordination Supreme Board. This report was including some radical offers such as the removal of the ban related to the use of languages. Subsequently, the National Security Committee prepared a counter report which stated that giving permission to the Kurdish broadcasting and education in Turkey would make extremist and separatist actions easier and this would become a threat for the sovereignty of Turkey. The National Security Committee also stated that it is inappropriate to align with and the overstated conditions of the EU and these conditions are not agreeable in Turkey’s characteristics. After the report issued by the National Security Committee, the above mentioned report prepared by Prime Ministry Human Rights Coordination Supreme Board was modified and Gürsel Demirok, developer of the report, resigned. In 2000, the Chief of the General Staff introduced the Domestic Security Report. In this report, there were important pre-requirements related to the Kurdish broadcasting and education. The report was

---

<sup>104</sup> Mehmet Ali Birand, *Shirts of Steel* (London: I.B. Tauris&Co. 1991).

also stating that some nations which are the members to the EU have showed their support for the PKK and for this reason; this organization was handled in the report as the exploiter of the EU requirements including the sub-identities issue and Kurdish broadcasting and education<sup>105</sup>.

In the upcoming years, some of the high-ranked officers stated their views regarding this issue. Halil Şimşek, the Brigadier General, declared his concerns about the way leading to the EU by stating that the EU was aiming to separate Turkey by forcing her to issue some rights related to the Kurdish broadcasting and education and by threatening the nation's essential elements. In the next year after the statements of Şimşek, Tuncer Kılıç, high-ranked military officer, stated his ideas which were against the EU. According to him, Turkey's aim should be align with Russia, Iran and the US, not the EU. He later said that these were only his views and therefore should not be bonded to the military. However, since he was a high-ranked officer, his ideas and views were considered as the thoughts of the Turkish Army Forces<sup>106</sup>.

Most of statements made by notable military officers make reference to the high-importance of nationalism and national unity. According to many conservative Kemalists, the aim of various global organizations and European states is to force Turkey to abandon the national unity concept in the Republic of Turkey by means of falsehood rights, independencies and freedom. In the same context, this group considers the acceptance of Alevi community as a religious group would threaten the unity of Turkey. Even, many high-ranked military officers avoid from expressing the likelihood of the accepting some ethnic minorities. They think that minorities do not necessarily occur through the indifferences between ethnicities and religions; therefore, their rights are only the personal rights and it is acceptable to regard them as collective by politicizing. After these statements of abovementioned military officers, Atilla Ateş, the Commander of the Land Forces, expressed that there are various institutions which aim to arouse the

---

<sup>105</sup> "Genelkurmay İç Güvenlik Yorumu," *ntvmsnbc*, 7 December 2000.

<sup>106</sup> "Türkiye Rusya ve İran'la İttifak Arayışında Olmalı," *Sabah* (Turkish Daily), 8 March 2002.

feeling of a distinction between Alevis and Sunnis who have existed in the same geography for long years. In this context, Directorate of Religious Affairs stated that Aleviness is not a sect but a culture and manner of life in the same religion and therefore, they should worship in the same places with Sunnis. As it is seen in the previous examples, there is the same policy related to the Alevi community with the adopted policy regarding the Kurdish and in this sense, conservative Kemalists aim to decrease the volume of talks in these issues.

The orthodox Kemalists consider the TAF to be the single institution that can preserve Turkey's unity as a nation and is immune to 'dissenting' forces. Second Chief of General Staff Yaşar Büyükanıt's speech that he gave in August 2004, describes the perspective of high-ranked military officials with regard to the military's role in Turkish politics: We have noticed that with comments such as 'the military's role in Turkish politics', internal/external forces try to distance the TAF from its role of guiding the regime. Everybody should be sure that we will continue to accomplish our responsibilities despite any individual interests. This vow to fulfil the responsibilities is the basis of the EU's worries with regard to the military's role; however, the TAF is not willing to settle in relation to its protective stance over Turkish government politics.

