

**TUNCAY SAYGIN**

**MEHMET ÖNAL**

**“SECULARISM” FROM THE LAST  
YEARS OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE TO  
THE EARLY TURKISH REPUBLIC**

The main aim of this article is to discuss both the concept of secularism among the Ottoman intellectuals and the principle of secularism during the period of the Turkish Republic based on ideas rather than practice. We can analyze “secularism in Turkey” in two separate periods of time: First, “The Ottoman Empire and Secularism” which discusses the ideas of secularism before the foundation of the Turkish Republic, and second “A Brief Analysis of the Turkish Republic and the Principle of Secularism” in which the idea of secularism related to the ideology of the state in the course of the Turkish Republic are shortly examined. In this article, we generally state the consistent development of secularism practiced in Turkey.

**INTRODUCTION**

Throughout approximately three centuries, we observe “westernization” as one the most serious problems both in Turkey and on the whole, most Eastern countries. When the efforts of “westernization” were started in the Ottoman Empire, many countries like Japan, Russia, India and Iran had already carried out “westernization” or had been about to start to do it. However, “westernization” had brought many problems with itself to the Ottoman Empire as well as other countries. One of the most important of these problems was religion because it was the process of secularism which improved in parallel with the reformation of religion that contributed to the development of European countries. In other words, the more religion and state were separated, the faster the advancements in society were becoming. This situation was a special problem in Eastern countries since there was no social structure, no such organizations and no dominant power like the church gained in Europe.<sup>1</sup> As opposed to a clerical social structure in Europe, it was obvious that religion had such a strict structure and powerful place in Eastern countries that it could not be possible to remove religion out of its permanent place; where it stands alongside social associations at the heart of life. Also the fact that Eastern countries did not have any theocratic classes independent from civil life which would have had dominant power the over the government was a significant difference from European countries.

Also, it was naturally almost impossible to separate religion from government especially in Muslim countries where people believed in Islam.

**Tuncay Saygin**

Researcher Asisstant,  
Adnan Menderes  
University,  
Department of  
Philosophy, Aydin,  
Turkey.  
Email: tuncaysaygin  
@yahoo.com

**Mehmet Önal**

Asisstant Professor,  
Ph.D., Adnan  
Menderes University,  
Department of  
Philosophy, Aydin,  
Turkey.  
Email: monal63@  
hotmail.com

**Key Words:** The  
Ottoman Empire,  
Secularism,  
Westernization, Islam,  
Turkey.

In this context, arguments which often arose based on the efforts of westernization focused on religion. Especially, from the mid-1800s, due to the movement of positivism which Ottoman Empire was affected, most of intellectuals demanded westernization to prevail in order to include western values and thought of traditional values as an obstacle to advancement (westernization). Consequently, the idea of westernization included religion inevitably and important innovations about religion were advised. “Secularism” was adopted in Turkey quite late and it may be accepted that implementations about secularism started with the movement of westernization. In short, secularism in the Ottoman Empire was an issue of argument which came out within the discourse of westernization.

Secularism, with its confirmed definition also effective to us, is the absolute detachment of religious affiliation from state affairs. According to this definition, either the state or religion ought not to have a direct intervention to one another. Thereby, the state should, rather than gathering its constitutional faculty by religion as in classical theocracy, hold a balanced policy to all faiths. During the time when the initial proposals on the notion of secularism were suggested, the Ottoman intellectual did not own such a directly figured secularism definition. Contemporaries of the era, by mostly referring to the structure of a western country so as to determine the distinctions between western countries and the Ottoman Empire, were trying to analyze the causes of the lagging of the Ottoman Empire. In the period when lagging was literally perceived, besides the supreme estimate, the basic distinction between the Ottoman Empire and western countries was a consequence of the diversity of science and technology; together with the dissatisfying effects of technological, since the midst of 1800, it had been discussed both among the administrative degree and the literati that the system itself has the so-called distinction. The fact the literati mostly encountered during this investigation was the affair of state and religion. For, ever so much construction and processing was formed by the Islamic principles in Ottoman Empire. Thence, all the intellectuals from Mustafa Fazıl Pasha to Ziya Gökalp mentioning secularism, whose ideas will be discussed later, were coherent at least on the question that the religion’s activity on the state was not proper to the modern state’s structure. In that context, according to the intellectuals therein, the salvation of the state would be through secular (western) state origin.

The intellectuals, whose ideas are attempted to be introduced in this text, undertook active roles in intellectual and political constitutions and are the ones securing the pursuing of the historical development of direct secularism concept. The majority of the thoughts offered by these names related to secularism prepared the basis of the secularism in Turkish Republic in different ways. Especially, Abdullah Cevdet and Ziya Gökalp are

the thinkers who acted directly to the positivist and pragmatic program of the Republic of Turkey.

In an attempt to explain secularism from Ottoman Empire to Republic of Turkey, there can be a mention of two traditions, first of which is the positivist tradition begins with Ahmet Rıza Bey. According to this tradition, the aim of secularism is the release of the state from the religious pressure and in order to achieve this thoroughly, secularization of the social consciousness is needed. This tradition, in the process, according as position of CUP against to religion, sometimes radicalized and turned into an attitude of religious antagonism. The other tradition is the attitude begins with Ahmet Şuayip and can be called as liberal. According to this tradition the aim of the state ought to be the individual therefore the state should not have an activity of pressure on the religious affairs of the people by holding an even policy to faiths with secularism. This attitude was much more adopted by conservative peripheries as a result of proposing more and more liberty to the devout by countering tension between the devout segment and the segment earning a positivist ideological dimension to secularism.

That westernization, having a positivist character and secularism having developed through the process of westernization in Turkey, brought about the positivist quality of secularism in parallel, either. Therefore, secularism was used as a tool transforming society by going out of a just legal reform. However, this process caused some inharmonious and conflicts between rigid values and real life.

## THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AND SECULARISM

In the Ottoman Empire, religion was one of the principal components of the state. The principles of religion were generally taken into consideration in the judicial system; however this does not mean that the Ottoman Empire was ruled by theocracy. Because of this, religion was a structure that determined principles, but custom was more widespread and effective source of law than religion. We can say that this situation was caused because of the multi-national structure of the Ottoman Empire which included many religions within it. Even though the Sheikh ul-Islam<sup>2</sup> approved decrees, he did not have any serious power to direct certain practices or institutions. Owing to this reason, it is a debatable issue whether religion interfered in state issues directly or not. Nonetheless, Islam was so dominant over the whole civil life that religion and temporal world presented a holistic synergy. To the last periods of the Ottoman Empire, the relations between government and religion were rather questioned in parallel with the advancement in westernization. In this context, particularly intellectuals who received training in Europe started to put forth their opinions for consideration at least as formal to transfer religious practices in Europe. Arguments constituting the basis of

secularism started with the ideas of westernization which also improved in that base.

