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INTRODUCTION:

One of the devoted students of studies of nationalism, Eric J Hobsbawm uses an analogy to explain the relation between history writing and nationalism: “Historians are to nationalism what poppy-growers in Pakistan are to heroin addicts: we supply the essential raw material for the market.”¹ According to Hobsbawm, historians are the ones who serve raw material to the “imagined community”. History, as a raw material of nationalist ideology can be studied and interpreted in different ways but its main principle never changes: Subject of history, past is the most basic element of nationalism; it forms the backbone of nationalist discourse. This past should continuously meet the needs of “the market” or else, according to Anthony Smith, “the concept of a nation could not be sustained.”²

Even though there are various theories regarding the concept of a nation and nationalism, growing literature on nationalism, on its emergence and on its development mainly concentrates on its constructed nature. This constructed nature is significant to understand the relation between history-writing and nationalism. If we follow Benedict Anderson’s “Imagined Communities”, there should be a good deal of imagination to form and sustain the nation. In his book, Anderson evaluates the nation as an imagined community; although members of this community do not know each other, in the minds of them, image of their communion stays alive. According to him, nationalism and nationality are “cultural artifacts of a particular kind”³. In this respect, nationalism is a historical movement; it has developed under certain historical conditions. It is a product of 19th century; it was created with concepts like bureaucratization, secularism and capitalism. In this new system, new traditions were invented to form a novel common culture which was essential to canalize the

---

support of masses for the needs of the state. Furthermore, it is “profoundly historicist” \(^4\). Its followers unconditionally believe that nation is a ubiquitious and universal phenomenon which has always been in history and which has been developing since the beginning of time.

John Breuilly also approaches the subject of nationalism from a modernist view. His state-centered perspective theorizes nationalism as a form of politics which is all about power\(^5\). In rivalry between the elites, nationalism emerges as an instrument of legitimization used by the elites in order to receive public support during government struggle. Breuilly points out that nationalism as a political doctrine is built upon three principles: 1) existence of a nation with its distinctive characteristic that is special and separate from other nations. 2) having interests and moral values above other nations and 3) being at least politically sovereign.\(^6\)

Breuilly signifies that nationalism is used by the state as a mediator between state and society to mobilize society according to the needs of the state. Hence, in order to work efficiently, nationalism as an ideology should be simplified, materialized and constantly repeated\(^7\), which in turn foster the imagination of the community. While Breuilly mentions symbols and ceremonies in his book, Anderson focuses on the print-media as a “concreted” medium to spread the nationalist ideology. In another work, Anderson also points out the importance of history-writing by explaining relation between members of the nation and their past. He argues that with its monuments, artifacts written records etc., traces of the past is all around us. Even though this past is inaccessible to us, we try to evaluate and make sense out of it with today’s perspective. Thus, “our relationship to the past is today far more political,

---


\(^6\) Ibid, 2.

\(^7\) Ibid, 64.
ideological, contested, fragmentary and even opportunistic than in ages gone by.”

The same is also true during the process of imagining the nation. In opportunistic way nationalism as a political ideology shapes the past and creates national histories which are expected to be in line with state ideology. Re-interpretation of the past in different periods of the nation for the sake of nation-state or in Anthony Smith’s terminology “Usable Past” becomes much more visible during the periods of cultural (re)production of the nation. It does not really matter whether this past is scientifically accurate. What matters is to find a “suitable past” which turns the future of the nation into a “believable” one. In fact many times, while this past is converting into a national history, mythical features also find their place in it. As long as this past instills a sense of belonging to members of the newly forming nation, as long as it justifies the existence of the nation, national history appears as an important politicized tool to provide unity within the community. Particularly, during the formation of the nation-state where it replaces the place of an old-system, “usable past” is used to actualize the shift in the identity in which a new national identity is imposed on an older one. Furthermore, according to Smith, through the national histories, myths of Golden Age are created to provide a sense of continuity from the past to future. This sense of continuity is fundamentally vital during the traumatic social changes suggesting that “despite the ravages of time and vicissitudes of social change, we are descendants of the heroes and sages of that great age”. Thus, this feeling of continuity is especially useful to overcome the national crises such as traumatic social changes.

It is also necessary to mention that when we connect nation and nationalism with the age of modernism, perceive it as an artificial formation; elites’ role in this process becomes

---

9 Anthony Smith, “The ‘Golden Age’ and National Renewal”
10 Ibid, 50.
much more visible. To form and sustain the nation, there should be a vivid image of it in the minds of its members but how does this imagination occur in the first place? Whose imagined community are we talking about? Hroch’s categorization is a useful one to answer this. According to Hroch, national movements can be divided into three periods. First period is “purely cultural, literary and folkloric” and is only limited with curiosity of researchers and some elites. However starting with the second period, minority agissante who supports ‘national idea’ begin to get organized and begin to get politicized. In the last category this group takes the support of the masses and they spread their nationalist ideology to masses\(^\text{12}\).

While Hroch examines the elites’ role in nationalism and this role’s gradual development, Breuilly approaches the issue from totally functionalist perspective as mentioned above. According to him, nationalism is a political doctrine used by the elites to seize the power of the government\(^\text{13}\). Anderson in book also, underlines the importance of elites, especially ones who had been educated in the West or had taken education in Western style\(^\text{14}\). These young generations who are equipped with Western ideas are not only becoming dissident elites against the ancien regime in their old country, but they also carry the nationalist ideas to their home countries. Hence, many times their youthness becomes the symbol of novelty against the old regimes of their country.

Consequently, elites emerge as the most important actor during the formation of the nation. They are the ones who involved in imagining the community, in inventing the traditions, combining “preexisting building blocks” and turning them into novel end products\(^\text{15}\) and who then, try to diffuse their nationalist agenda to the society. Moreover, they not only invent or select already existing traditions and re-shape them but also dismiss


\(^{13}\) Breuilly, 1.


inconvenient, problematic values and memories from the collective memory of the society\textsuperscript{16}. As Gregory Suny states, elites “appear to have the greatest agency in the shaping of national understanding, propagating the values of the nation, disciplining the people internally, and enforcing the rules and boundaries of the constituent people”\textsuperscript{17}.

When we examine the Turkish case, similar developments can be realized. Once dissident elites of the old empire succeeded to form the new republic, they confronted a difficult task. Even though the new state was created, there was hardly a “Turkish nation” but a religious community within the borders of the new republic. To succeed the shift from religious community to the nation, the new state concentrated on Cultural Revolution. Especially during the period of Mustafa Kemal, intense cultural reforms were implemented. Furthermore in line with Breuilly’s argument of state-society relation, to complete this project “top” section of the society should have reached to grassroots in order to spread the state’s ideology of the period. To achieve this, the state used intellectual-cultural groups and institutions such as Turkish Hearths. Significance of these cultural groups was based on their place between the upper and lower segments of the society. They worked as mediators, they were autonomous at first but all of them were in line with the nationalist ideology of the period and they were helping to spread nationalism to the society. This way, the state could easily shape common cultural characteristics of the newly forming Turkish imagined community. Not surprisingly, the foundation of “Tarih Tetkik Cemiyeti” (Society for the Study of History - later on changed its name to “Türk Tarihi Tetkik Cemiyeti” [Society for the Study of Turkish History]) coincided with the formation of the Turkish Republic. Grand narrative of the period, Turkish History Thesis was also first formulated by the state elites and then was distributed by the period’s “missionary” historians.


\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
This dissertation will concentrate on the period of 1930s in Turkey, when Turkish History Thesis was formulated. Particularly rather than re-telling the story of Turkish History Thesis, individual historians will be the main case in this work. There is an immense literature about period’s historiography both in Turkey and outside Turkey and it is still growing area. However, what are really missing in this literature are the individuals of the period. Main trend in this literature is to examine the Thesis, its formulators and to show how the Thesis was used to achieve the formation of the nation. However little work has been done to analyze how at the same time period’s nationalist atmosphere affected the writings of the historians of era. As can be expected, all through 1930s, the Thesis dominated the writings of the historians and in fact, ones who tried to criticize the Thesis encountered serious accusations of the state. Hence many critics that were raised by the period’s intellectuals were either suppressed or were forced to be adjusted in line with the thesis. Still when we step into the general picture and specifically focus on the period’s historians, we can see that actually there were some scholars who tried to avoid this grand narrative and who developed alternative approaches. In this respect, by focusing on three important historians of the Republican era; Afet Inan, Fuat Köprülü and İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, first aim of this work is to show various arguments about the Turkish History Thesis, alternative approaches and effect of the dominant nationalist history writing of the period over historians.

Secondly, all of these historians had dual characteristics; they were historians yet at the same time they had close connections with state politics. In this respect, while investigating these historians, one has to consider both politician and historian sphere of these historians. For instance, while discussing the roles of the elites, Edward Said focuses on these two modes of characteristics and distinguishes elites into two categories as following: intellectuals and “supportive insiders”. According to him, while supportive insiders are the ones who send nationalist messages to masses and promote special interests, “corporate
thinking, and a sense of class, racial or gender privilege”\textsuperscript{18}, he categorizes intellectuals as ones who purifies themselves from “nation-ness”\textsuperscript{19}. A similar separation can be seen in Michael Okeshott’s work. Okeshott discusses that historian approaches the past without any moral judgment. According to him, for historian “in history no man dies too soon or by accident, there are no successes and no failures and illegitimate children” and this past is “without the moral”\textsuperscript{20}. In this sense, for the historian “past stays at the past”. Yet, “practical man” approaches the past opportunistically and “reads the past backwards”\textsuperscript{21}. For the practical man, the past is vivid and it is used to support his political agenda.