Nonetheless, there have been cutting-edge developments in relation to the TAF's views on EU's perspectives as well as the alteration of Kemalism. For example, the former Chief of General Staff Hilmi Özkök and the Chief of General Staff Yaşar Büyükanıt had both made statements in relation to the altering of Kemalism and accepting EU perspectives. Büyükanıt for example, suggests that Turkey's membership in the EU is an anticipated result of Atatürk's model of civilization and that the TAF completely approves of the EU model. Büyükanıt also states that Kemalism should not be viewed as a belief, as what Atatürk left behind is not a confined framework of ideology. Instead, it is a worldview representing humanitarianism, modernism and diversity. Similarly, Hilmi Özkök has also given speeches along the same line that notes TAF's approval for Turkey's membership in the EU and has even disapproved of the previous military coups

and has exclaimed that the TAF will maximize its accreditation to the decisions of civilians<sup>107</sup>.

Still, when these speeches are comprehensively analysed it can be found that they are no more than covered up repetitions of the old mindset with a EU enthusiastic background. Both domestic and international pressure for the alteration of the Turkish governmental system paired with the large support for Turkey's membership in the EU has encouraged the Turkish military to at least verbally support Turkey's participation in the EU; however, the old mindset still prevails. Büyükanıt's speech on May 30 2003 portrays the military's contradicting view on Turkey's EU membership. The military is especially contradictory in relation to dogmatic minority and ethnic concerns and this is evident in the speech mentioned above. During this speech, Büyükanıt initially argues that the military gives full support to Turkey's membership in the EU and then continues with contradiction that the broadcasting in languages besides Turkish is a threat because of the number of terrorists that reside in Turkey.

With examples as such, it can be discussed that the TAF claims to be pro-EU but continues its scepticism towards the EU. Examples also show the military's rejection of the EU's principles on ethnic minorities as well as the military's role in politics and the democratization of the Turkish government via improved freedoms and rights which would lead to a more diverse society. The military expresses its approval of the EU due to great levels of support for Turkey's membership in the EU. However, this approval is shown under 'Ankara criterion' as opposed to the 'Copenhagen criterion.' TAF therefore continues to maintain the political advances in Turkey while at the same time pretending to express its support for the EU to comply with the Copenhagen criterion. While each announcement by high ranked military officials praise the EU at the same time promises are given to continue to protect the Republic of Turkey and its

---

<sup>107</sup> "Orgeneral Özkök'ten İhtilal Yorumu," Sabah, 15 September 2004.

democracy from domestic threats; creating the essential issue to Turkey's civil and military relationship.

TAF's authentic view on EU's conditions and Turkey's membership in the EU can be seen in the statements by retired key military officials, such as the former Second Chief of the General Staff Çevik Bir and the retired general Suat İlhan. Bir suggests the Shanghai Five as an alternate to the EU. With that, Suat İlhan says that the six principles of Kemalism and Kemalist thought will be shifted and lose significance with Turkey becoming an EU member. By sharing its standards of independence and nationalism that Atatürk had made a core element of the Turkish Republic, our nation will lose its exceptional qualities, making Turkey a mere element of the EU... Supporting the EU participation without neglecting Kemalist ideologies is inconceivable. Nobody remains a Kemalist while supporting the EU membership at the same time.<sup>108</sup> The statements of retired military officials are more reflective of the realistic military views as the retired personnel are not obliged with pleasing the public in order to continue TAF's important function within Turkey.

The Orthodox reading of Kemalism is also represented by bureaucrats and academicians. Among them is Erol Manisalı, who is famous academician that supports Orthodox Kemalism. Manisalı argues that the EU supporters in society are the result of collaborations by the EU for its secret plan to divide Turkey. He also states that EU supporting lobbyists who distance themselves from Kemalism and would gain advantages from the undermining of Kemalist ideology. Therefore, he argues that for the benefit of Turkey, the TAF must persist the struggle with the EU defending lobby because the Turkish Army is the only force where such pro-EU forces cannot be exercised. Manisalı states that the Kurdish issue is used by EU countries as a means for delaying Turkey's acceptance. Furthermore, if Turkey provides the Kurds with political and cultural rights or accepts them as a minority group, the Kurdish issue will still be used to achieve certain aims. These aims are: to oppose the American power in Northern Iraq by

---

<sup>108</sup> Suat İlhan, *Avrupa Birliği'ne Neden Hayır?* (İstanbul: Ötüken, 2002.)