### The Young Ottomans and Secularism

The main aim of the movement of the Young Ottomans<sup>3</sup> composed by a group of intellectuals who firstly gathered in 1865 was to prevent the run of bad events by opposing the wrong policies of the statesmen in that period.<sup>4</sup> The most significant names of this movement were intellectuals like Sadık Rıfat Pasha, Şinasi, Namık Kemal, Ziya Pasha, Ali Suavi and Hayreddin Pasha. The financier of the movement and the principal founder of it was Mustafa Fazıl Pasha. He was one of the grandchildren of Mehmet Ali Pasha who was the governor of Egypt at that time. Also, Mustafa Fazıl Pasha presided over *Meclis-i Hazain*,<sup>5</sup> but he was removed from this position by the Palace.<sup>6</sup> After these years, Sultan Abdülaziz enunciated an edict with the efforts of Ismail Pasha, who was the *Hidiv* (khedive)<sup>7</sup> of Egypt at that period, to deprive Mustafa Fazıl Pasha of the right of inheritance and he was sent to exile.<sup>8</sup> However, after he was deprived of inheritance, he was paid money as compensation. He settled down in Paris and called the Young Ottomans to there so that they started to publish issues against Sultan Abdülaziz and his deputies by making use of his compensation.<sup>9</sup>

After he settled down in Paris, he wrote a letter<sup>10</sup> to Sultan Abdülaziz in 1866. This letter may be called as the first proposal about secularism, by addressing to Sultan Abdülaziz in 1866.<sup>11</sup> In this letter, he stated that “religion and cult dominated over the spiritual sides of people and promised us benefactions after death. In other words, he meant that it was not religion and cult which determined the rights of people and limited them. If religion did not remain as eternal fact and its assessments which meant interference of religion in temporal world, it caused damage instead of being useful, at the same time, it wasted everyone besides itself”.<sup>12</sup> In that letter, he also showed that the governmental system as one of the reasons of decline in the state. According to him, the governmental system in the Ottoman Empire should firstly be changed, it defended his opinions with these sentences: “we were ruining because of our archaic traditions. These archaic traditions especially damaged our civil servants. We should leave this system and old rules which devastate instead of protecting the present government. In their place, we should apply new systems established other improved countries which made them happy.”<sup>13</sup> In his letter Mustafa Fazıl Pasha emphasized on saving law from arbitrary practices, improving liberties and establishing secular life. Yet, the crucial point of his letter was the idea of decreasing the effect of religion in governmental system, because he thinks that “the Christians and Muslims have the same conception about the world since the thing called justice is one and unique. The fact that we call politics and governmental system is only actual justice.”<sup>14</sup>

The statements quoted from Mustafa Fazıl Pasha clearly proposed a new governmental system. In this new system the government was separated from religion. In his opinions, the old governmental system of the Ottoman Empire was far away from responding the necessities of its era. The action which ought to be carried out was to make religion as a matter of individuals and to rule the country with a modern system. Şerif Mardin interprets new proposal in the letter of Mustafa Fazıl Pasha as a liberal governmental system.<sup>15</sup>

Among the Young Ottomans, Ali Suavi is the most striking person.<sup>16</sup> İsmail Hami, Faliş Rifkı make mention of him as “the pioneer of revolutions” and according to Cemil Meric, Ali Suavi is a person who is “taking out his place to become a saint.”<sup>17</sup> On the contrary, some of his contemporaries depict him as “a charlatan” and “unconscious.”<sup>18</sup> Inconsistency and enthusiastic status in his opinions caused different comprehension about ideas he defended. One of the best examples of these differences is about his ideas related to secularism. İsmail Hami said for Ali Suavi “he is a reformist person who lived in the past. Whereas his body remains with reformists of the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century in the Ottoman Empire, his soul stays with us forever. From 1839 to 1878, he managed to live 39 years with dreams of secularism during theocracy period, republic on autocracy and Turkishness and Turkism throughout the Ottoman period. However, he became a martyr for his attempt to carry out his dreams.”<sup>19</sup> With these words, İsmail Hami describes Ali Suavi as the defender of secularism and the ideas of republic. Also, Hilmi Ziya Ülken agrees with İsmail Hami about the defense of secularism by Ali Suavi,<sup>20</sup> On this issue says that Ülken says that “Suavi attacks those who want Islamic laws as a base in judicial system. In his article *Yarım Fakih Din Yıkar*, Ali Suavi emphasizes on «meaninglessness of the search of politics method in Kuran and Hadith, and of making conclusion from Arabic expressions», «we accept Koran and Hadith for the service of religion, but not for the matters of temporal world because the science of politics relies upon geography, economics and ethics.»<sup>21</sup> Continuing that «if we had removed rules of temporal world out the arguments about Arabic expressions as solving a crossword, we could have established a proper governmental system.»<sup>22</sup> According to sentences of Ali Suavi quoted by Ülken, it is difficult to talk about the idea of secularism in total and in terms of politics. References that show defense of secularism by Ali Suavi generally remains the same. It is mentioned about “Ali Suavi” in Islamic Encyclopedia of Abdullah Uçman as “for example, Ali Suavi defends the necessity of the separation of religion and temporal world completely under the control of government in some of his articles like “*Yarım Fakih Din Yıkar*”.”<sup>23</sup>

Ali Suavi is accepted as the defender of secularism by many people. Because of his ideas about not basing governmental issues on Arabic expressions, he wouldn't need to search any expressions in Koran and Hadith, However Hüseyin Çelik claims the contrary. According to him, Ali

Suavi had not ever defended secularism; on the contrary, he was the writer who kept religion a ground at the utmost among the Young Ottomans Society.<sup>24</sup> Çelik also states that “contrary to what is said, Suavi accepts Islam as a factor which should dominate the whole life and institutions. In one of his articles, Suavi expresses that “we heard that if the Islamic Law interferes with temporal world, there will be no improvement for government. It is true for the Christian Law and government. Since, there is no expression about temporal world in the Old Testament and the Bible even today. Therefore, it is called as a rancor to insist on talking about only Islamic Law” and Suavi does not use the word “secularism” and rejects the principles of secularism.”<sup>25</sup> Huseyin Çelik thinks quotations we also used as the reason of secularist image of Ali Suavi. In these sentences, Suavi says that governmental system is decided by the science of politics rather than by God, and these sentences, which are quoted by Seyyid Şerif Curcani, do not belong to Suavi. It is stated that “the writer who suggests this opinion says that God does not command people to divide the country into provinces or into separate subdivisions of a province. Instead of this, God says them to make regulations about temporal world by taking main principles into consideration, which were sent by him to them. Yet, the principles of God means are religious rules, in other words, Koran.”<sup>26</sup> Similarly according to Ahmed Bedevi Kuran, the arguments between Ali Suavi and Young Ottomans derived from his demand on basing the coming reforms on religious principles,<sup>27</sup> correspondingly Eric J. Zürcher says “Ali Suavi was a radical fundamentalist Muslim.”<sup>28</sup>

The fact that Ali Suavi has an ardent character which might cause to suggest different opinions, some of which were extreme for conditions of that period such as giving call to prayer in Turkish, reading Koran in Turkish and accepting interest as permissible, intensified ideas about defending secularism of Ali Suavi. Besides these, when different opinions quoted above are taken into account, it is not so possible to reach a conclusion of whether Ali Suavi was defending secularism or not. Furthermore, it decreases plausibility owing to the fact that materials which are applied to prove secularist ideas of Ali Suavi remain the same and his articles about secularism enable people to make different interpretations. As a consequence of these ideas, as İlber Ortaylı said, it is more suitable to say that Ali Suavi hovered around Islam and secularism during that period.<sup>29</sup>

### “Committee of Union and Progress”

According to Şükrü Hanioglu, “[t]he Young Turk ideology was originally “scientific”, materialist, social Darwinist, elitist and vehemently antireligious.”<sup>30</sup> Although this opinion is not acceptable for the whole *Ittihadists* (the Committee members), many important intellectuals of the



Committee of Union and Progress suit the stereotype of “the Young Turks” described by Hanioglu.