However, it is important to signify that, especially in situations involving these kinds of politician-historian characteristics, creating two different modes of spheres, categorizing and evaluating these two characteristics unconnectedly from each other is mostly an artificial separation. Particularly, if we are talking about historians at the dawn of the creation of a nation, the situation is a much more complex one as will be discussed in Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı. For instance as can be seen in various examples such as Iorga from Romania or Novakovic from Serbia\textsuperscript{22} many times, both of these characteristics commingle. Furthermore, even historians or intellectuals that are not directly connected to politics would have some prejudices or subjective approaches to various issues due to their backgrounds. As Suny rightly discusses: “All intellectuals, given the fatality of language and the necessity of citizenship in the modern world, are “nationed.” Contingently, at least, they have a national identity, and their practices may have important consequences for the nation.”\textsuperscript{23} Hence, we can not talk about the ultimate objectivity of historians. Especially if he or she is somehow

\textsuperscript{18} Suny, 14.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 15.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 168.
\textsuperscript{23} Suny, 15.
related to politics, he or she will most probably approach issues through his or her political ideology.

In this context, in the dissertation, while evaluating writings of İnan, Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı, their political and historian sides will also be carefully examined. Rather than trying to distinguish their dual characteristics and analyze them separately, the effect of their politician side over historian characteristic, or vice versa, will be investigated and whether it was politics or history that affected their works will be discussed.

To sum it up, this thesis will focus on the Republican Era of Turkey and the effect of the period’s nationalist ideology over historiography will be investigated by examining three important historians of the period; Afet İnan, Fuat Köprülü and İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı. Especially, history writing in this period was a politicized tool as it has never been before. It was used as a medium to destroy alienation between the state and the society, direct the society according to needs of the state and to reply the claims of Orientalist approaches of European Historians. Contributions of these historians in this “grand mission”, and how the period’s nationalist discourses affected their writings will be the main concerns of this dissertation. Connected to this issue, politician-historian sides of these historians will be discussed by looking at the personalities and backgrounds and the events and ideologies that shaped their work. In this respect, in the dissertation, while Afet İnan as one of the formulators of the period’s grand narrative, symbolizes the hegemonic Kemalist ideology, Fuat Köprülü and İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı represent another dimension of the ideology; those who did not directly support the Grand narrative of Turkish History but at the same time those who could not dare to criticize it, due to pressures of the Kemalist state. Another important issue that needs consideration is the difference between İnan and Köprülü – Uzuncarşılı. For instance, Afet İnan’s ideas were shaped during the formation of the new
Republic, Uzunçarşılı and Köprülü were already present as historians during the foundation of the Republic. Thus, as Berktay notes about Köprülü, -and can be extended to Uzunçarşılı also- was an intelligentsia that the Ottoman State transferred to the Republic. Another important point is that both Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı were the historians of one of the “others” of the Republic, namely the Ottoman Empire. Particularly Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı opposed the reductionistic idea that demonstrates the accomplishment of the Ottoman Empire as the success of its Turkishness and extensively discussed political factors that enabled the Ottoman Empire to be a world-power. However, in the international context when Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı confronted with foreign historians such as Iorga who claimed that the Ottoman Empire had been nothing but a simple imitation of Byzantium Empire, effect of period’s nationalist discourse in Turkey could be seen on these historians. Still, it can be seen that, motivated to explore Turkish History, Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı, while being inspired by Turkish nationalism, the dominant discourse of their time, dedicated themselves to scientific research instead of confining themselves to the shallow explanations of Turkish nationalism.

Furthermore, even though both historians were also members of the parliament, unlike İnan, in general their politician and historian features did not always coincide in their academic work. Yet this does not mean that they openly criticized the grand narrative. In fact, especially as we will see after the dispute of Köprülü with Afet İnan in the First Turkish History Congress, Köprülü decided to remain silent about Turkish History Thesis and he preserved this policy until the abolition of the Thesis.

First chapter of the dissertation will focus on the formation of the Turkish History Thesis and contributions of Afet İnan to this thesis. The following chapter will discuss Fuat

Köprülü and İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı and their standing in period’s grand narrative. Even though their historical methodology differs from each other, their approaches to the period’s historical problems are similar. As will be seen they both reacted national and international history-writing regarding the Ottoman Empire in similar ways. Thus, while first chapter will focus on the state’s direct influence over a historian, following chapter will discuss effect of national and international stimulus on two historians.
CHAPTER ONE:

TURKISH HISTORY THESIS AND AFET İNAN

As it is already pointed out in the Introduction, Afet İnan as a historian was the direct outcome of the ideology that shaped the newly thriving Republic. She had witnessed the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the birth of a new republic constituted in accordance with a Western ‘Image’. She had benefited from the earnings of the Republic whose main aim was the destruction of dogmas of the ancien regime and thus the successful transformation of the society from a religious community to a nation. In pursuing this goal, nationwide education campaigns along with the presence of semi-autonomous research institutions such as Society for the Study of Turkish History and “Türk Dil Kurumu” (Turkish Language Institution) proved to be empowering tools for the new regime. Against such a background, Inan, as an educated Western style woman emerged as the symbol of the new Republic and the conveyor of Kemalistic Cultural Revolution. The image of the young, ambitious, nationalist female social scientist appeared to be an appropriate reflection of the dynamism of the new Republic. However, of all the characteristics and attributes listed above, the most important was her education, a ‘westernized’ one, for, in this period, being a woman ‘exhibiting’ westernized values plus getting actively involved in public life were vital tools in concretizing the cultural revolution of the new Republic. Making Turkish Modernization ‘visible’ by addressing to the ‘eye’ with their western looks was what was expected from the women of the time. Their mission was, in Inan’s words: “To prove that the newly founded Republic is no longer an eastern country”.

As Özgür Sevgi Göral points out, in this period ‘The participation of

---

27 Özgür Sevgi Göral, “Afet İnan” in Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce : Cilt 2 - Kemalizm (Political Thinking in Modern Turkey : Volume 2 - Kemalism), Tanıl Bora, Murat Gültekingil (eds.) (İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 2004), 224.
women in public life as republicans/nationalists is an indication that they have been liberated a priori and the issue is regarded as part of a complementary national project.”

Hence, it was expected from İnan to represent the modernity of the Republic, to contrast its nationalist face against the community-based Ottoman visage and its modernist-positivist stance against the religious and dogmatic style of the Empire. However, as Halil Berktay points out “when a particular ideology is directed against dogmas, new dogmas emerge”.

This chapter will briefly give background information about Afet İnan first, then move into the development of Turkish History Thesis and İnan’s contribution to this grand narrative of the period.

Afet İnan was born in 1908 in Sumnu. Her father was a state officer, inspector and supporter of the Young Turk movement in Macedonia. When she was four years old she and her family migrated from Macedonia to Anatolia as refugees. It can be stated that leaving her country of birth and losing her grandfather during the war had a strong effect on her; in her memoirs she explained how Balkan Wars affected their family lives in Macedonia and how they had to migrate to Anatolia.

İnan’s childhood days coincided with the fall of an empire and birth of a new republic. In these years, because of her father’s state duty she traveled around Central and Western Anatolia with her family. These travels created the opportunity for her to see the meager and poor conditions in Anatolia. In her memoirs, she mentions that one of her dreams when she was young was to go to Europe, to study there and come back to Turkey as a teacher to

---

28 Ibid.
30 Ari İnan, Prof. Dr. Afet İnan (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2005), 39.
31 Ibid., 30.
support the development of the new Republic and to help the new Republic achieve its main goal, namely: “catching the European civilization”\textsuperscript{32}.

When the war was over, İnan began her teaching career in Izmir as an idealist school teacher. In one of Mustafa Kemal’s visits to Izmir in 1925, she met him and from that meeting till Kemal’s death she was always on his side and became one of the few honored historians who was able to take seat at Mustafa Kemal’s dinner tables where all kinds of debates and discussions about the problems and goals of the country were held. First she was sent to Lausanne to get a French language education, and then in 1927 she began to attend French High School, Notre dame de Sion in Istanbul. In 1929 she started teaching in Ankara. After 1929, she actively got involved in several conferences and helped the formation of the Society for the Study of Turkish History. She was one of the writers of “Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatlari” (Main Features of Turkish History) where the Turkish History Thesis was first formulated. In 1931, she prepared a school book called “Vatandaş İçin Medeni Bilgiler” (Civic Information for Citizen) with Mustafa Kemal and the following year in the First History Congress, she presented “Tarihten Evvel ve Tarih Fecrinde” (Before History and Twilight of History) in line with the newly evolving Turkish History Thesis. The object of her speech was to prove the continuity of Turkish race from the ancient ages. In 1935 she became the vice-president of the Society for the Study of Turkish History and began her doctorate in Geneva. At the same time, from 1936 onward, she began giving history lectures at Ankara University, at the Faculty of Language and History. İnan graduated from Geneva University in 1938 with her thesis on “Antropological Characteristics of Turkish People and Turkish History”.

Rather than specializing in one period of history, Afet İnan wrote and gave speeches about various subjects. However, all through 1930s the prevailing theme in her work was to

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 86-87
prove the validity of Turkish History Thesis and to “give an identity to this society, majority of which consisted of Turks”33.