regulating the Kurdish population there via Turkey; to destabilize Turkey by creating a potential Kurdish rebellion within the countries to overcome potential regional supremacy. In relation to this, Manisalı advises a solely economic alliance with the EU without Turkey becoming an official EU member. It is therefore evident that Orthodox Kemalists are leery of Turkey's relations with the EU and of the EU itself. Orthodox Kemalists believe that the EU aims to separate Turkey by using Kurds and Alevis as minority groups and demand their rights. To overcome these threats, they argue that the TAF need to supervise Turkish politics and the Turkey – EU connections to prevail over the threats and maintain Turkey's national and provincial virtue. In relation to Turkey's membership in the EU, they argue that the EU's primary aim regarding Turkey is to take advantage of Turkey geographically and economically while at the same time never allowing Turkey's full membership. They argue that to overcome these threats, Turkey needs to focus on becoming a regional force by continuing its independence and entrusting in its powerful militaristic strength.<sup>109</sup>

#### **4.2 Kemalism and Liberalism: Neo-Kemalism**

The reforms in Kemalism are comprehensively studied by the acclaimed sociologist, Nilüfer Göle. Göle states that a more open-minded form of Kemalism is about to flourish. She also states that at present Turkey is undergoing from the effects of its labour agenda. Furthermore, she discusses that a new version of Kemalism has been forming since the late years of the 80s. The uprise of the organizations of civil society, especially youth and women's groups that both protect and exercise Kemalism, gives hints of a neo-Kemalism ideology evolving; hence, shifting society one step at a time. For years, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk has been mythologized by society. The admiration for him led to certain social taboos and a blind reading of Atatürk's ideology. This new wave of Kemalism allows society to genuinely understand Atatürk's thoughts and missions and reflect them upon social life; the tolerant-Kemalist ideology, although not yet apparent in the

---

<sup>109</sup> Erol Manisalı, *İçyüzü ve Perde Arkasıyla Avrupa Çıkması* (İstanbul: Otopsi Yayınevi, 2001).

political scene, can be examined in social life. As a conclusion, Göle argues that the new wave Kemalism is bound to be reflected in the political scene sooner or later and that Kemal Derviş is the ideal key figure for representing this new ideology ('tolerant-Kemalism) and distinguishing it from Orthodox Kemalism, as he supports not only Kemalism but also social democracy.<sup>110</sup>

As Göle argues, the arising "tolerant Kemalism" is very similar to neo-Kemalist ideology. This segment looks at the core concepts of neo-Kemalist thinking and its perspective on various issues such as the Alevi argument, the Kurdish controversy, the military's role and giving up independence to become an EU member. The neo-Kemalist view on these issues is the core for their differentiation with Orthodox Kemalists.

A senior journalist, Andrew Mango is among neo-Kemalists and argues that Kemalism cannot function as a fixed ideology that has no room for change. He states that Atatürk was an innovative and wise leader and that his innovative stance can be used to resolve problems faced today. Mango uses the Kurdish question as a key example for this argument. Atatürk's ideas differed amid and after the Independence War. This led Atatürk to acknowledge self-government to maintain local traditions. Mango argues that a similar action should be taken; hence, giving greater rights for foreign languages – including Kurdish. According to Mango, the Orthodox argument that giving such rights will result in a domestic uproar of other minorities is invalid.<sup>111</sup>

Mango proposes a three step plan to resolve the Kurdish issue. Initially, Kurds should be given cultural rights. Then, local governments should be strengthened and ultimately opportunities for new regional and ethnic non-violent parties to be formed should be given, this would mean the dismissal of political barriers. As Mango argues, the removal of these barriers on ethnic parties would result in a

---

<sup>110</sup> <http://www.ntv.com.tr/news/87867.asp>

<sup>111</sup> Mango, Andrew. "Kemalism in a New Century", in *Turkish Transformation: New Century- New Challenges*, ed. Brian Beeley. Huntington: Eothen Press, 2002.

diverse representation of the hidden Kurdish societies. It can therefore also be concluded that Mango views the existing policies on the Kurdish issue as sufficient and that he advises the revision of the existing policies in a manner to conform to the revolutionist and pragmatist background of Kemalism<sup>112</sup>.

Mango also questions if becoming an EU member and losing full independence is agreeable with Kemalism; to defend his argument that the two notions do not contradict, he states that Ataturk himself had joined such alliances such as the League of Nations and the International Court of Justice in The Hague for the overall benefit of the country<sup>113</sup>.