The practices of secular ideas whose theoretical studies were carried out before by Mustafa Fazıl Pasha had been started in different ways. Moreover, Zürcher interprets the reforms of education during the Tanzimat<sup>31</sup> period as attempts of secularism. He thinks that “decisions which make Sheikh ul-Islam expelled from the cabinet and give the authority of *madrasah* and foundations to secular ministries between 1916 and 1917 are the last steps of secularism progress.”<sup>32</sup> In the time of the same periods, Ahmet Rıza Bey (1858-1930), who wrote mainly in his journal called *Meşveret* (Consultation) and in the other journals, centered himself as the defender of *laïque system* in which the influence of religion on education, government and politics is discarded. This definition is the first tradition about secularism in the Turkish thought from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic, also generally aimed the secularization of the society with a positivistic view. And in this secular view leads to secularism an ideological meaning. Therefore we called this definition positivistic secularism which was understood as being against to religion. According to this view, religion must be private and must not have an active role in the public sphere. And this perspective is emphasized the secular character of the government referred to the western model of state.

Because of his Austrian mother who became Muslim later,<sup>33</sup> Ahmet Rıza Bey was brought up with Western culture. After he graduated from the Galatasaray High School, he got agricultural education in France in three years and returned to Turkey. He worked in different administrative positions related to reformations he wished to make. However, when he could not get positive results from his attempts, he went to Paris under the pretense of 100<sup>th</sup> celebrations of the French Revolution. He stayed in Paris until the second constitutional period by resigning his previous job, the Ministry of Education in Bursa.<sup>34</sup> Ahmet Rıza Bey started to participate in Pierre Lafitte’s classes, who was at the head of French positivism so that he knew positivism and gradually accepted this movement.<sup>35</sup>

In 1889, Ibrahim Temo by being the initiator of the society, Ishak Sukuti, Cerkes Mehmet Resit, Abdullah Cevdet and Huseyinzade Ali from Baku (Azerbaijani) founded Society for the Union of the Ottomans (whose purpose was constitutional monarchy against despotism of Abdulhamit) in Military Medical College (Mekteb-i Tıbbiye-i Şahane) by taking the Society of Italian Carbonari as their model.<sup>36</sup> Activities of this society, which had tried to awaken the public by various brochures until 1894, were became known and some were caught. Then, a decision was made about carrying on the activities out of the country. Then, Ahmet Rıza Bey was asked for undertaking the leadership of Paris branch of the society and being active against Abdulhamit.<sup>37</sup> Thereupon Ahmet Rıza Bey founded with some of his friends the Committee of Union and Progress (1895) which was a branch of

the Party of Union and Progress in Europe. “Under Ahmet Rıza’s leadership the Paris branch now published the newspaper *Meşveret* (Consultation) in both Ottoman and French.”<sup>38</sup> Yet, Ahmet Rıza Bey was not a revolutionist; he only tried to prevent the collapse of Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, he had sent some letters to Sultan Abdülhamit which included some advices and he also did not defended actions against Sultan Abdülhamit because these actions could lead to the collapse of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>39</sup>

Ahmet Rıza Bey is important in terms of our history of thoughts because he was the pioneer of positivism in Turkey<sup>40</sup> and his positivist thoughts affected his view of religion significantly. Whereas he was sometimes objected to the criticisms of Western intellectuals about Islam<sup>41</sup> due to his positivist ideas he also defended secularism in order to prevent religion from interfering in governmental issues. He did not see Islam as an obstacle within its theory and considered that Islam was an institution, ‘une solide instruction laïque’, whose foundations should be laid.”<sup>42</sup>

In addition to the positivist ideas of Ahmet Rıza Bey, he was also aware of the necessity of religion for society, but it should not mean that religion could interfere in politics. In his opinion, religion is an instrument for society. A. Rıza Efendi, summarizes his opinion about the role of religion in the governmental system in the following way. “Religion should aim at improving society and gathering it at a common point. (...) Even in countries where religion does not dominate over society, people are searching for a common point such as socialism and anarchism: the ones who are straying from the community wander off in the wrong ways.”<sup>43</sup> As concluded from these arguments, Ahmet Rıza Bey sees religion as an instrument that gathers society as a whole and religion carries out ideally the functions of all ideologies. Ahmet Rıza Bey criticizes the ones who accused him of atheism harshly in his memoirs. Also, he implies that religion consists of not only prayer and worship, but also conscience, and says that people are in the effort of denigrating him as an atheist.<sup>44</sup>

Ahmet Şuayip is accepted as one of pioneers of liberalism in Turkey affected by Ahmet Rıza and adopted secularism. Ahmet Şuayip published *Hayat ve Kitaplar* which is accepted as the first positivist work in terms of describing philosophy, literature and history.<sup>45</sup> Besides these, he was one of the primary people who defend secularism systematically. According to him, hindrances opposite to sciences should be removed so that social improvement could be achieved. “One of the biggest hindrances of these is dominance of religion and an autocratic government over society. A secular system in which governmental issues and religion are separated should be founded and a parliament system should be constituted instead of liberal system in order to overcome these hindrances.”<sup>46</sup>

Ahmet Şuayip considers secularism and liberalism as the necessity in order to improve society. What is more, he states troubles brought about by practicing secularism as if he foresaw. “Government does not prohibit



individuals from believing whatever they want, but he defends that they can practice their worship in an atmosphere that does not damage social order (Şuayip 1909a, 161-162)<sup>47</sup> “Hürriyet-i Mezhebiye”, which means practicing of a religion without any oppression by a religious institution or government, is a principle which Ahmet Şuayip wished to be carried out in order to break the oppressive power of autocratic government and to settle down secularism in Turkey.”<sup>48</sup>

According to Ahmet Şuayip, the dominance of religion over government ended because of the condition that the Papacy was subjected to. He says that “the autocratic system in which religion depends on government and the secularist system in which religion and government are separated.”<sup>49</sup> As the primary defender of liberalism in Turkey, Ahmet Şuayip defends the second one mentioned above because he thinks that religion and politics should certainly need to be separated. Another significant side in his ideas is that he has explained his opinions about freedom of people practicing and restricting their own religious faiths as if he anticipated problems between the religion and state which experienced in Turkey from early years of republic to today. In his opinions, restriction in religious faiths is a kind of execution performed in dictatorial rules that is why he underlined religious freedom of individuals.

Abdullah Cevdet (1869-1932), who was a member of Committee of Union and Progress, was another person who defended secularism directly. He graduated from a School of Medicine in 1897 and joined in the Young Turks. He was one of the administrators of the *Ottoman* journal and was editor-in-chief. According to Şerif Mardin, it is possible to see the first firm base of secularism in Cevdet’s anonymous articles.<sup>50</sup> Upon the agreement of the journal *Ottoman* with government, he became the government doctor of Vienna Embassy. However, he could not get on well with the ambassador and he was driven away from the country. After this, he published *İctihad* firstly in Geneva, later in Cairo.<sup>51</sup> In his articles, the fact that he wrote about inessential presence of the dynasty and their degeneration caused many arguments.<sup>52</sup> In addition to this, his articles against religion aroused great reactions towards him. At the same period, he translated the book of R. Dozy, *Essai sur l’histoire de l’Islamisme*, which Dozy attempted to explain the life of the Prophet Muhammad with morbid psychology, as *Tarih-i İslamiyyet* and published it.<sup>53</sup> Both due to articles he wrote against religion and owing to the translation of Dozy’s book, he was introduced as a person hostile towards religion although he defended the translation as a scientific work. Moreover, Abdullah Cevdet became a leader in Kurdish nationalism in 1906<sup>54</sup> and was responsible for important duties at the Kurdish Rise Community in 1920s.