On examining İnan’s history writing, one can witness the frequent occurrences of inconsistencies and uncommon flashbacks. For instance, she could easily jump into the present and compare the “enlightened” new republic with the “backward” and “degenerated” Ottoman Empire while talking about Ottoman History or could suddenly change the subject into Turkish History Thesis while giving a speech about the Methodology of History34. This kind of manipulation, the manipulation of history for the justification of the new regime, thus exposes the ideological thrust in İnan. Interestingly, this is the exact stance which she so vehemently denounced in her classes as she emphasized the importance of the usage of primary sources to become an objective historian. Furthermore, while explaining the “dynamism of history”, she states that the basis of this dynamism is formed by the usage of primary sources35. According to her, every single document increases the dynamism of history. In this respect, as Büşra Ersanlı points out: “According to İnan, the historian’s personal interpretation or examination depends entirely on documents”36. However in the First Turkish History Congress, she follows a different path. In the congress, she presents a paper on the achievements of Brakifesal human type and the relations between this human type and Turks37. Her speech is based on assumptions and secondary sources rather than primary sources, contradicting her own remarks and suggestions about the objectivity of the historian. While alleging that the historian has to investigate primary sources to find the “ultimate truth”, it is a fact that she does not hesitate to ignore primary sources to support her

34 See her article: Afet İnan, “Türk-Osmanlı Tarihinin Karakteristik Noktalarına Bir Bakış” Belleten Vol 2 No.5/6 (April, 1938)
Also see her first lecture in Ankara Language and History Faculty on January 9, 1936 (Arı İnan,141-146)
35 Afet İnan, Tarih İlininin Dinamik Karakteri, 7, quoted in Ersanlı, İktidar ve Tarih : Türkiye’de “Resmi Tarih” Tezini Oluşumu 151.
36 Ibid.
37 Afet İnan, “Tarihten Evvel ve Tarih Fecrinde” in Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi. Konferanslar, Müzakere Zabıtları (First Turkish History Congress. Conferences, Discussion Reports. ) (Ankara : T.C Maarif Vekaleti)
political agenda when she could not find any other solution to prove her point. This is evident in her speech in the congress and in her dispute with Köprülü on the usage of sources as will be revealed in the next chapter in detail.

To see her arguments in a detailed way, we can divide the general subjects in Inan’s writings as follows: attempting to invalidate European Theories, to prove the continuity of Turkish Race in Anatolia, and to undermine the effects of the Ottoman and Islamic past over the society in order to legitimize the newly formed Republic.

*Turks as the Creator of Great Civilizations*

From the beginning of the 19th century, Social-Darwinist theories formed in Europe showed Turks as “secondary people who belong to “yellow race”. Europeans’ tendencies to show Turks as a barbaric nation, who are the enemies of civilization, were bothering the new state for obvious reasons. The state was trying to forge a nation that has self-confidence. At the same time, by continuing westernization movements that had begun long before the Republican Era, the new Republic was trying to reach the “stage of modern civilizations”. As one of the first formulators of Turkish Nationalism, in Ziya Gökalp’s “Culture” and “Civilization” concepts, aim of the Turkish nation is to reach the level of modernized civilizations without losing its unique culture. According to his organic theory, there is harmony between “being like western” and “being ourselves”. For Gökalp, synthesis between national culture and international civilization corresponds to the needs of time. Gökalp mentions that cultural institutions are necessary to form the unity of the society, yet the society should progress by borrowing technology and scientific knowledge from civilization. However while adapting westernized reforms and favoring the “West” instead of the “East”, more specifically while trying to be one of the western countries, attitudes of the West were

---

discouraging to the new Republic. In November 1923, a French journalist interviewing Mustafa Kemal, crystallized the period’s Kemalist feelings toward Europeans: “Ideas of hatred and hostility against Turks had been instilled among European societies. These ideas which had been established in western minds had formed a special thought. This thought is still present in spite of everything and all of the events.” 39 By saying “everything” and “all events” Mustafa Kemal especially underlines the situation of the new Republic: The new Turkish State was making westernized reforms, but still, Kemalists could not totally change the attitudes of Europeans toward Turkey.

For the two reasons sighted above, Europe created a duality in the history writing of the period. First of all, the advanced West was an attractive ideal, but there was also a need to reply to the degrading claims of Europe. Hence, European theories were questioned not only to get rid of the inferiority feeling but also to make an easy access to European civilization. As Murat Belge points out: “In an interesting – and typical- way, together with the boast of “we created the civilization”, the message of “We are also white like you! Don’t think of us as yellow” is being sent to Europe.” 40 In this way, rather than totally excluding Europe, Kemalists were trying to show the linkage between the West and Turkey.

Afet İnan also tells a similar story. In 1928, when she was studying at Notre Dame de Sion in Istanbul, she realized comments in French history and geography books which “offended her national feelings.” 41 She took these books and showed them to Mustafa Kemal:

“In 1928, in one of the French geography books, it was written that Turkish race belongs to yellow race and it’s a secondary (secondaire) type of human according to European thought.
I showed him [Mustafa Kemal]. Is it so? I said.
“No, it can’t be, let’s concentrate on this. You study.”
He said.” 42

40 Murat Belge, “ ‘İrk’imiz Tarihi” Radikal Gazetesi (Radikal Newspaper) (September 14, 2003), 9
41 Ari İnan, 100.
42 Afet İnan, “Atatürk ve Tarih Tezi” Belleten Vol. 2 No. 10 (April, 1939), 244.
With the order of Mustafa Kemal, İnan’s journey as a “missionary” historian began. Her mission was determined by Mustafa Kemal, she had to concentrate on invalidating the European theories that claimed Turks are secondary people and she had to investigate the question of “What is the real place of Turks in the world history from the ancient ages and in what ways they had contributed to the world civilization?” To find the answer of this question, “Main Features of Turkish History” was written by the future members of Society For the Study of Turkish History including Afet İnan. In the introduction part of the book it is written:

“The main goal of this book is, to work for the eradication of mistakes that are harmful to our nation which has taken its natural position back today in the world and is living with this consciousness. At the same time this is the first step to fulfill the needs of writing a national history of Turkish Nation in whose soul the feelings of existence and unity have been awakened with those recent great events. With this (...) we would like to tell that our natural development is bound to deep racial origins.”

Even though the book was only distributed among the elites of the new state, it could not take the approval of many historians of the period such as Uzunçarşılı. Still, first signal of Turkish History Thesis which will be officially accepted with the First Turkish History Congress can be realized here. Afet İnan explains the thesis in her first lecture in Ankara Language and History Geography Faculty:

“Homeland of Turks is Central Asia. They had developed Neolithic and mining cultures when the climate was suitable there. However, when our ancestors had to migrate to other continents and various parts of the world due to the climate change, they had brought their knowledge of these Neolithic and mining cultures to those other places.”

It was with these great migrations that Turks spread all over the world and Turks was the race that created the powerful civilizations of history all over. Thus, Turks were not the enemies of civilization as Europeans had told; rather they had contributed to the formation of great civilizations including the ones in Europe.

43 Ari İnan, 101.
44 Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları (Main Features of Turkish History) (İstanbul : Kaynak Yayınları, 1996), 25
46 Ari İnan, 144.
As can be realized, in Turkish History Thesis, race as a subject dominated the general discourse. İnan also contributed to this discourse, in fact, her studies that were based on archeological remaining together with her anthropological studies directly shaped the racial tone in the Thesis. While trying to prove the connection between white race and Turks, and Turkishness of Anatolia for centuries, İnan emphasized non-corrupted, purified Turkish race as she was influenced by the racist anthropologic research becoming popular in Europe. She examined 64000 remainders of skulls and skeletons in Anatolia in her doctorate thesis, to prove the Turkishness of Anatolia for thousands of years. Continuity of Turkish race in Anatolia appears as an important subject especially during the formation years of the Republic. Particularly during this period Hittites were considered as the founder of the first great Turkish State in Anatolia. This “invention” helped to accomplish several goals. First of all, it helped the formation of a feeling of entity, of a Turkish past and Turkish continuity in Anatolia. Indeed, before the last period of the Ottoman Empire, rather than Anatolia, it was the “Rumeli” area, Balkan Peninsula that the empire concentrated on. When the Balkan Peninsula was lost, Anatolia remained as the last stronghold that needed to be protected. A formulation was needed to link the new Republic to this last stronghold, a formulation that would create a sense of ‘belonging’. This was accomplished through awakening a feeling of belonging to Anatolia by underlining its Turkishnesss throughout history. As Afet İnan told in her first class at Faculty of Language and History – Geography in Ankara: “Our Anatolian descendants have taken different political forms and names from Hittites until today. However, the ones who own the country and carry on the cultural lives are directly those societies in different times. Today, people who are

47 Füsun. Üstel. “Makbul Vatandaş”ın Peşinde (In Pursuit of the “Ideal Citizen”), (İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 2005), 216
living, in Turkey are the grand children of those owners of the old culture.” Here, Inan connects “today” with the Hittite past to legitimize the existence of the Turkish nation for centuries in Anatolia.

Moreover, according to Europe-based history theories, Greeks were the first great civilization in the world and Europeans learned the values of the civilization from the Greeks. On the contrary, The Turkish History Thesis claimed that it was the Hittites that brought virtues of the civilization to the Greeks. So, in this way European past was connected to Turkish Hittite Past: First, Hittites taught Greeks how to be civilized and then Greeks carried what Hittites had taught to them into the European Civilization. What is more, for a long time Anatolia was a “contested territory”, while the so-called Turkish past of Anatolia was exalted, the importance of other communities that had been living in Anatolia was reduced and the past of Anatolia was degraded to the past of Hittites. Thus, the statement that claims Hittites had been living in Anatolia long before the Greeks, suggested the idea of “the one who comes first has the right”. As we will see in the next chapter Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı would also respond to this argument. However they approach the issue of Greek Legacy in a rather different way and they would respond to this line of argument by focusing on what Köprülü calls “March of Anatolian Turkicity” which is aimed to deny Byzantium influence over the Ottoman Institutions.

Studies of Afet İnan regarding the issue of Turkish race are shaped by both internal and external dynamics of the period. Totalitarian tendencies of the state increased all through 1930s and campaigns such as “Citizen, Speak Turkish!” or institutions like Public Houses aimed to “turkify” the nation. At the same time, external dynamics also influenced the period’s atmosphere. As Halil Berktay notes, in this period, emphasizing the greatness of

---

48 Arı İnan, 141.
Turks as a race and basically claiming that great civilizations of the world had been formed by the pure Turkish race was not only specific to Turkey, rather it was influenced by the rising popularity of racial ideologies in the West. In this respect, Afet İnan as an intellectual who took her education in the West and who worked with Prof. Pittard - an important academician in Eugenes Studies- was a carrier of these western ideas into the intellectual sphere of the new Republic.