Sami Selçuk, the retired president of the Court of Cassation also states that Kemalism has become a stagnant thinking system. He argues that the world has been in a constant change from the 1930s to the 1990s and that due to threshold Ataturk has in Turkey, an authoritarian practice is still advocated; he states that this authoritarianism needs to be abandoned in order to accept a more diverse democracy<sup>114</sup>.

Sami Selçuk studies the state and society and state and religion relations of the 1930s. In his observations he notes that, compulsory religious activities have threatened the secularism of the nation. This is because opening and running religious educational institutions automatically implies the state's support for a certain religion. In relation to this, Selçuk defends the idea of the EU and the Alevi society in Turkey which both argue that the state needs to be religiously neutral. Furthermore Selçuk suggests that the state and religion relations in current Turkey must be differentiated then the way it was during the Independence War. During this War, Ataturk and his associates had concerns over religious exploitation and therefore supervised religion. However, in contemporary Turkey

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid.

<sup>114</sup> Selçuk, Sami. *Longing for Democracy*. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye publications, 2000.

where society has become plural, religious monitoring cannot be maintained. Instead, impartiality needs to be evident in both regulations and organizations.<sup>115</sup>

From Selçuk's announcements, it can also be noted that he supports the teaching and broadcasting in other languages besides Turkish, including Kurdish. He also states that pluralist democracies cannot have a fixed hegemonic identity and must also abandon fixed principles. Selçuk also advocates that pluralism by giving inner-cultures equal practice by the state will bring prosperity and development to a nation. It can therefore be said that Selçuk believes that Kurdish political and cultural freedom will be a key component for the further democratization of Turkey. In relation to the military's role in Turkish politics, Selçuk states that "degenerated democracy which is permitted under the supervision of big brothers. I want the highest democracy in the sense of a government of a people made up of free individuals by the people and for the people." It can be observed in his statement that Selçuk views the TAF's role in Turkish politics as a contradiction to national freedom, hence, going against one of the key principles of Kemalism. In relation to the EU controversy, Selçuk argues that Turkey's membership in the EU is delayed due to a lack of democracy and that only after this democracy is achieved will Turkey become an EU member.<sup>116</sup>

Neo-Kemalism is also supported in journalism, for example the columnist Hasan Cemal argues that Atatürk's reference to contemporary civilization was in fact at the time Europe, as all modern civilizations of his time were located there. To defend his argument, he states that it was the reason why Ataturk adopted Commercial Law from Germany, Civil Code from Switzerland and the model of unitary and *laicist* state from France.<sup>117</sup> Hence, he declares that Turkey's membership in the EU is in line with Ataturk's missions and that Turkey should not neglect the EU. In relation to the Kurdish and Alevi issue, Cemal argues that the limiting of these groups social freedom intensifies the issues.<sup>118</sup> Similar to the

---

<sup>115</sup> Selçuk, Sami. *Longing for Democracy*. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye publications, 2000.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid.

<sup>117</sup> Hasan Cemal, "Atatürk Yolu Demek," *Milliyet*, 6 July 2003.

<sup>118</sup> Hasan Cemal, "Yasakçı, Ne Oldu?," *Milliyet*, 10 February 2005.

other neo-Kemalists, Cemal believes that current situations should be considered under the current circumstances as opposed to the expired views of the 1930s that are not reflective of the contemporary world. He acknowledges that the ideas of law, democracy and domination are in transition on account of the EU conditions. He defends that in relation to this transition and EU's conditions that Turkey should generate new instruments and policies that deal with the Kurdish and Alevi issues<sup>119</sup>.

Another neo-Kemalist columnist, İsmet Berkan discusses developed democracy in Turkey. He discusses that democracy in Turkey was challenged in the progression era of the 1950s when Turkey switched to a multi party system. He argues that like in the 1950s when Turkey was not divided or threatened by the democratic transition, it should not be that way today. In relation to this, he supports the religious and ethnic freedom of subordinate identities in the nation. He defends that this freedom will increase the citizen faithfulness to the government in the country.<sup>120</sup>

When these perspectives are taken into consideration, it can be acknowledged that there is a large amount of demand for both the amending of Kemalism and the emergence of a more present neo-Kemalist group. The majority of neo-Kemalists argue that Kemalism is able to adapt to the contemporary world with a more elastic perspective. They argue that the majority of Kemalist arguments are appropriate today, such as using scientific knowledge for forming a democracy while utilizing pragmatism and revolutionist. Hence, neo-Kemalists question orthodox Kemalism and propose that Kemalist ideology should be returned to its roots – when Kemalism was a more temperate ideology. Of course to raise this question, the essence of Kemalism needs to be examined.<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> Hasan Cemal, "29 Ekim: En Büyük Bayram!", *Milliyet*, 29 October 2004.