Abdullah Cevdet was generally known as absolute westernizer or extreme westernizer because he thought that it was an inevitable obligation to be westernized both in individual and political arena. He believed that “there is no civilization on earth except for Europe.

Civilization only means Europe. We have to accept this civilization with both advantages and disadvantages... ”<sup>55</sup> As a consequence of this, we have to adapt both science and etiquette of European society that is why he published *Perfect and Pictured Etiquette Handbook*<sup>56</sup> which aimed at improving *westernization in individual life or westernization in the mind of individuals*. In 1912, he published two article consecutively with the title of “A Quite Awake Sleep” which he told actions desired for the sake of *political westernization*<sup>57</sup> : “Fez will be banned and instead of it, a new hat will be accepted, ..., small and big dervish lodges will be abolished and their revenues will be transferred to education budget, all *madrasah* will be closed and new literary and technical schools will be founded; wearing turban, cassock, etc. will be permissible only for certificated ecclesiastic men; saints, vows and presents will be forbidden and the money saved from them will devoted to national defense; writers of charm, healers and people like that will be removed and malaria treatment will be compulsory; functional schools will be opened for old people; Ottoman Turkish dictionary and grammar will be prepared by a committee consisting of linguists and writers.”<sup>58</sup> It is a striking point that some of these innovations show serious resemblance with practices carried out at the extent of secularism policies in Atatürk’s reforms. All reforms proposed by Abdullah Cevdet were not mentioned here and many of these reforms constituted religious structure and its mechanism because he sees religion like Ahmet Rıza as an instrument to educate society.<sup>59</sup> However, as different from Ahmet Rıza Bey, Abdullah Cevdet defended that individuals in a society should not bring up with religious doctrines in order to transfuse principles of biologic materialism into them<sup>60</sup> Abdullah Cevdet with these opinions got established as a harsh supporter of the idea of positivistic secularism and let the *route* that Ahmet Rıza Bey had started reach extreme point. Abdullah Cevdet was giving an ideological function to secularism by his approach. Because while he was putting forward the necessity of not being content with extracting religion from public places, he was turning secularism into a purpose of its own record and hoping that societal transformation would gain speed together with, also.

From this aspect, Abdullah Cevdet can be assessed as a materialist secularist man. Zürcher expresses in this way: “Among the whole Young Turks, Abdullah Cevdet was the most secularist one. He did not only defend separation of religion and government, but also he searched ways to dissuade people from their religious world views as a believing materialist and attempted to guide them to a world view based completely on science.”<sup>61</sup> Actually, the secularist attitude of Abdullah Cevdet aims at removing religion out of the political atmosphere and decreasing the impact of religion on daily life. As a result of this, he did not limit westernization only in politics and he wished to enlarge westernization consisting of individual life so that his reforms, which suggests the reduction in the effect of religion became rather meaningful.

Abdullah Cevdet wanted to change society with the way of westernization and reduce them to a form purified from religion. In his opinion, everything should be explained in a logical way and his contrary ideas to religion or his wish to remove religious dogmas were caused because of their clash with his rationalist or biologic rationalist mentality. In his reforms he defended about government, he was clearly in favor of secularism by saying that religion should be eliminated from individuals' life. He considered that “It is nothing other than our own Asiatic minds... our own degenerate traditions and institutions... The power that is defeating us is none other than our own eyes which do not want to see our brains which do not know how to think... These are the forces that have defeated us, that are defeating us, and that will always defeat us.”<sup>62</sup>

Although westernization ideas of Abdullah Cevdet based mainly on a strict positivism has been criticized both in his period and following periods, most of his dreams have come true, most of his ideas have been accepted and came into important principles of new Turkey.

### Ziya Gökalp and Secularism

Ziya Gökalp is certainly one of the most important people who have been effective in the history of contemporary Turkish thought. He was born in 1875 or 1876 in Diyarbakır as the son of Tefik Efendi. According to U. Heyd, Tefik Efendi, was a patriot who could compromise liberal and progressive ideas with religious thoughts. Ziya Gökalp firstly learnt liberty and patriotic ideologies from his father.<sup>63</sup> After he finished primary school in Diyarbakır, he went on to study at the military secondary school and continued to attend civilian high school. While he was studying in the high school, he took Arabic, Persian and Islamic philosophy courses from his uncle, Hasip Efendi, and learnt French in this school, he learnt natural sciences from Dr. Yorgi and met with Dr. Abdullah Cevdet.<sup>64</sup> With the effect of Abdullah Cevdet, he started to read materialist intellectuals like Haeckel, Buchner, Spencer and G. Le Bon. As a consequence of psyche-confusion caused by these ideas, he committed suicide but he failed. The bullet he shot with was stuck in his skull and prevented him from dying. Ziya Gökalp was constantly in a search in that period like most of Turkish intellectuals and he decided to pursue an ideology called Turkism or Turanism at the end of this search.

Beyond any doubt, Ziya Gökalp had a totalitarian westernization idea than previous intellectuals and secularism was an inevitable and significant step among his secular ideas. According to U. Heyd, Gökalp's ideas about secularism were a kind of attempt to reform religion and these ideas had two aims: “a) to separate religion and government; that is, he was in favor of putting an end to domination of Islam over politics and social life: b) to keep apart religion from Eastern civilization and in this way, to perpetuate European civilization and Turkish culture with basic

principles of Islam.”<sup>65</sup> Indeed, Gökalp, for the first aim, “presents an elaborated and historical note based on social and judicial research to the Union and Progress Party; and demands the annulment of Sheikh ul-Islam with its traditional form. The dignitaries of the party adopt his opinions. [In accordance with this note] the government assigns the control of Islamic law courts to the General Court and the administration of *madrasah* to the Ministry of Education.”<sup>66</sup> Arai suggests that these can be accepted the pioneers of reforms carried out by Atatürk.<sup>67</sup> In fact, the fact that Atatürk annulled the office of Sheikh ul-Islam proves the rightness of Arai.

Davison underlines that Gökalp aimed at making synthesis between Islam and modernity theoretically rather than practical suggestions. This synthesis depended on a conventional relation between religion and politics because he believed that the separation of religion and government completely was a basic judicial necessity for modern countries.<sup>68</sup> Gökalp states this opinion in the Principals of Turkism in this way “the essential condition to join improved countries is to save all branches of national law from theocracy and the ruins of clericalism.”<sup>69</sup> Getting rid of theocracy and clericalism was indeed one of the most significant steps of innovations for Ziya Gökalp because Gökalp explained the same opinion in different ways at many times. Many of intellectuals who supported the ideas of Durkheim were in favor of secularism and they were against church that is why it is an interesting subject of study how Gökalp was affected by Durkheim in terms of religion or how much, too.<sup>70</sup>

Positivist side is influential on even Ziya Gökalp’s suggestions about secularism, for this reason it can be supported that he carried on the route of Ahmet Rıza Bey and Abdullah Cevdet. Because as in the positivist approaches of this period, Gökalp emphasized that it is necessary for religion to have rationalized and come to the fore of its societal functions by purifying the dimension of pertaining to the next world. According to him, secularism should be a *process* which would cause this transformation.