Berktay also points out that when one compares Turkish History Thesis with western romantics that praise the so-called antiquity of their respective nations, one should be very cautious. According to him, in the Turkish case, this historiography is not an aggressive but a defensive one: “Instead of exalting Turks to a stage of masterliness distant to everyone, it now aims at incorporating them into a world history which has announced its Turkishness. It purports to say we are all one, you can not exclude us, we are part of humanity, rather, everyone is Turkish and as a matter of fact there is not any humanity apart from us”\(^50\). In this respect, one should also evaluate Inan’s work within this defensive historiography. Her main efforts were concentrated on to invalidate the theories that show Turks as barbarians.

\textit{Ottomans as the Corrupters of the Purified Turkish Race}\textit{

“European civilization will have positive effects on us in terms of unique beauties and moral tastes. However, these effects are useful to the extent they are trying to destroy the philosophical, moral and aesthetic tastes which has come from Persia to us.”\(^51\) Here Ziya Gökalp stresses that Western Civilization is instrumental as long as it helps to break the cultural values of the East. Indeed, while westernizing, the Kemalist State wanted to cut its connection from the East Civilization. To adapt western values such as positivism, the state

\(^{50}\) Halil Berktay. “Dört Tarihçinin Sosyal Portresi” , 31.  
\(^{51}\) Koçak, 371.
did not hesitate to loosen the ties between its Ottoman legacy, its Islamic past and the new Turkish Republic. Formed against the *ancien régime* of the old Empire, the new Republic was trying to eradicate the effect of religion, consequently, during the period of transformation from a religious community to a nation, Ottoman and Islamic roots of Turkey were denounced as “others” and tried to be alienated from the Turkish Republic.

Nevertheless, until the 1930’s, the aim of the Turkish State to destroy the connection with the Ottoman past was not that explicit in history writing. An example can be given from a school book: in “Türkiye Tarihi” (Turkish History) school book which was used during 1924-1929, emphasis was on the Ottoman Empire. The book had 560 pages and 357 pages of this book were directly about the Ottoman Empire and 92 pages of the book told about the past of the Turkish Society including the Ottoman Empire. However, in the “Main Features of Turkish History”, the chapter of the Ottoman Empire contained only 39 pages out of 467 pages. In “Turkish History”, it was emphasized that Turks before Islam had been living as tribes. Later, the Turkish History Thesis and Afet İnan as one of its formulators saw that kind of claim as an insult and used the word “state” instead of “tribes” to underline the complexity and hence the ‘civilized nature’ of the Turkish past\(^2\).

Afet İnan in her book named “Civic Information for Citizen” written with the support of Mustafa Kemal, gives a detailed description of the Turkish Nation under the heading “Millet” (Nation). Needless to say, when she points out the characteristics of a nation, she mentions that even though some might claim that religious unity is also a significant element of being a nation, yet this is not acceptable in the Turkish context. In fact, according to her, religion has loosened the national ties of the Turks:

“(…) Turks were a great nation even before they had been converted to Islamic religion. After Turks had been converted to this religion, this religion had no effect in terms of making Arabs, Iranians from the same religion and others like that to create a nation united with Turks. Conversely, it loosened the national bonds of Turkish Nation. It numbed its

national feeling, national excitement. This was natural. Because the ideology of the religion that Muhammed established was to create a religious community above all and including all of the nations.”

In an article called “Türk-Osmanlı Tarihinin Karakteristik Noktalarına Bir Bakış”\(^5^4\) (A Glance at the Characteristic Aspects of Turkish-Ottoman History), once more, İnan’s language is more propagandist than scientific. When she explains the regression of Ottoman political power she first criticizes the expansion of Islamic Ideology over the institutions of the Empire which has triggered its decline\(^5^5\), delineating how religion was being increasingly used as an instrument of politics. In this respect, İnan’s emphasis on the relationship between politics and religion should be seen as a message to her time: Secularization of the country should be carried or else we have already seen what happens if religion directly affects state politics.

In addition, in line with her racist arguments, she points out the degeneration of the Ottoman Dynasty as the first reason of Ottoman Decline\(^5^6\) in “A Glance at the Characteristic Aspects of Turkish-Ottoman History”. According to İnan, in the Ottoman Dynasty, sultans had forgotten their ancestors and thus pure Turkish race had been lost. Once the essence of Turkishness in the dynasty had been lost and the hegemony of religion over the state institutions had begun, combined with other factors such as rebellions within the Empire and the incapability of sultans to rule the Empire, Ottoman Political Power had faded away. İnan’s nationalist approach becomes much more evident when she suddenly jumps into the successes of Mustafa Kemal at the end of the article\(^5^7\). In fact these kinds of sudden changes and approaches to various historical issues in an anachronistic way, underline her politicized language.

\(^{53}\) Afet İnan, “Millet” in Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce Cilt 2 : Kemalizm (Political Thinking in Modern Turkey Vol 2 : Kemalism) (İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 2004), 656.

\(^{54}\) Afet İnan, “Türk-Osmanlı Tarihinin Karakteristik Noktalarına Bir Bakış” Belleten Vol 2 No.5/6 (April, 1938).

\(^{55}\) Ibid, 126

\(^{56}\) Afet İnan, “Türk-Osmanlı Tarihinin Karakteristik Noktalarına Bir Bakış”, 129.

\(^{57}\) Ibid, 132
To sum it up, as can be seen, İnän’s approach to history is shaped by the period’s nationalist discourses. As a “missionary” historian who was under the mentorship of Mustafa Kemal, her aim was to legitimize the existence and the ideology of the new Republic and “give an identity to this society, majority of which consisted of Turks”\textsuperscript{58}. She had taken her first steps in the history discipline in the more liberated atmosphere of the period after the collapse of the Empire, yet, this openness ironically paved the way for the creation of new dogmas, one of which was the Turkish History Thesis. İnän became a formulator and a fervent defender of the Thesis. In this respect, at many times, her political agenda dominates her history writing as manifested in her speeches and writings. As Göral discusses, “İnan goes through the same contradiction akin to every nationalist historian. While claiming to explain the existent phenomenon as it is with a positivist belief, she actually reflects it in the form she wants it to be understood. The actual phenomena and the phenomena that should be presented according to the author’s beliefs are interwined in the texts”\textsuperscript{59}. In this regard, in İnän’s works, political stance and history writing exist side by side and history is manipulated as a tool for politics.

\textsuperscript{58} Afet İnän, \textit{Tarih İlinin Dinamik Karakteri}, 4, quoted in Büşra Ersanlı, \textit{İktidar ve Tarih : Türkiye‘de “Resmi Tarih” Tezinin Oluşumu}, 151.

\textsuperscript{59} Göral, 224.
CHAPTER TWO:
“LIMITED” OPPOSITION IN NATIONAL HISTORY:
FUAT KÖPRÜLÜ AND İSMAİL HAKKI UZUNÇARŞILI

As reflected in the last chapter, the impact of the ideology of the period on Afet İnans’s history writing is manifested in her works. Her efforts were concentrated on legitimizing the so-called Turkish History Thesis in order to prove the existence of Turks in Anatolia for thousand years and thus to invalidate the Europe-based theories while orientating the transformation of the society. In this respect, it can be stated that all through the 1930s, İnans’s political opinions took precedence and they have expanded at the expense of her historical objectivity which in turn has influenced her history writing.

While İnans could unproblematically be added to the category of the “supportive insider” or “practical (wo)man”, the relationship between political ideology and history-writing doesn’t always appear so obvious. If we aim at categorizing the history-writings of Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı in a similar way, it will eventually be realized that these historians do not fit in this kind of a picture that easily. Although they have remained within the Kemalist Cadres all through the 1930s, in their academic work they successfully evaded the “shallow explanations of Turkish Nationalism”60 which was manifest in Afet İnans’s writings. Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı have tried to approach the issues in the most possible scientific manner even in their writings in which the touch of Turkish Nationalism can easily be detected. In other words, both of them made an effort to support their arguments scientifically without resorting to the tabooed nationalist discourse of the era.

Yet this does not mean that the ideology of the period did not affect their writings. As will be seen in the works of Köprülü, he has frequently adjusted his arguments according to the claims of the grand narrative of the period. Particularly, after his argument with Afet İnans

in the First Turkish History Congress, till the death of Mustafa Kemal, Köprülü has written articles praising the “greatness of Mustafa Kemal”. In two of his articles from the period, he denounces the deterministic perspective history can take and then attributes the success of the Turkish Revolution to a singular man, arguing that “No any preconditions or any other events have set the stage for Turkish Revolution and Republic and none of the preconditions and other events can explain it, but it is a miracle actualized by a great genius on his own”\textsuperscript{61}.

These kinds of statements of Köprülü have been much argued. For instance, A. Cerrahoglu wrote a book named “Tarihi Anlayışı Olmayan Bir Tarihçi: Fuat Köprülü” (“A Historian without an Understanding of History: Fuat Köprülü”) in 1964. Rather than analyzing the history writing of Köprülü, Cerrahoglu examined Köprülü’s unscientific writings to show his “inconsistencies”. By analyzing Köprülü’s works written in the 1930s together with his articles that were written after the formation of the two-party regime in which Köprülü criticizes the totalitarian atmosphere of the 1930s, Cerrahoglu concludes that Köprülü had no “historical insight”\textsuperscript{62}. In a similar way, today many academicians simply summarize Köprülü’s historiography as a “political tool in order to justify his nationalist agenda”\textsuperscript{63}, just as we have seen in Inan’s history-writing. Although, it is accurate to assert some of Köprülü’s historiography as a “political tool”, this tendency to focus solely on ‘a part’ of Köprülü’s writings, prevents one to see the larger picture of Köprülü’s history-writing, and misleads us.