<sup>120</sup> İsmet Berkan, "Cumhuriyet'in Değerini Bilmek ve Onu İleri Götürmek," *Radikal*, 29 October 2004.

<sup>121</sup> Ernest Gellner, *Encounters with Nationalism* (Oxford: Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell, 1994).

Neo-Kemalists argue that Kemalism was not formed as repressing ideology by Atatürk, but rather that the military has made into a strict thinking system. Neo-Kemalists criticize the orthodox Kemalists for stagnating Kemalist ideology and ignoring its revolutionist and democratic arguments which could be used today. Orthodox Kemalists are also criticized for not updating their global perspective and ignoring Atatürk's wish to become a modern, democratic, pluralistic nation that values human rights.

In this sense, neo-Kemalists differentiate from anti-Kemalists. Anti-Kemalists argue that Atatürk had no objective of becoming democratic and instead wished to create an obedient, homogenous nation where society could easily be controlled. However, Neo-Kemalists argue that Kemalism is founded on a multidimensional ideology. Therefore, anti-Kemalists favour the complete neglecting of Kemalism while neo-Kemalists argue that Kemalism needs to be reviewed in order to be in accordance the contemporary global relations.

Neo-Kemalists therefore propose that Turkey needs to modernize with the focus being society. They state that Kemalist reforms should take place which will allow members of society to be the core of modernization. Furthermore, they discuss that the military's role in Turkish politics and society needs be minimized as Turkey develops as a nation. They also defend the recognition of identities within Turkey that have been deemed as secondary populations.

In relation to Turkey's membership in the EU, neo-Kemalists view this as natural way of Kemalism as it is a group of modernized countries. They defend the ideas of democratization, pragmatism, civil rights and reformism and discuss that these are the components of Kemalism that should be used to make Turkey more align with the conditions of its EU membership.

## CONCLUSION

Turkey's membership in the EU and EU's conditions has no doubt become a great motivation in Turkey's politics and society. This is evident that in nearly all political controversies have a reference to Turkey's EU membership; such as, how Turkey can actually become a member without losing its essence. It is evident therefore that Turkey is in transition.

Political parties throughout Turkey's history have all tried to portray themselves as defendants of Kemalism; Islamists parties argued that Ataturk would have been a political member of their party; PKK terrorist group leader announced that he sympathized with Ataturk, etc. The visibility of Kemalism in various mediums is due to its flexibility and adaptability.

However, despite its flexible nature, with the military coup of 1980, Kemalism was transformed into a strict ideology which embraced nationalism and was reflected on Turkey both socially and politically. This transition unsurprisingly created a limited perspective on Kurdish and Alevi issues, and also increased the Turkish military's role in politics. These limitations have caused the greatest barriers for Turkey's achievement of the Copenhagen criteria. Despite the 1980 military coup's limitation to sovereignty, supporters of the coup (orthodox Kemalists) defend Turkey's sovereignty and are strongly dissent Turkey's membership in the EU.

Nonetheless, Turkey's EU process which is reported in progress reports and Accession Partnership records show that Turkey's membership in the EU is practically impossible with the widespread orthodox Kemalist thinking. In opposition with orthodox Kemalists and anti-Kemalists, the materializing neo-Kemalist group which is based predominantly on EU conditions, defends Ataturk's ideologies of pragmatism, reformism and modernism to achieve EU

membership while at the same time redefining Kemalism to be more in line with the contemporary world. By doing so, they show efforts to demonstrate that Kemalism is compatible with the EU conditions and that EU membership is directly linked to the basics of Kemalism.