The feature differentiating Gökalp from other intellectuals is that he oriented towards this aim operational proposals which are conjoint point with Abdullah Cevdet. We can see similarities between the content of “A Quite Awake Sleep” written by Abdullah Cevdet and Gökalp’s articles, as well. Like Abdullah Cevdet, he also suggests that some clichéd systems should be given up and important innovations should be carried out. However, it can be said that Ziya Gökalp is more decisive than Abdullah Cevdet in this issued and he is different from Abdullah Cevdet in terms of making nationalism systematized. This divergence has also significant effect on Turkish ideology.

There was few systematic knowledge and notion in the inheritance taken over by Ziya Gökalp. All movements of Islamism, Turanism and Westernization did not have a certain identity and were constituted by inefficient knowledge. Owing to this, Ziya Gökalp is accepted as an intellectual who firstly systematized most of ideologies. We can say that he

was the one who planned the program of Turkish Republic in a sense by making westernization systematized, listing transformations and changes although he was usually highlighted with his contribution to Turanism. It is already known that Ziya Gökalp has had deep effects on many expressions and revolutions of Turkish Republic.

## A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE TURKISH REPUBLIC AND THE PRINCIPLE OF SECULARISM

Religion was wildly emphasized during the Turkish War of Independence by stopping or rejecting secularism started in terms of idea and politics.<sup>71</sup> And this situation continued in a similar fashion during years of the Turkish War of Independence and until opening of the second parliament. Meanwhile, the sultanate was abolished but the caliphate which was the most important symbol of religion was protected. However, the caliphate was later annulled in 1924 and the expression of “the religion of the state” was removed from the constitution in 1928. All these progress were untitled practices of secularism. In spite of this, it was necessary to wait to make the term of “secularism” come into prominence until 1937. In that time, secularism was put into the constitution as one the basic principles of the state.<sup>72</sup> The principle of secularism was adopted with the apprehension that “it should not be considered in respect of slackening mentality of previous centuries but according to haste and evolution concept of our century”<sup>73</sup> and secularism was a part and conclusion of putting an end project not to be defeated by the West.”<sup>74</sup> As a result of this, the seculars aimed at eluding the government from religion by making up an apprehension based on people and that is why nationalism was considered quite appropriate for the modern state concept. It was not a surprising result to be centered to concept of nationalism rather than religion because constitutive group who adopted positivist philosophy wanted to practice it relying on secularism instead of being clearly against religion. Thus, Kemalism had a tendency to put “nation” in the base of social organizations and to define this term without any religious factor. With this way, secularism would form legitimate background of the new government.<sup>75</sup>

Together with the principle of secularism in the constitution, difficulties about the practices of the notion which had been discussed for a century and could not be reached an agreement started to appear. At first glance, it had two reasons. Firstly, it was caused thanks to evaluating the subject as a sub-title of westernization and not making any serious and independent action intended for practices and theories related to arguments about secularism since the Ottoman Empire. Secondly, it appeared with misinterpretations of positivist intellectuals because these intellectuals did not think to form a secularism aiming at removing religion from the mind of society in spite of imposing their positivist ideas.

However, secularism had been put into practice in a radical way to complete modernization since the declaration of Turkish Republic. In addition to this, serious secularism definitions could not be made because of the theoretical basis of secularism had not been established completely. Therefore, besides the people, the intellectuals could not even understand precisely what was aimed with the principle of secularism and they thought its meaning which could be something like atheism. The translation of secularism as “*la dinî*=out of religion” and the practices of secularism in a rigid way may have been effective. Because *la* prefix which transferred from Arabic to Turkish has mean “none” or “to refuse” anything. But the mean of “*la dinî*=out of religion” is free from religious principles and dogmas. However *la* prefix sometimes caused that understanding of term with the “non religious” mean, that is to say atheism.

Although secularism which was turned into a principle in 1937 was described the separation of religion and government, the practices did not fit this description completely. It was because domination of religion over government was prevented but the power of government over religion, its comments and directions about religion continued. In this context, new legislations were enacted to purify religious beliefs of people from traditional values in general meaning and to embody religion and religious people. However, before this principle was put into practice, the obligation to wear hat and the abolishment of religious institutions or their assignment to the control of government are examples that recurs to mind at once. These implementations did not fit with secularism ideas and practices carried out in the West. Furthermore, this purification progress was enlarged to change the main principles of religion accepted as the essence of it in the society. And these practices were carried on though they were sometimes against nationalism and populism which are among principles of Atatürk. Mete Tunçay explains this clash with these words, “Secularism and Populism are certainly progressive principles. However, these two principles had clashed with each other during the first years of the Turkish Republic.”<sup>76</sup>

When we assess these opinions carefully, we can say that secularism was understood as a principle against religion by the conservative people because of both theoretical ideas composed in the tradition having kept going for the Ottoman Empire and the practices which might be reminiscent of anti-religion. Even though there were not so many contrary opinions to secularism, the method of application of secularism has often been criticized. Kemal Karpaz describes secularism in Turkey similarly “the aims of secularism in Turkey have quite versatile features as the extensive part of nationalism’s targets: To help establish a national, modern, impartial to religion; to rescue society from oppression of Islam and to compose independent individuals. This secularism was rational, scientific, non-traditional and against clericalism.”<sup>77</sup> However, as Karpaz underlined,



this principle attained an “official irreligion dogma” and extreme anticlerical positivist character, too.<sup>78</sup> Secularism was signified as the necessity to become an improved country and its fulfillment. Because secularism has been the main principle of the state together with nationalism since the first days of the Turkish Republic, “secularism has been more radical and effective than western countries.”<sup>79</sup> With secularism, it was also aimed at controlling religion by the government in addition to the separation of government and religion.<sup>80</sup>

The secularism principle targeted to make people conscious of secularism in order to have a modern country. Thus, it should be interfered in religion when it is necessary. With this aim, a committee founded in 1928 prepared a report called “Modernization and Reform Report in Islam”. This committee suggests that “Religious life should be improved according to scientific basis e.g. Moral and Economic life”. Also “neat and clean mosques” with benches and checkrooms were suggested in places where people ought to “enter the mosques with clean shoes.”<sup>81</sup> In fact, these kinds of attempts and works prove the aim of westernized religion and worship so that they proposed to build places of worship suitable for westernization.

Although his ideas in this context have an exceptional importance, it shouldn't be undervalued that ideas of Atatürk about religion occasionally seem to be different. Although he had read some manifestos which contained religious feelings, he stated decisively that the government should be purified from traditional values and religion should only remain in individuals' private sphere. This argument is interpreted dependent on ideological positions in Turkey as argued in the past, too. Yet, shallowness and partiality have made difficult to understand the main reason of this problem.