A rather different point of view can be seen in Halil Berktay’s book called “Cumhuriyet Ideolojisi ve Fuat Köprülü” (Republican Ideology and Fuat Köprülü). In the book, Berktay evaluates Köprülü’s writing as a reaction against European Imperialism which has used the discipline of History to exploit peripheries and thus Berktay presents Köprülü

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid, 31.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid, 32.
\textsuperscript{63} Aslıgül Berktay, “The ‘Anti-Nationalist’ Liberation of the Turkish Historiography on the Balkans: The Contributions of Three Turkish Historians to an Understanding of the Byzantine Legacy” (M.A diss., Central European University - The Department of History, 2005), 15.

In order to be fair, it should be noted that in Aslıgül Berktay’s dissertation, Koprulu’s historiography analyzed in a comprehensive way. However Aslıgül Berktay seems to draw conclusion about Koprulu hastily which in turn prevents a more detailed conclusion.
almost as a revolutionary historian. However, even in such a perspective, Köprülü’s history writing is imprisoned into a definite categorization once again.

Another tendency about Köprülü and Uzunçarşı is to assess their history-writing as definitely objective ones. Even today, because of these historians’ extensive concentration on primary sources, as Berktay points out, their work is perceived as objective secondary sources. However, as mentioned in the introduction chapter of this work, factors such as the background of a historian and even the environment of which he is a part all may shape, at least affect his or her writings. Furthermore as it is already alluded, one should be very cautious to see the complexity in Köprülü’s and Uzunçarşı’s writings which make it difficult to put their writing under the category of “practical man”. Both of the historians were nationalist, yet at the same time they have frequently succeeded to stay away from unscientific arguments in their academic writings. Moreover, as will be seen although methodologies of Köprülü and Uzunçarşı were different from each other, many times their approaches to the historical problems of the period were akin.

To understand how their approaches were shaped, first of all background information about Köprülü and Uzunçarşı will be given and then their approaches to history-writing, methodologies of them will be compared. Finally their position against period’s two prevailing paradigms, namely Turkish History Thesis and Orientalist arguments of European historians will be discussed.

---

64 Halil Berktay, *Cumhuriyet İdeolojisi ve Fuat Köprülü* (Republican Ideology and Fuat Kopruulu), (İstanbul : Kaynak Yayımları, 1983)
In a similar way Berktay turns a blind eye to period’s totalitarian tendencies and negative effects of these tendencies over historiography of the period. For instance, he mentions that in the First History Congress Köprulu could raise criticism freely (Halil Berktay, *Cumhuriyet İdeolojisi ve Fuat Kopruulu*, 59). However Berktay does not talk about strong reaction of Afet Inan and Hasan Cemil, which eventually forced Köprulu to step back from the argument. Furthermore, Berktay emphasizes revolutionary change in Turkish historiography to invalid imperialist Europe’s orientalist views. Years later, he admits in “Social Portraits of Four Historian” that as an effect of his ideological belief in 1980s, he overemphasized revolutionary characteristic of period’s historiography. (Halil Berktay, “Dört Tarihçinin Sosyal Portresi”, 22.)

Fuat Köprülü was born in 1890 in Istanbul. His family was one of the well known families in the Empire and for a long time they served in the Empire’s highest offices. For instance, he was a direct descendant of Köprülü Mehmed Pasha, a grand vizier of Sultan Mehmed IV. Coming from a lineage of grand viziers, Fuat Köprülü had an opportunity of being educated in the best schools of the capital. After he successfully graduated from high school, he began to study law in Faculty of Law from 1907 till 1910. From 1910 onward, he occupied important academic positions in famous schools and faculties of the period and taught in various disciplines. Several of them were: Turkish Literature, Law, History of Turkish Institutions, Turkish History and Political History. Furthermore, he worked as the Head of the Istanbul University Faculty of Literature between 1923 and 1934. He became the dean in 1934 at the same university and worked in this position until 1943. In line with his academic career, Köprülü published various scientific articles and books in this period and he “wrote articles in almost every area of social sciences” 66.

It is important to note that his career and work were not limited to Turkey, especially starting from the 1930s he also began to be recognized in Europe as one of the important historians regarding the subject of Ottoman History. In this respect, he also gave many lectures abroad. For instance, his famous lectures in University of Paris in 1934 about the foundations of the Ottoman Empire, was published as “Les Origines de l’Empire Ottoman” one year later in France 67.

Although, starting from the foundation of the Republic, Köprülü remained within the Kemalist Cadres, his active political life began in 1935. He was elected from Kars and became a member of the Turkish National Assembly. Till 1943, Köprülü followed both a political and an academic career at the same time by giving lectures in Ankara and Istanbul Universities jointly while being the Kars Deputy in the National Assembly. In 1943,

66 Ersanlı, İktidar ve Tarih : Türkiye’de “Resmi Tarih” Tezinin Oluşumu , 153
67 Fuat Köprülü, Osmanlı Devleti’nin Kuruluşu (Foundation of the Ottoman Empire), (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1991), XV
Köprülü’s membership in the Republican People’s Party was terminated and in 1946 with the formation of a two-party regime, he became one of the founders of the Democrat Party. An article of Köprülü from 1959 is an important one to see why he was terminated from the Republican People’s Party and his reason in joining the opposition party. In that article, he points out that the era of the mono-party regime was “inevitable as a matter of social development, yet dictatorial”\textsuperscript{68}.

Starting from 1950, Köprülü held important posts in the Democrat Party Government. First he became Minister of Foreign Affairs then Minister of State and finally Deputy Prime Minister. However when the party steered for an authoritarian regime and started suppression of the community, he resigned from the party, first joining the Freedom Party and then he founded the Free Democratic Party in 1961\textsuperscript{69}.

Köprülü’s active political life is significant to understand his work. Although many times he is compared to Iorga because of his active involvement in politics and academics, thanks to his moderate liberal stance he did not confuse nationalism with government representativeness as much as Iorga did. Yet, as noted before, for a period Köprülü also published articles that were focused on praising the mono party system. In this respect, in an opportunistic way, he remained as the loyal citizen to the mono party regime, not raising any opposition against the regime and hence was able to hold his posts in the university and in the state at a time when many academicians’ careers in universities were terminated by the state. Eventually however, when the oppression of the mono-party regime weakened and opened the way to a two party system, he left to join the opposition party.

Buşra Ersanlı presents Köprülü in 1930s with a title called “Opposition in National History”\textsuperscript{70}. Though it is not wrong to assert that at least in his academic work, Köprülü did oppose many themes of the period’s grand narrative, he could never raise his voice freely

\textsuperscript{68} Halil Berktay. “Dört Tarihçinin Sosyal Portresi”, 31.
\textsuperscript{69} Mehmet Fuat Köprülü (Biyografi.info) (http://www.biyografi.info/kisi/mehmet-fuat-koprulu)
\textsuperscript{70} Ersanlı, İktidar ve Tarih : Türkiye’de “Resmi Tarih” Teziniğinin Oluşumu, 153.
during the era. As Ersanlı mentions, “Köprülü was held outside the “absolute victory” of the Turkish History Thesis.”\footnote{Ibid, 236.}, yet he never openly stated that. In fact, as can be seen in the First Turkish History Congress in moments when Köprülü really wanted to oppose the dogmas of the thesis, he was forced to step back. Still, at the same time he was unconditionally supporting the part of the thesis which aimed to invalidate European based theories. In this respect while Köprülü was influenced by the period’s nationalist atmosphere, he never went to the extremes.

In “Republican Ideology and Fuat Köprülü”, Halil Berktay mentions that ‘in order to let the blossoming of Köprülü’s modern history sapling’ first the old dogmas of the Empire needed to be eliminated by the Republic.\footnote{Halil Berktay, \textit{Cumhuriyet İdeolojisi ve Fuat Köprülü}, 47.} However, as Berktay notes in his later work, Köprülü was an intelligentsia that the Ottoman State transferred to the Republic\footnote{Halil Berktay. “Dört Tarihçinin Sosyal Portresi”, 35-36.}. Indeed, his contribution to the discipline of History began as early as in 1910s, during the last phase of the Empire. While talking about Köprülü’s studies in 1910s, Halil Inalcık also states: “Now we find him as a writer (...) yet, first of all, we find him as a creative intellectual (...) Köprülü conceived profoundly the importance of creative West mentality”.\footnote{Ersanlı, \textit{İktidar ve Tarih : Türkiye de “Resmi Tarih” Tezinin Oluşumu}, 154} Without doubt, the new Republic should have contributed to the professionalism of History discipline with the foundation of various institutions on historical studies. However even before the Republic, one could realize that Köprülü began to publish articles that were concerned with modern historiography. For instance, an article of Köprülü from 1917, was concerned with the issue of writing of national history in a modern way\footnote{Fuat Köprülü, “Tenkid : Bizde Milli Tarih Yazılabilir mi?” \textit{Yeni Mecmua}, 22, (1917).}. In “Bizde Milli Tarih Yazılabilir mi?” (Can National History be Written in Our Country?), Köprülü compares the historiography in Europe and in the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, Köprülü signifies the importance of getting professionalized in one specific subject or period in history and emphasizes historians’ need
to work in an interdisciplinary atmosphere. He says; “in our country the historian knows about every era meaning that indeed he/she knows nothing” 76, an example of which is Afet Inan.

Köprülü’s main methodological opposition to Turkish History Thesis was the insufficiency of the sources of the Thesis, and what is more, the Thesis was being formed hastily which departed it from scientific research. In his article from 1917 he emphasizes that in order to write a national history, first the shortcomings need to be eliminated 77. His concentration on primary sources can also be witnessed in the First Turkish History Congress. After Afet Inan’s speech regarding the issue of Turkishness of Central Asia for thousand years, Köprülü takes the speech and very cautiously criticizes Afet Inan. In his speech his main concern is that Inan’s research is inadequate and her thesis is only supported by secondary sources. He adds that there is hardly a document that shows the prehistoric period of Turks, the earliest document about Turks being from the 6th century. Moreover, Köprülü suggests that one should be patient in this subject since prehistoric studies, archeology and anthropology are newly developing in Central Asia. Before reaching a definite conclusion about Turks in prehistoric ages, one should wait for the results that will come from these study areas 78.