Concluding that Kemalism has not been able to modernize or that it is coming to an end is not possible at this stage because Kemalism has prevailed for seventy years. Turkey is capable of evolving into a completely modern nation. The prevalence of Kemalism for such a long time is due to its adaptability. Süleyman Demirel states “Ataturk has to be our reference even in the next century, since we have witnessed the demise of other references such as religion or ethnicity.” With acknowledgement to this statement, neo-Kemalists aim to amend Kemalism and reform it into a method of thinking which uses a form of civilizations and pragmatism that is not a barrier to Turkey’s membership in the European Union as its essence.

## Bibliography

- Ahmad, F. "The Historical Background of Turkey's Foreign Policy," in Lenore G. Martin and Dimitris Keridis (ed.) *The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy*, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2004.
- Ahmad, F. "Islamic Reassertion in Turkey", *Third World Quarterly*, 10:2, 1988.
- Atatürk, M.K. "Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri II", Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1961.
- Barkey, H.J. and Fuller, G.E. "Turkey's Kurdish Question: Critical Turning Points and Missed Opportunities," *Middle East Journal*, 51:1, 1997.
- Belge, M. "Kemalist İdeolojinin Özellikleri," *Radikal*, 7 October 2003.
- Berkes, N., "The Development of Secularism in Turkey", Montreal, 1964.
- Berkan, İ. "Cumhuriyet'in Değerini Bilmek ve Onu İleri Götürmek," *Radikal*, 29 October 2004.
- Birand, M.A. "Shirts of Steel", London: I.B. Tauris&Co. 1991.
- Bodrogi, K. K. "Syncretistic Religious Communities in the Near East", New York: Brill, 1997.
- Bruinessen, M.V. "Kurds, Turks and the Alevi Revival in Turkey," *Middle East Report*, July – September, 1996.
- Caporaso, J. "The European Union and forms of state: Westphalian, regulatory or post-modern?" *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34, 1996.

- Cemal, H. "Atatürk Yolu Demek," Milliyet, 6 July 2003.
- Cemal, H. "Yasakçı, Ne Oldu?," Milliyet, 10 February 2005.
- Cemal, H. "29 Ekim: En Büyük Bayram!," Milliyet, 29 October 2004.
- Cooper, M. "The Legacy of Atatürk" International Affairs 78, No.1, 2000.
- Çamuroğlu, R. "Some Notes on the Contemporary Process of Restructuring Alevilik in Turkey," in Syncretistic Religious Communities in the Near East, New York: Brill, 1997.
- Çetiner, Y. "Son Padişah Vahdettin", İstanbul : Milliyet, 1993
- Ertan, T.F. "Kadrocular ve Kadro Hareketi", Ankara. T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1994.
- Evin, A. "Demilitarization and Civilization of the Regime," in Politics in the Third Turkish Republic, eds. Metin Heper and Ahmet Evin, Boulder: Westview Press, 1994.
- Gellner, E. "Encounters with Nationalism", Oxford: Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell, 1994.
- Gönlübol, M. "Olaylarla Türk Dış Politikası", Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 1996.
- Güçlü, Y. "Turkey's Entrance into the League of Nations," Middle Eastern Studies, 39:1, January, 2003.

- Grbey, G. “zal Dnemi Dış Politikası”, in Devlet ve Siyaset Adamı Turgut zal, İstanbul, 20 Mayıs Eğitim, Kltr ve Sosyal Dayanışma Vakfı, 1996.
- Hale, W. “Turkish Politics and the Military”, London: Routledge, 1994.
- Harris, G. “Turkey: Coping with Crisis”, Boulder: Westview press, 1985.
- Heper, M. and Gney, A. “The Military and Consolidation of Democracy: The Recent Turkish Experience,” Armed Forces & Society, 26: 4, 2000.
- Heper, M. “The State Tradition in Turkey” Walkington: The Eothen Press, 1985.
- İlhan, S. “Avrupa Birliği’ne Neden Hayır?”, İstanbul: tken, 2002.
- Jacoby, J. “For the People, of the People and By the Military: The Regime Structure of Modern Turkey,” Political Studies, vol. 51, 2003.
- Karpat, K. “ Military Interventions: Army-Civilian Relations in Turkey Before and After 1980,” in Metin Heper and Ahmet Evin (eds.), State, Democracy and the Military Turkey in the 1980s, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988.
- Kili, S. “Assembly Debates on the Constitutions of 1924 and 1961”, İstanbul: Robert College Research Center, 1971.
- Kili, S. “The Atatrk Revolution”, İstanbul: Trkiye İş Bankası Kltr Yayınları, 2003.
- Lewis, B. “The Emergence of Modern Turkey”, London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