Like most of the principles of westernization adopted by the Turkish Republic, most of the principles of secularism were the ideas made and defended by Abdullah Cevdet. In this sense, as Ahmet Çiğdem said, “Although Abdullah Cevdet had proposed progressive projects in *İctihad*, it is surprising that Ziya Gökalp was accepted as the ideologue of the Turkish Republic.”<sup>82</sup> By all means, it was not difficult to anticipate it. The most significant reason of this choice was the nationalist expression of Ziya Gökalp because the Ottoman Empire had two main principles: Islam and the Umma (worldwide Muslim community). With the declaration of the Turkish Republic, they firstly abandoned the idea of the worldwide Muslim community and they adopted the principle of nationalism. And later, the ideas of nationalism were gradually accepted and it enabled to question whether the new government was an Islamist or not. Lastly, the caliphate was abolished and the principle of secularism was adopted.

According to Niyazi Berkes who uses the concept of secularism as modernization, the adoption of the principle of secularism was a result of choice made between *theocracy* and *democracy* and Turkey chose

democracy. He thinks that liberal and strict Islamist criticisms such as “the real secularism means not to interfere the state in religion” and “secularism is an attitude to defeat Islamism” towards the practices of secularism are caused by not seeing the historical features of both religion and government. Therefore, secularism signifies a place in favor of democracy and against theocracy in Turkey.<sup>83</sup>

At the end, we can say, today the secularization process of Turkey had not ripened yet, because it was not originally a public movement or project. According to Özdalga “The secularist project was victorious on the official level, but it was more difficult than imagined to rally the Turkish people around the values of secularism. Official secularism therefore encountered resistance and opposition. Popular Islam developed in [different] directions, which also meant that religion has continued to be an important issue of controversy in Turkish politics.”<sup>84</sup>

## CONCLUSION

In general, it is not difficult to say that religion dominated to government during the Ottoman Empire, but we also cannot easily state that there was a secular system in the Ottoman Empire because some references in the governmental system of the Ottoman Empire were based on Koran and the Sunna. Even though some implementations about secularism had especially started with the Tanzimat, secularism did not exist in the basic structure of the government. During the period after the Tanzimat which symbolizes the transformation from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey, the Ottoman intellectuals defended some ideas about secularism. Whereas some of these ideas were scattered among westernization and positivist attitudes, some intellectuals explained clearly and audaciously their secular ideas and proposals towards practices.

Some of the notions which were attempted to explain above were the base of secular practices during the Turkish Republic, but it is meaningful to disregard some of these ideas. At the disregard of the historical inheritance of secularism, some of the other principles of Republic had been effective. Among most striking of these principles, we can certainly list nationalism and positivism. These principles have had a great impact on the government from the acceptance of secularism till today that is why it is very important to discuss these principles alongside with secularism.

Even though secularism has been put into practice for almost a century, it has not been evaluated well as a concept, the way of practice and its historical progress where it was born in. Secularism was only described with its official meaning as “the separation of religion and government” defined by the government and it could not prevent tensions sometimes experienced between the government and society. Related to this ambiguity, there have been many arbitrary practices and disorders.

Thus, in every government, a new practice of secularism was carried out and some of them went so far that society defined them as atheism so that conservative people comprehended secularism equal to atheism and it made rather difficult to practice secularism.<sup>85</sup>

As for present arguments about secularism, the inability keeping up with the modern world is concluded because we see that the same principles are protected and these are made meaningful in the practice. Some extreme attitudes towards religion which are shown as the pursuance of Atatürk's ideas are clearly the ideology of positivism, which was tried to be accepted by society, rather than secularism.

Therefore, the most important thing which should be regarded in the practising of secularism is the balance between populism and secularism accepted as the principles of foundation of the Turkish Republic. When we look at the practices carried until present, we can say that populism was sacrificed for secularism. Furthermore, the disregard of historical background of secularism is one of the most significant reasons of inefficient definition and practices of it. In addition to this, as parallel with improvements in the world, democratic evolutions should be made rather than classical obligations.

### Bibliography

Ahmed Rıza Bey. *Ahmed Rıza Bey'in Anıları*. İstanbul: Arba Yayınları, 1988.

Ahmed Rıza Bey. *Batının Doğu Politikasının Ahlaken İflası*. Prepared by Ziyad Ebuzziya. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1988.

Arai, Masami. *Jön Türk Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliği*. Translated by Tansel Demirel. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1992.

Atatürk, Mustafa Kemal. *Nutuk 1919-1927*. Prepared by Zeynep Korkmaz. Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 2006.

Bayur, Y. Hikmet. *Türk İnkılâbı Tarihi, C. I, Kısım I*. Ankara: TTK, 1991.

Berkes, Niyazi. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. London: Hurst & Company, 1998.

Çelik, Hüseyin. *Ali Suavi*. Ankara: TC. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1993.

Çelik, Hüseyin. *Ali Suavi ve Dönemi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994.

Çelik, Hüseyin. “Türkiye’de İlk Laiklik Teklifi ve Arkaplanı.” *Türkiye Günlüğü* 19 (1992): 24-30.

Çiğdem, Ahmet. “Batılılaşma, Modernite ve Modernizasyon.” In *Modernleşme ve Batıcılık*, edited by Uygur Kocabaşoğlu, 68-81. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Davison, Andrew. *Secularism and Revivalism in Turkey*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1998.

Delibaş, Kayhan. “The experience of Secularisation in modern Turkey: secularisation from above.” In *Religiosität in der säkularisierten Welt*, edited by M. Franzmann and C. Gärtner, N. Köck, 375-394. Wiesbaden: Vs Verlag Für Sozialwissenschaften, 2006.

Ebüzziya, Ziyad. “Ahmed Rıza.” In *İSAM İslam Ansiklopedisi c. 2*, edited by Bekir Topaloğlu, Tayyar Altıkulaç, İsmail Erünsal, 445-448. İstanbul: İSAM, 1996.

Eroğlu, Hamza. “Laikliğin Bedeli.” In *I. Uluslararası Atatürk Sempozyumu 21-23 Eylül 1987*, edited by Reşat Genç, 73-90. Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1994.

Gökalt, Ziya. *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. İstanbul: Devlet Kitapları, 1969.

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. *Abdullah Cevdet ve Dönemi*. İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat, 1981.

Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü. *The Young Turks in Opposition*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Heyd, Uriel. *Ziya Gökalp Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Temelleri*. Translated by Cemil Meriç. İstanbul: Sebil Yayınevi, 1980.

Karpat, Kemal. *Türkiye’de Demokrasi Tarihi*. İstanbul: AFA, 1996.

Kasaba, Reşat. “Eski ile Yeni Arasında.” In *Türkiye’de Modernleşme ve Ulusal Kimlik*, edited by. Sibel Bozdoğan, Reşat Kasaba, 12-28. İstanbul: Tarih Yurt Vakfı Yayınları, 1998.

Kansu, Aykut. “20 Yüzyıl Başı Türk Düşünce Hayatında Liberalizm.” in *Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyetin Birikimi*, edited by. Mehmet Ö. Alkan, 277-295. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Korlaelçi, Murtaza. “Pozitivizmin Türkiye’ye Girişinde İki Öncü.” *Felsefe Dünyası* 28 (1998): 43-61.

Köker, Levent. *Modernleşme Kemalizm ve Demokrasi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1993.

Kuran, Ahmet Bedevi. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde İnkılap Hareketleri*. İstanbul: No publisher, 1959.

Kuran, Ahmet Bedevi. *İnkılap Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2000.

Lewis, Bernard. *Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu*. Translated by Metin Kırıatlı. Ankara: TTK, 1998.