Afet İnan gives her first reply to Köprülü in the first hour of the afternoon session. It is a short reply and rather than trying to rebut Köprülü’s argument, she departs from the scientific argument and deflects it by first using a secondary source and than approaching the subject in a provokating way:

“Presumably the <Turk> title was not given to Turks by means of Turkish state which the Chinese called <Tukyu>. It’s much older than that. For instance, we can all see that the part of Etrusches who had gone to Italy were called <Turski> in 8th century BC according to Encyclopedia Britannica. However Tukyu state which the Professor mentioned was in 6th century AD.

76 Ibid, 427.
77 Ibid, 428.
78 I. Türk Tarih Kongresi : Konferanslar, Müzakere Zabıtları, 42-47
Apparently the Chinese could not be the father of the name of the Turks. Turks had not needed to be baptized by any nation ever to take a name and still they don’t. (Applause).

My statement is this. 79

Member of the Society for the Study of Turkish History, Hasan Cemil Bey also replies to Köprülü. In his speech, Hasan Cemil Bey clarifies that although studies concerning Central Asia are newly developing, it does not reduce the importance of these studies. Rather, these studies are important ones since they pawn a new way to invalidate old theories 80. After these aggressive criticisms, Fuad Köprülü steps back from the argument and he explains that he has been misunderstood 81. In this respect, as Ersanlı points out, “if anything, (...) the new state made it more difficult for him to carry on his critical investigations” 82.

Just as Köprülü was an intellectual that the old system transferred to the Republic, İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı too was an intellectual of his time, the time of the end of the Empire. However unlike Köprülü, his name began to be known in academic circles after the foundation of the new Turkish Republic. Uzunçarşılı, was born in 1888 in Istanbul. He graduated from İstanbul University Faculty of Literature in 1912. Even though he joined the Committee of Union and Progress for a short period, he eventually quit the Committee 83 and went to Anatolia to teach history in various cities of Anatolia. He left his work in Kütahya in 1921 when the Greek forces occupied the city. Uzunçarşılı then moved to Ankara and joined the National Government during the war. Later he continued his career in Kastamonu by teaching history in Kastamonu Highschool. During his stay in Kastamonu, Uzunçarşılı also began to write his historical researches in a local newspaper, “Açiksöz” which was known as

79 Ibid, 50-51.
80 Ibid, 80-8.
81 Ibid.
a supporter of the Ankara Government during the war. After the war, Uzunçarşılı was appointed to Balıkesir and in 1927 he became a member of the parliament as the representative of Balıkesir till 1950. Unlike Köprülü, Uzunçarşılı never actively got involved in politics, he chose to stay away from the political arguments of the period. At the same time by the order of Mustafa Kemal, he began to teach in the history departments of Istanbul University and the newly founded Ankara University till 1939. When the Democrat Party took control of the government in 1950, Uzunçarşılı also lost his seat at the parliament. Till his death in 1977 he concentrated on his researches and books, never laying aside his main task of translating the Ottoman documents at the National Archives.84

Like Köprülü, Uzunçarşılı was also critical about the usage of sources during the formulation of the Turkish History Thesis. For instance, in “Türk Tarihi Yazılırken” (While Turkish History is Being Written), Uzunçarşılı points out the defective parts of “Main Features of Turkish History”85. According to him, sources that were used for the book are insufficient, the book was written hastily and those who wrote the chapters of the book were not professionals specialized in the subjects they wrote about.86 Yet, most probably because of the government’s suppression, the inconsistency of Köprülü can also be detected in Uzunçarşılı. While criticizing the sources that were used in “Main Features of Turkish History” where the Turkish History Thesis was announced for the first time, in an earlier article of him, Uzunçarşılı seems to support the Thesis and talks about the adequacy of the newly founded (or rather “invented”) sources87.

Many times Uzunçarşılı’s and Köprülü’s works are compared to show methodological differences between the two of them. Köprülü’s direct connection with academic circles in

---

Europe and his being cognizant of the developments in historiography in the international arena must have an effect over his historiography. According to Halil Berktay, Köprülü’s materialist and universalist methodology made him the earliest follower of the Annales School in Turkey. In this respect, Köprülü is shown as the first representative of the ‘new style’ modern historian in Turkey. Uzunçarşılı on the other hand is seen as a representative of ‘traditional’ narrative history. He has a style of using primary sources and in general, solely focusing on the primary sources without interpreting them. These characteristics of his style make his stand as a historian closer to Rankean Historiography. However as Ersanli points out: ‘These two branches of historiography, so to say, grew from a common trunk; and this common basis was the need to locate and analyze hitherto unknown primary sources, without which neither traditional narrative, nor the new economic and social history could progress.’ In this respect, even their methodological approaches differed from each other, approaches of Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı to period’s historical problems were very similar. On the one hand, while they remained within the Kemalist Cadres of the period at the same time they were trying to posit themselves against the shallow explanations of Turkish History Thesis which stated that the successes of the Ottoman Empire were based on its Turkishness. On the other hand, against the international academic circles, they were trying to invalidate the Europe-based theories which claimed that the Ottomans were incapable of building an empire with a proper system and complex institutions; therefore they directly copied institutions of the Byzantium Empire.

88 Ashgül Berktay, 16
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Responding to Turkish History Thesis

As it is stated before, one of the prevailing arguments in the Turkish History Thesis was that the successes of the Ottoman Empire were based on its Turkishness. Afet İnan tried to prove this by claiming that when pure Turkish race had been lost in the Ottoman Dynasty, its failures also began. Moreover, the Thesis was trying to reply to the claims of the European-based theories. As it is noted, in an Orientalist way, these theories were picturing Turks as a backward and barbaric race. As will be discussed, in the international context, Turks were degraded to an underdeveloped tribe who could not create a complex state. As a response to this, in the Turkish History Thesis, tribal features of Turks were rejected and it was emphasized that Turks, as a race, established successful states. Afet İnan quotes from Mustafa Kemal: “Turks as a tribe could not have founded an empire in Anatolia. There should be another explanation. The history discipline must reveal this.”92. In order to reveal this, Afet İnan as a missionary historian tried to prove the continuity of Turkishness in Anatolia for thousand years in her researches. By doing this, she not only tried to give a Turkish characteristic to Anatolia as it has been discussed before, but she also tried to prove that the oldest complex states of Anatolia had been founded by Turks. Since Turks had been in Anatolia for centuries and founded complex states, tribal characteristics of the Ottoman Empire were negligible and not worthy of mentioning.

Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı responded to these arguments and their approaches were similar to each other. Yet once again, both of these historians could not openly oppose these themes during the 1930s’ Turkey. For instance, Köprülü criticized the main arguments of the thesis regarding the issue of foundation of the Ottoman Empire in his book “Les Origines l’Empire Ottoman”. Needless to say, even though this book was published in France in 1935,

92 Afet İnan, “Atatürk ve Tarih Tezi”, 244
it was not published in Turkey until 1959. In a similar way, Uzunçarşılı did not write much about the subject of the foundation of the Ottoman Empire in the 1930s. However in “Osmanlı Tarihi” (Ottoman History) volumes which were published in 1947 for the first time, Uzunçarşılı could freely declare that the successes of the Ottoman Empire were based on both external and internal dynamics of the period, not its Turkishness. Rather than focusing on the issue of Turkishness of the Empire, Uzunçarşılı in his work specifically emphasizes the weakness of the Byzantium Empire during the formation of the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, Uzunçarşılı concentrates on the relation of the Ottomans with other principalities and Islamic sects in Anatolia. According to Uzunçarşılı, especially the sultans’ good relations with Islamic Sects in Anatolia such as Ahis and Babais, played an important role in the sultans’ being supported by the diverse parts of the society.

Köprülü approaches the similar issue in a more detailed way in “Les Origines l’Empire Ottoman”. According to Köprülü, lack of primary sources about the origins of the Ottoman Empire prevents historians to conceive the details about its foundation. This contributes to a manipulation, namely, the shaping the past, by the historians, according to their ideologies and thus their speculations about the era in line with these ideologies. Köprülü criticizes the European historians who present Turks as backward. Indeed, it can be said that, in a disguised way he also criticizes the new republican historians who attribute Ottomans’ success to Turkishness of the Ottomans, in the same way.

According to Köprülü founders of the Ottoman Empire were Turks. However he posits himself against the reductionist arguments that show the successes of the Empire as the successes of the Turkish Race. Rather, in order to understand the successes of the Empire, the historian should investigate various fields of the Empire such as its economy, law, religion,
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military etc. Synthesis of these fields could only clarify the missing parts to understand the successes of the Empire\textsuperscript{97}. Moreover, Köprülü was aware that the phenomena of religion and race by going through certain changes and developments may lose their original purity, and thus it may be misleading to talk about a pure religion or race over the Empire\textsuperscript{98}. The Empire did not only consist of Turks but “the masses that belong to different nationalities who have come to Anatolia from diverse areas of the Islamic world and the old community of Anatolia as well as the Greeks who are more crowded at the seaside lands, namely the whole Anatolian public/community” were also living in the Empire\textsuperscript{99}. In this respect, the Ottoman reality cannot be explained solely by its Turkishness according to Köprülü. Rather, the social and political evolution of the Empire should be analyzed. However, in a period when Turkishness was underlined and when the political power of the Ottoman Empire was rejected by the period’s grand narrative, it is understandable why this book was not translated to Turkish in the 1930s.