- Mango, A. "Atatürk and the Kurds," Middle Eastern Studies, Vol. 35, No. 4, October, 1999.
- Mango, A. "Kemalism in a New Century", in Turkish Transformation: New Century- New Challenges, ed. Brian Beeley. Huntington: Eothen Press, 2002.
- Manisalı, E. "İçyüzü ve Perde Arkasıyla Avrupa Çıkmazı", İstanbul: Otopsi Yayınevi, 2001.
- Meray, S.L. "Lozan Barış Konferansları: Tutanaklar, Belgeler", Ankara: Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1972.
- Oran, B. "Türk Dış Politikası", vol. 1, İstanbul: İletişim, 2001.
- Özbudun, E. "Contemporary Turkish Politics: Challenges to Democratic Consolidation", London: Boulder and Lynne Reinner Publishers, 2000.
- Sakallıoğlu, Ü.C. "Islam-State Interaction in Turkey", International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 28, 1996.
- Selçuk, S. "Longing for Democracy", Ankara: Yeni Türkiye publications, 2000.
- Shaw, S. "From Empire to Republic", vol. 2, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2000.
- Shils, E. "The Concept and Function of Ideology", International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 7 and 8, New York. The Macmillan Company & The Free Press, 1972.

- Szyliowicz, J.S. "Elites and Modernization in Turkey," in Frank Tachau (ed.) *Political Elites and Political Development in the Middle East*, New York: Wiley, 1975.
- Toprak, B. "Religion as State Ideology in a Secular Setting: The Turkish-Islamic Synthesis," in *Aspects of Religion in Secular Turkey*, ed. Malcolm Wagstaff, Durham: University of Durham Centre for Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies, 1990.
- Turan, İlter. "The Turkish Political System: Instability and Hurdles," in *Turkey: The Road Ahead?*, ed. Bertil Dunér. Stockholm: The Swedish Institute of International Affairs, 2002.
- Vali, F.A. "Bridge Across the Bosphorus", Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1971.
- Vamik, V. "The Immortal Atatürk : A Psychobiography", Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Webster, D.E. "Kemalism: A Civil Religion?", 1979.

## Official Documents

- 1982 Constitution of the Republic of Turkey
- 1998 Regular Report, part b, Relations between the European Union and Turkey
- 1999 Regular Report by the Commission on Turkey's Progress Towards Accession
- 2000 Regular Report by the Commission on Turkey's Progress towards Accession
- Arie Oostlander, Report on Turkey's Application for Membership of the European Union (COM(2002) 700-C5-0104/2003-2000/2014(COS)).
- Commission Opinion on Turkey's Request for Accession to the Community
- Economic and Social Committee of the European Communities, Opinion, Relations Between the European Union and Turkey, CES 1314/93, Brussels, 22 December 1993.
- European Parliament, Resolution on the Situation in Turkey and the offer of a ceasefire made by the PKK (B4-0060, 0076, 0086 and 0089/96), 18 January 1996.
- Luxembourg Presidency Conclusions, 13 December 1997, part d. Review Procedure, par. 35.

## Internet Sources

- [www.alevibektasi.org](http://www.alevibektasi.org)
- “Azınlık ve Kültürel Haklar Raporu”, Sabah, 2004, [http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/ozel/azinlik194/dosya\\_194.html](http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/ozel/azinlik194/dosya_194.html)
- “Derviş globalleşmede katalizör”, ntvmsnbc, 11 Haziran, (<http://arsiv.ntvmsnbc.com/news/87867.asp>)
- “Genelkurmay İç Güvenlik Yorumu,” ntvmsnbc, 7 December 2000 (<http://arsiv.ntvmsnbc.com/news/49409.asp>)
- “Orgeneral Özkök’ten İhtilal Yorumu,” Sabah, 15 September 2004 (<http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2004/09/15/gnd102.html>)
- “Türkiye Rusya ve İran’la İttifak Arayışında Olmalı,” Sabah (Turkish Daily), 8 March 2002 (<http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2002/03/08/p01.html>)