Mardin Şerif. *Yeni Osmanlılar Düşüncesinin Doğuşu*. Translated by M. Türköne, F. Unan, İ. Erdoğan. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998.

Mardin, Şerif. *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001.

Meriç, Cemil. *Mağaradakiler*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998.

Mert, Nuray. “Cumhuriyet Türkiye'si'nde Laiklik ve Karşı Laikliğin Düşünsel Boyutu.” In *Kemalizm*, edited by Ahmet İnsel, 197-298. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2000.

Önal, Mehmet. “Yahudilik, Hristiyanlık ve Müslümanlık'ta Laikliğin Kökleri ve Türkiye'de Laiklik.” *Türkiye Günlüğü* 102 (2006): 98-113.

Ortaylı, İlber. *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Özbilgen, Erol. *Pozitivizmin Kısacasında Türkiye*. İstanbul: Ağaç Yayınları, 1994.

Özdalga, Elizabeth. *The Veiling Issue, Official Secularism and Popular Islam in Modern Turkey*. Richmond: Curzon, 1998.

Ramsaur, Ernest E. *Jön Türkler ve 1908 İhtilâli*. Translated by. Nuran Ülken. İstanbul: Sander Yayınları, 1972.

Tevfik, Ebuzziya. *Yeni Osmanlılar Tarihi*. Simplified by. Şemsettin Kutlu. İstanbul: Hürriyet Yayınları, 1973.

Tiryakian, Edward. “Emile Durkheim.” In *Sosyolojik Çözümlemenin Tarihi* edited by T. Bottomore, R. Nispet; Prepared in Turkish Mete Tunçay, Aydın Uğur, 193-241. Ankara: Ayraç Yayınları, 1997.

Tunçay, Mete. *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nde Tek-Parti Yönetimi’nin Kurulması (1923-1931)*. Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 1981.

Uçman, Abdullah. 1996. “Ali Suavi.” In *İSAM İslam Ansiklopedisi c. 2*. edited by Bekir Topaloğlu, Tayyar Altıkulaç, İsmail Erünsal, 445-448. İstanbul: İSAM, 1996.

Ülken, Hilmi Ziya. *Türkiye’de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*. İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları, 1998.

Ünüvar, Kerem. “Abdullah Cevdet.” In *Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet’in Birikimi*. edited by Mehmet Ö. Alkan, 98-103. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002

Ünüvar, Kerem. “Ziya Gökalp.” In *Milliyetçilik*. Edited by Tanıl Bora, 28-35. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Zürcher, Erich Jan. “Kemalist Düşünenin Osmanlı Kaynakları.” In *Kemalizm*. edited by Ahmet İnsel, 44-55. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002

Zürcher, Erich Jan. *Turkey A Modern History*. New York: I. B. TAURIS, 2004.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Mehmet Önal, “Yahudilik, Hristiyanlık ve Müslümanlık'ta Laikliğin Kökleri ve Türkiye'de Laiklik,” *Türkiye Günlüğü* 102 (2006): 98-99.

<sup>2</sup> Sheikh ul-Islam: The chief religious official in the Ottoman Empire.

<sup>3</sup> According to to Bedevi Kuran as a revolution society, the society of “the Young Turks” can be respected as advance courier for the Young Ottomans. This society had been founded by Hüseyin Daim and attempted to dethrone Sultan Abdulmecid, and appointed Abdulaziz to the position. This society had been come on the scene with “Kuleli Case”. Ahmed Bedevi Kuran, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nde İnkılap Hareketleri*. (İstanbul: No publisher, 1959), 60-63.

<sup>4</sup> Şerif Mardin, *Yeni Osmanlılar Düşüncesinin Doğuşu*, trans. Türköne, F, Unan, İ.Erdoğan (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998), 17-18.

<sup>5</sup> *Meclis-i Hazain*: It is a committee founded to rearrange state finances.

<sup>6</sup> Ebuzziya Tefik, *Yeni Osmanlılar Tarihi* (İstanbul: Hürriyet Yayınları, 1973), 19.

<sup>7</sup> *Hidiv* (khedive): It is an official title, which is equal to head of vizier, given to the governor of Egypt during the Ottoman Empire.

<sup>8</sup> Hüseyin Çelik, “Türkiye’de İlk Laiklik Teklifi ve Arkaplanı,” *Türkiye Günlüğü* 19 (1992): 24.

<sup>9</sup> Ahmed Bedevi Kuran, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nde İnkılap Hareketleri”, 69.



<sup>10</sup> Although this letter was written with the signature of Mustafa Fazıl Pasha, it is not certain who wrote it. While Huseyin Celik claims in his article mentioned above that this letter was written by Mr. Ganesco. Çelik, “Türkiye’de İlk Laiklik Teklifi ve Arkaplanı”, 25. Şerif Mardin is doubtful of Mustafa Fazıl Pasha. Şerif Mardin, *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları. 2001), 45.

<sup>11</sup> Çelik, “Türkiye’de İlk Laiklik Teklifi ve Arkaplanı”, 24. Şerif Mardin states that this letter was started to be written in 1865, but ended in 1867. Mardin, “Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri”, 45.

<sup>12</sup> Tevfik, 41.

<sup>13</sup> Tevfik, 40-41.

<sup>14</sup> Tevfik, 40-41.

<sup>15</sup> Mardin, “Yeni Osmanlılar Düşüncesinin Doğuşu”, 307-314; 43-47.

<sup>16</sup> Ali Suavi is one of people among the Young Ottomans Society who was mostly emphasized and discussed: some of the works about him: Hüseyin Çelik, *Ali Suavi* (Ankara: TC. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1993); Hüseyin Çelik, *Ali Suavi ve Dönemi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994).

<sup>17</sup> Cemil Meriç, *Mağaradakiler* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998), 154.; Çelik, “Ali Suavi”, 48-51.

<sup>18</sup> For some pro and con comments about Ali Suavi see Cemil Meriç, 144-160.

<sup>19</sup> Quoted from İsmail Hami by. Meriç, 44.

<sup>20</sup> Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye’de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi* (İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları, 1998), 80.

<sup>21</sup> We can say that Ali Suavi was affected by ideas of Ibn Khaldûn (1332-1406) who was one of most creative of muslim political thinkers and had an important impact on political, social, religious thought of the Ottoman scholars.

<sup>22</sup> Ülken, 83.

<sup>23</sup> Abdullah Uçman, “Ali Suavi” in *İSAM İslam Ansiklopedisi* c.2, ed. B. Topaloğlu, T. Altıkulaç, İ. Erünsal (İstanbul: İSAM, 1996), 447.

<sup>24</sup> Çelik, *Ali Suavi*, 78.

<sup>25</sup> Çelik, *Ali Suavi*, 79.

<sup>26</sup> Çelik, *Ali Suavi*, 79.

<sup>27</sup> Ahmet Bedevi Kuran, *İnkılap Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler* (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2000), 23.

<sup>28</sup> Erich Jan Zürcher, *Turkey A Modern History* (New York: I. B. TAURIS, 2004), 69.

<sup>29</sup> İlber Ortaylı, *İmparatorluğun En Uzun Yüzyılı* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), 162.

<sup>30</sup> M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, *The Young Turks in Opposition* (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 32.

<sup>31</sup> Tanzimat: The Tanzimat, which means reorganization of the Ottoman Empire, was a period of reformation between 1839 and 1876.