Köprülü also responded to the arguments about the tribal characteristics of Turks during the foundation period of the Ottoman Empire. Instead of putting tribe and state into opposite camps, Köprülü “carefully traced in descriptive terms, the development, the qualitative transformation, from the one to the other in the concrete case of the Oghuz Turks”\textsuperscript{100}. In the book, Köprülü tries to show the evolution of Turkic states in Anatolia starting from the 11\textsuperscript{th} Century. The main argument of Köprülü is that a historian should not exclusively concentrate on the history of the Ottoman Dynasty and its foundation. According to him, Ottomans were the last unit of “the historical march of Anatolian Turkicity”. “As the Ottoman’s geographical foundation area is not a lonely island in the middle of the ocean,
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\textsuperscript{100} Halil Berktay, “The ‘Other’ Feudalism. A Critique of 20th Century Turkish Historiography and its Particularization of Ottoman Society” (PhD diss, University of Birmingham Faculty of Arts, the School of History – Department of Medieval History, 1990), 131. quoted in Aslıgül Berktay, 18.
people living there were consequently not a distinct element from the Turks of Anatolian Seljukids”\textsuperscript{101} In this sense, Ottoman history could only be understood “by being placed and investigated within the framework of general Turkish history, that is to say, in conjunction with the other Anatolian Principalities and as a continuation of Anatolian Seljukid History”\textsuperscript{102}.

Köprülü discusses that the tribal feature of the Ottoman Principality, should not be seen as a weakness of it. While he opposes the Turkish History Thesis which claims that the Ottomans had never had a tribal characteristic, Köprülü demonstrates why this is so exactly. According to him even though the Ottoman Principality was a tribe at the beginning, it was actually a “state from the outset”. It carried the potential of becoming a complex state because the Seljukid Empire and Anatolian Seljukids, its Turkic antecedents had been states themselves. In this respect, it was very much possible for the Ottomans to be transformed into a complex state as it carried and embraced the traditions and institutions of the former Turkic states. Yet it should be once more reminded that according to Köprülü, even if the former-Ottoman Turkic States had an influence in the foundation of the Empire and so it could be acknowledged that the Turks established the Empire, it would be a mistake to deduce the Empire’s success from its Turkishness.

Hence, Köprülü seeks to place the Ottoman Empire into the wider context of the Turkish History and emphasizes “Ottoman can not be demonstrated as a lonely island in the middle of the ocean”. However when he tried to invalidate Europe-Based theories, he could easily turn a blind eye on the possible effects of “alien” stimulus (Byzantine Empire) over the institutions of the Ottoman Empire. Uzunçarşılı also followed a similar path as Köprülü and he completely neglected even the smallest influence of the Byzantium Empire over the Ottomans.

\textsuperscript{101} Köprülü, \textit{Osmanlı Devletinin Kuruluşu}, 22
\textsuperscript{102} Ibid, 63.
Responding to Western Orientalism

Köprülü explains the Europe-Based theories in his various works and just like the period’s grand narrative opposes these theories, Köprülü too posits himself against these existing claims. He summarizes these theories in the following way:

1) The Ottoman State had been founded by a small tribe settled on the Byzantine frontier by Seljukid Emperors. Consisting entirely of rude shepherds and not possessing the civilized components necessary to found a state, this tribe had adopted Islam itself in the time of Osman (...). It was only through the non-Muslim elements of the areas they conquered and settled on that these people obtained the means necessary for state construction.

2) The first organizational efforts these nomads undertook after their conversion to Islam was doubtless of a primitive and Asiatic character… It was only after the conquest of Istanbul that the Ottoman Empire would be institutionally reorganized from top to bottom. And it was entirely natural that this should be based on imitating and adopting Byzantine institutions.

As we have seen, in order to refute these arguments, while the Turkish History Thesis completely rejected the tribal features of the house of Osman, Köprülü, not denying the tribal features, argues that the tribal and nomadic characteristics of the Ottomans should be evaluated within the wider context of the “March of Anatolian Turkicity”. However another problem arises here: Even Köprülü admitted the influences of external dynamics over the Ottomans, he and Uzunçarşılı did not accept the possible influence of the Byzantium Empire over the Ottomans while trying to prove that the institutions of the Ottomans were not based on or did not imitate Byzantine Institutions. They responded to the Orientalist theories of Europe through a complete denial of the Byzantine Legacy. In this respect, while Köprülü rightly argues in his book that one should not evaluate the Ottoman Empire as a lonely island, both of these historians have an effort to restrict the effects that are possible to come from Byzantium, perceiving the Ottoman Principality as a peninsula.

As Aslɪgül Berktay argues, similarities between the Ottoman and Byzantine Institutions were striking and many historians in the international arena point out to these
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resemblances. An important historian like Iorga alleges that the Ottoman did not imitate the Byzantium but it actually stole from it\textsuperscript{104} while historians like Rambaud and Diel state that The Turks are neither governors nor law-makers but harsh soldiers not interested in the science of politics.\textsuperscript{105} All of them drew attention to parallel institutions: Position of sultan / emperor, palace protocols, nature of military fiefs in both of these empires, taxation, military organization, organization style of provinces and even position of eunuchs in the palace are some of the subjects that the international historians used at that time to show the resembling similarities between the Byzantium and Ottoman Empires.

However, resemblances between the Byzantium Empire and the Ottoman Empire were not only discussed within the academic circles. Before World War I and during the Paris Peace Conferences, the rhetoric that Turks had always been a barbaric nation, thus they could only create the Ottoman Empire by borrowing the institutions of Byzantium, was used in the political context many times. Especially after the war, these claims had been adapted to Wilsonian Principles so that the Empire could be shared between world powers. Particularly, at the Peace Conferences, Allied Powers clearly stated that: “The Turk, whether among the European Christians and whether among the Muslims in Syria, Arabia and Africa, has not done anything else but destroyed the places he seized; he never demonstrated the ability to develop in peace what he had acquired in war: this ability does not exist among the characteristics of Turk.”\textsuperscript{106} Connected to these Orientalist views, all through the Peace Conferences, the Greek State was trying to prove that the Ottomans had been nothing but a simple imitation of the Byzantium Empire in order to prove the right of self-determination of Greeks in Anatolia. In this respect, as Berktay discusses, for Turks, the subject of history

\textsuperscript{104} Fuat Köprülü, \textit{Bizans Müesseselerinin Osmanlı Müesseselerine Tesiri} (Effect of Byzantium Institutions on the Ottoman Institutions) (Istanbul : Otuken Yayınları, 1981), 17.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid, 7
\textsuperscript{106} Halil Berktay, \textit{Cumhuriyet İdeolojisi ve Fuat Köprülü}, 23
“became more than an issue of solely academic discussion and its consequences started to be felt in the economical, ideological and cultural aspects of social life”

Köprülü, in “Bizans Müesseselerinin Osmanlı Müesseselerine Tesiri” (Effect of Byzantium Institutions on the Ottoman Institutions), responses to these Orientalist approaches of European Historians. He critically analyzes the European historians’ arguments and notes that these historians “seize the Byzantium effect as an established issue, not a case that needs to be proved.” Moreover Köprülü states that lack of sources about the Ottoman past is one of the reasons of the claims of European Historians. For instance, according to Köprülü, Iorga’s assumptions about the Ottoman Past and the effect of the Byzantium Institutions over the Ottoman ones “are not based on historical truths, but rather on his own fantasies.”

More than that “The greatest reason that leads European historians to mistaken conclusions in this matter is the prejudice they have about Turks.” Köprülü then analyzes Ottoman Institutions one by one in order to confirm that the Ottoman institutions are not Byzantine in origin and to rebut the arguments of European historians. His argument is that; if a historian does not investigate Ottoman History as the last chain of Turkish History, as a continuation of Anatolian Seljukids, then he or she could not enlighten this historical problem. Köprülü’s evolutionary perspective to explain the tribal features of the Ottoman Principality, or in his term “Historical March of Anatolian Turkicity” can also be seen in his stance on the effect of Byzantium over the Ottoman: “Just as in all other social institutions, in order to make our juridical institutions understandable, we have to understand what kind of phases those institutions went through in various Turkish states, in a chronological manner, starting from
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pre-Islamic period and also we have to ascertain the possible external influences in every period and every geographical area.”

For instance, the issue of the military fief in the Ottoman Empire can be examined as a case. While trying to prove that the Ottoman timar system was not inherited from Byzantium pronoia, Köprülü goes into a detailed analysis of the evolution of military fief from the first Islamic states to the Ottoman Empire. According to Köprülü, ikta system in the first Islamic states had formed the basis of Turkish timar system. It then evolved into timar system through substantial evolution during the Seljukid Empire and the Ottoman Empire inherited this system from the Seljukids. In this aspect, even there was a similar military fief in the Byzantium Empire, “the fact that there exists a Seljukid and thus a non-Byzantine antecedent to the timar system is seen as proof in itself that the system was not taken from the Byzantine pronoia.”

Still, Köprülü does not completely discount the Byzantium impacts upon the Ottomans. Some taxes of the Ottoman Empire could be derived from the Byzantium system or some words such as “alay” and “efendi” could also be used in the Byzantium Empire. Other than these, Köprülü also discusses that Byzantium could have indirect influence over the Ottoman System. For instance, according to Köprülü, in the early Middle Ages, Byzantium Empire and its institutions had influenced the Ummayads and at that time, some of the institutions of Byzantium had been imitated in the Islamic empires. Especially at the very beginning, when Arab conquerors entered into Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia and defeated the Byzantium forces, they had to adopt Sassanid and Byzantine institutions in order to build a complex state. In this sense, Ottomans had absorbed some of the institutions of the Byzantium Empire in an indirect way. However, at the end of “Effect of Byzantine
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Institutions on the Ottoman Institutions”, Köprüllü once again states that these effects do not change the fact that “Ottomans’ contact with Byzantium, before and after the conquest of Istanbul, did not have any important influence”\textsuperscript{117}. Indeed, when Ottomans conquered Constantinople, Byzantium Empire was nothing but a weak feudal state and its institutions had already been corrupted. Hence, a comparison of Mehmed II’s centralist empire with the weak Byzantium is absolutely not acceptable according to Köprüllü\textsuperscript{118}.