<sup>32</sup> Erich Jan Zürcher, “Kemalist Düşünenin Osmanlı Kaynakları” in *Kemalizm*, ed. Ahmet İnel (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), 45-46.

<sup>33</sup> Ziyad Ebüzziya, “Ahmed Rıza” in *İSAM İslam Ansiklopedisi* c. 2, ed. B. Topaloğlu, T. Altıkulaç, İ. Erünsal (İstanbul: İSAM, 1996), 124.

<sup>34</sup> Mardin, “Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri”, 173-175.

<sup>35</sup> Erol Özbilgen, *Pozitivizmin Kısacasında Türkiye* (İstanbul: Ağaç Yayınları, 1994), 95.

<sup>36</sup> Ernest E. Ramsaur, *Jön Türkler ve 1908 İhtilâli*, trans. Nuran Ülken (İstanbul: Sander Yayınları, 1972), 30-31. Ahmet Bedevi Kuran, “İnkılap Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler”, 45.

<sup>37</sup> Kuran, “İnkılap Tarihimiz ve Jön Türkler”, 46-47.

<sup>38</sup> Zürcher, “Turkey A Modern History”, 87.

<sup>39</sup> Y. Hikmet Bayur, *Türk İnkılâbı Tarihi, C. I, Kısım I* (Ankara: TTK, 1991), 258-272.

<sup>40</sup> Murtaza Korlaelçi, “Pozitivizmin Türkiye’ye Girişinde İki Öncü,” *Felsefe Dünyası* 28 (1998): 43-44.

<sup>41</sup> For the defensive works of people who support ideas of Ahmet Rıza see: Ahmed Rıza Bey, *Batının Doğu Politikasının Ahlaken İflası* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1988) and M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, *Preparation For A Revolution* (Oxford- New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 34-49.

<sup>42</sup> Mardin, “Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri”, 184.

<sup>43</sup> Aykut Kansu, “20 Yüzyıl Başı Türk Düşünce Hayatında Liberalizm” in *Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet’in Birikimi*, ed. Mehmet Ö. Alkan (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), 291.

<sup>44</sup> Ahmed Rıza Bey, *Ahmed Rıza Bey’in Anıları* (İstanbul: Arba Yayınları, 1988), 62.

<sup>45</sup> Korlaelçi, 61.

<sup>46</sup> Kansu, 291.

<sup>47</sup> This part of the sentence quoted by Kansu from Şuayip

<sup>48</sup> Kansu, 291.

<sup>49</sup> Kansu, 291.

<sup>50</sup> Mardin, “Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri”, 228.

<sup>51</sup> Kerem Ünüvar, “Abdullah Cevdet” in *Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet’in Birikimi*, ed. Mehmet Ö. Aklan (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), 98.

<sup>52</sup> M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, *Abdullah Cevdet ve Dönemi* (İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat, 1981), 218-223.

<sup>53</sup> *Tarih-i İslamiyet: History of Islam*.

<sup>54</sup> Hanioğlu, “The Young Turks in Opposition”, 91.

<sup>55</sup> Hanioğlu, “The Young Turks in Opposition”, 359.

<sup>56</sup> Hanioğlu, “The Young Turks in Opposition”, 360-361.

<sup>57</sup> Hanioğlu states similarity between the idea of Abdullah Cevdet “to make differences in terms of ideas” with his idea “differences which should be made in social areas.” Hanioğlu, “Abdullah Cevdet ve Dönemi”, 367.

<sup>58</sup> Bernard Lewis, *Modern Türkiye’nin Doğuşu*, trans. Metin Kırıatlı (Ankara: TTK, 1998), 235-326. See for the whole article Hanioğlu, “Abdullah Cevdet ve Dönemi”, 375-383.

<sup>59</sup> Mardin, “Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri”, 231.

<sup>60</sup> Hanioğlu, “Abdullah Cevdet ve Dönemi”, 21.

<sup>61</sup> Zürcher, “Kemalist Düşünenin Osmanlı Kaynakları”, 47.

<sup>62</sup> Quoted from Abdullah Cevdet by. Niyazi Berkes, *The Development of Secularism in Turkey* (London: Hurst & Company, 1998), 348.

<sup>63</sup> Uriel Heyd, *Ziya Gökalp Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Temelleri* (İstanbul: Sebil Yayınevi, 1980), 16.

<sup>64</sup> Kerem Ünüvar, “Ziya Gökalp” in *Milliyetçilik*, ed. Tanıl Bora (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), 28.

<sup>65</sup> Heyd, 63.

<sup>66</sup> Heyd, 65.

<sup>67</sup> Masami Arai, *Jön Türk Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliği*, trans. Tansel Demirel (İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık, 1992), 141.

<sup>68</sup> Andrew Davison, *Secularism and Revivalism in Turkey* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1998), 101.

<sup>69</sup> Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (İstanbul: Devlet Kitapları, 1969), 173.

<sup>70</sup> Edward Tiryakian, “Emile Durkheim” in *Sosyolojik Çözümlemenin Tarihi* ed. T. Bottomore and R. Nispet, prepared in Turkish M. Tunçay, A. Uğur (Ankara: Ayraç Yayınları, 1997), 197.

<sup>71</sup> Mete Tunçay, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nde Tek-Parti Yönetimi’nin Kurulması (1923-1931)* (Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 1981), 202.

<sup>72</sup> Tunçay, 212.

<sup>73</sup> Transferred from Atatürk by Reşat Kasaba, “Eski ile Yeni Arasında” in *Türkiye’de Modernleşme ve Ulusal Kimlik* ed. S. Bozdoğan, R. Kasaba (İstanbul: Tarih Yurt Vakfı Yayınları, 1998), 21.

<sup>74</sup> Nuray Mert, “Cumhuriyet Türkiye’sinde Laiklik ve Karşı Laikliğin Düşünsel Boyutu” in *Kemalizm* ed. Ahmet İnsel (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2000), 198.

<sup>75</sup> Levent Köker, *Modernleşme Kemalizm ve Demokrasi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1993), 161-162.

<sup>76</sup> Tunçay, 208-225.

<sup>77</sup> Kemal Karpat, *Türkiye’de Demokrasi Tarihi* (İstanbul: AFA, 1996), 224.

<sup>78</sup> Karpat, 224.

<sup>79</sup> Hamza Eroğlu, “Laikliğin Bedeli” in *I. Uluslararası Atatürk Sempozyumu 21-23 Eylül 1987*, ed. Reşat Genç (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 1994), 73.

<sup>80</sup> Köker, 166.

<sup>81</sup> Kasaba, 21.

<sup>82</sup> Ahmet Çiğdem, “Batılılaşma, Modernite ve Modernizasyon” in *Modernleşme ve Batıcılık* ed. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), 72.

<sup>83</sup> Berkes, 482.

<sup>84</sup> Elizabeth Özdalga, *The Veiling Issue, Official Secularism and Popular Islam in Modern Turkey*, (Richmond: Curzon, 1998), 3.

<sup>85</sup> See. Kayhan Delibas, “The experience of Secularisation in modern Turkey: secularisation from above” in *Religiosität in der säkularisierten Welt*, ed. M. Franzmann and. C. Gärtner, N. Köck (Wiesbaden: Vs Verlag Für Sozialwissenschaften, 2006), 375-394.