Uzunçarşılı also contributed to this issue. In the Foreword of the “Ottoman History”, he first explains the attitudes of foreign historians, particularly those of Balkan Historians. According to him, prejudices of Balkan Historians prevent them from writing an objective history regarding the Ottoman Empire and “These histories written with hatred (…) they saw the fair conduct Ottomans demonstrated during their [Ottoman state] victories and they wrote those works with the feeling of not being able to digest the invasion of Balkan peninsula, which was full of Christians, by a handful of Muslim Turks in a short period. They hurt us in an unfair way with those works.”\textsuperscript{119}

However, unlike Köprüllü, Uzunçarşılı is in complete denial of even any small influence of Byzantium institutions over the Ottoman Empire. When he talks about the institutions of the Ottoman, he does not go into details of arguments about the effect of Byzantium Institutions. Just like Köprüllü, Uzunçarşılı also asserts that institutions of the Ottoman Empire could only be understood by analyzing older Turkish and Islamic states. For instance, in the subject of taxation and military fief in the Ottoman Empire, Uzunçarşılı points out to the evolution of taxation and military fief from first Islamic states to Anatolian
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Seljukids. Similar to Köprülü, Uzunçarşılı explains the resemblance between timar and ikta systems.

This small opinion difference between Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı regarding whether Byzantium had any effect over the Ottomans, was also debated between these two historians. In “Kuruluşundan 15. Asırın İlk Yarısına Kadar Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Teşkilati” (The Ottoman Empire Organization From Its Foundation Until the First Half of 15. Century) which was published as a part of “Main Features of Turkish History”, for the first time, Uzunçarşılı tries to demonstrate the fact that there are no connections between the two empires. Moreover, in the article, Uzunçarşılı criticizes Köprülü by stating that Köprülü overestimates the impact of the Byzantine Institutions on the Ottoman institutions. After this, Köprülü respond Uzunçarşılı with a lengthy article which was later on published as “Effect of Byzantine Institutions on the Ottomans”.

In spite of the fact that Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı tried to be scientific by using primary sources to support their theories, in their aims at refuting the Orientalist Perspective they merely tried to state the exact opposite of Orientalist Historians. Both historians were commited to show the already proven absence of any impact of Byzantium on the Ottoman State. Before starting their studies, they held in mind arguments to empower their views that Byzantium had no effect. Futhermore, while mentioning the similarities between timar system in the Ottoman Empire and ikta in the Islamic states and counteracting the Byzantium pronoia, none of them “advanced to a theory of the common material determination of all three”. In other words, they did not explain the widespread usage of military fief in medieval states.
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Moreover, Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı had a tendency to put Byzantium and Ottoman Empire into two opposite camps as if they were exact opposites like black and white. While Köprülü admits a possible modest permeability between these two empires, Uzunçarşılı completely ignores this possibility. However, Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı could not see beyond this categorization. They miss the most basic commonalities between the two Empires. “The same geography, climate, technology and time”, in short, the same conditions that these two empires had been affected by\textsuperscript{124}. Furthermore, as Asilgül Berktay rightly points out, interaction between the Ottoman and Byzantium subjects, a shared culture at the frontier regions and the creation of hybrid identities on these regions are totally ignored in Köprülü’s writings\textsuperscript{125} as well as in Uzunçarşılı’s work.

Thus, the approaches of Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı to the historical problems of the period were very similar. Even their methodological approaches to history differed, in their historiography, they posited themselves against the two prevailing discourses of the period: One was national historiography or the so-called Turkish History Thesis and the other one was international historiography regarding the issue of the Byzantium influence on the Ottoman Empire. On the one hand, Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı tried to avoid the shallow explanations of Turkish History Thesis. Yet, because the suppressive atmosphere of the new republic could not let them freely criticize the rhetoric of Turkishness, Köprülü could publish his book abroad and Uzunçarşılı could write about this subject years later. Hence, when we follow their academic work it could be noted that Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı were not the part of the grand narrative of the period, in fact they opposed the core idea of the Turkish History Thesis; the issue of “Turkishness”. On the other hand, they surely remained within the “defensive historiography” of the period. When they counteracted European Orientalism and its historiography they tried to disprove the prevailing theme which claimed that all through
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centuries Turks had been a barbaric nation. As historians studying the Ottoman Empire, Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı specifically focused on the argument which discussed the effects of the Byzantine Institutions over the Ottoman Institutions. Effect of period’s nationalist discourse became visible when they reacted against these international arguments which in turn reflected their writings as denial of the effects of Byzantine Past over the Ottomans. What they theorized was that the Institutions of the Ottoman Empire could not be understood without analyzing the evolution of pre-Ottoman Turkish and Islamic states. Although they based their theories on primary sources and tried to present scientific arguments, they could not come out with alternative approaches. Rather, they worked on the theory that the Ottoman State was influenced by the Seljukids and its predecessors against the theory of Byzantium influence.
CONCLUSION:

As we have seen, many times formation of a nation goes hand in hand with an invention of a “suitable past”. Raw material of a nation, “usable past” can be re-written, re-shaped and then finalized according to the needs of the nationalist ideology. Moreover, most of the time, mythical features are added into “the usable past” to make the effect of “heroin” (“history” in Hobsbawm’s analogy) much stronger. Ernest Renan points out a similar phenomenon when he says: “Forgetting history, or even getting history wrong, is an essential factor in the formation of a nation”\(^{126}\).

Importance of history as a discipline was also well-realized by the founding fathers of the Turkish Republic. Mustafa Kemal formulated the definition of a nation as “people who are part of a culture make up a community which is called nation” and according to him, in order to be a nation “there should be a rich legacy of memories” \(^{127}\). Particularly, during the Kemalist Era of the republic, “usable past” was formulated by the elites of the new republic to “awaken” “rich legacy of memories” of the Turkish nation. This formulation of the past was presented to the society as a thesis called “Turkish History Thesis”.

As it is mentioned before, the thesis aimed to accomplish several goals. In national context, it targeted to legitimize the newly formed republic by spreading the ideology of nationalism to grassroots and to justify the existence of the new republic within the borders of “National Agreement”. Furthermore, another aim was to trigger the transformation of the society from religious community into a nation by creating a common culture, on which Turkish nation can flourish. Even though the Kemalist government had tried to weaken the effects of ancien regime over the society by applying several reforms such as abolition of Caliphate or by compelling all male citizens of the new republic to abandon the fez for the Western brimmed hat, still legacy of the Ottoman Empire and Islamic Past could not be
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totally erased. Thus, by concentrating on the Pre-Ottoman past and by announcing the *ancien régime* as the “other” of the new republic in Turkish History Thesis, Kemalist government hoped to accelerate the process of loosening the ties between Ottoman Legacy and the society.

On the other hand, in the international context, there was an urgent need to reply the Orientalist claims of Europe that showed Turks as secondary people belonging to yellow race. In addition to causing an offence of national feelings, in a period when Turkish Republic was trying to be a Westernized country, this kind of claims could not be accepted. Furthermore, these Orientalist theories had been used in the political context many times. Particularly after the World War I, the rhetoric claiming that Turks have an inability to found complex states and barbaric features of Turks were underlined for the political self-interest of the international arena. In this respect, as we have seen, defensive characteristic of the period’s nationalist grand narrative occurred to invalidate these arguments.

Where can we place historiography of the period’s three important historians, namely Afet İnan, Fuat Köprülü and İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı within this nationalist grand narrative? Where do their historiographies stand within this national grand narrative? As it is already alluded, İnan remained as a part of this grand-narrative all through 1930s. Indeed, she was one of the formulators of the Thesis and this was directly reflected in her politicized history-writing. As a “missionary” historian under the guidance of Mustafa Kemal, she shaped the past according to her political agenda.

Although some might claim that political atmosphere of the period also completely dominated the writings of Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı (just as we have seen in the case of İnan), a closer examination of Köprülü’s and Uzunçarşılı’s work proves that this was not always the case. Both of these historians unconditionally supported the new republic and defended Turkish nationalism. However, in a period when extreme sides of the Turkish nationalism began to be visible (and supported by the government), Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı succeeded to
avoid shallow explanations of Turkish nationalism in their academic work. Instead, in the national context, Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı pointed out the deficiencies and mistakes of the Thesis in their scientific work rather than supporting Turkish History Thesis. Nevertheless, while opposing the period’s nationalist grand narrative and its extreme sides, Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı stayed within the sphere of “defensive historiography” of the period. Even though methodologies and approaches of Fuat Köprülü and Ismail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı differed from each other and from Afet İnan, in the international context, both of them were trying to invalidate Europe based Orientalist views.

Therefore it would not be wrong to conclude that, relatively, İnan, Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı were all influenced by the period’s dominant ideology. Yet, how much they had been influenced by the period’s nationalist discourse, is indeed what reflects their real concern; whether it is a scientific stance or using history as an instrument of politics. Having already examined this issue in the cases of İnan, Köprülü and Uzunçarşılı, there is no need to reiterate once again. Instead, it would be appropriate to end this dissertation with a rather lengthy quotation, which was written by Fuat Köprülü in 1946, to see his approach regarding the issue of the relation between nationalist discourse and being a historian:

"‘When one examines the times every nationalism develops, one can come across a completely romantic understanding of nationalist history and this psychological breakthrough is very useful in terms of history understanding’s gaining importance and its expansion. (...) Turkish nationalism has also naturally experienced this romantic period of nationalist history understanding. Against very unjust and negative interpretations of European historiography which have no scientific support, it was probable that the reaction of our romantic historiography was going to be exaggerated, indeed, it happened. (...) In spite of my definitive tenacity for not leaving rationalism, I cannot hide that in my precedent works, sometimes, there are influences of this romanticism. Today, as it was also the case thirty years ago, I bear in my heart and in my mind the excitement of Turkish nationalism which is humane. However, while searching for historical realities I can never forget that I am the servant of a scientific truth.’"
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