

EXTRACTING NATION OUT FROM HISTORY: THE RACISM OF NİHAL ATSIZ

Murat Altun

Psychoanalysis and anthropology mainly have served by demonstrating the significance of the “Other” in the process of the construction of the Subject. The perception of difference is the key point in that process. Yet difference does not have to arise, by Strauss’s terminology, in “good to think with” images; the Other can easily be the source of “hate-to-think-with” images that can cause such emotions as desolation, fear, and anxiety. In contradiction with the common thought claiming these feelings’ destructiveness, they are the inseparable essentials of the psyche’s construction. On the other side, psychology underestimates the subjectivity of the social, which is more than one Self and one Other, and the power producing relations of that social. Therefore, any psychological explanation of the construction of the Subject should be in touch with the social context, world history shows how subjective construction can easily turn into mass hysteria. Not only catastrophes like war or genocide, but even nationalism or, if remembered, the ordinariness of faith in the biological given, as race, before the shock when Auschwitz was opened to the international community after World War Two, were simple examples of this fact.

In that sense, racism should not be grasped as a perverted or excessive mode of nationalism, but rather as its complement. From this point of view, the analysis of the place of the racism in nationalism is decisive: though racism is not equally manifested in all nationalisms or all in their history, it nonetheless always represents a necessary tendency in their constitution.¹ Since nationalism, as a modern discourse for the construction of the social, is nevertheless a claim of universality, it must place its claim of uniqueness or the historical specificity of the nation in an ambiguous universality. This universalistic claim would not have been achieved if an ahistorical-biological given had not been invented during the late nineteenth century and perpetuated in the first half of the twentieth century: race. Here, nationalist historiography, from a teleological modernist perspective, ambiguously extracts the “race” from itself and sets it as a given. Racism thus permits a specific universalization, therefore an idealization, of nationalism.² This ability of racism can be better comprehended if racism is considered, as Balibar does, as a historiography which makes history the consequence of a hidden secret revealed to men about their own nature and their own birth;³ yet a historiography *sui generis*. Consequently, and once again, it should be grasped that the connection between nationalism and racism is neither a matter of perversion nor a question of formal similarity, but an historical articulation.⁴ In the Turkish case that articulation can be detached in the period roughly between 1930 and 1944, especially by the path followed by a notorious figure called Nihal Atsız.

Atsız in Life

Atsız was born the son of Ottoman navy commander in Istanbul in 1905. He was educated in French and German schools in Istanbul. His education in foreign schools,

with non-Muslim classmates, continued while he traveled abroad with his father. In Egypt, he spent some time at a French school when the Ottoman navy had taken shelter there because of the Turco-Italian War. His fights with foreign children marked the first signs of his nationalist leanings.⁵ Perhaps growing up in a military environment with the consciousness of being a part of a “dissolving empire” was among the prime reasons for the transformation of his attitude from one of defense to aggression. This aggression continued in 1922 when he entered the Military Medical School, in which the many minorities and non-Turkish Muslims enrolled were a reflection of imperial cosmopolitanism. However, Turkish nationalism as an education policy caused a strict tension among students from many ethnicities, resulting in the expulsion of Atsız in 1925 for fighting and displaying disrespect to a lieutenant of Arab descent.⁶

His hatred and lack of confidence towards all things non-Turkish flourished in his studies of language and literature, and subsequently history after his registration at *Dar-ül Fünun* (Istanbul University) in the Faculty of Literature. For Atsız, a strong, active language, was essential for a mighty State.⁷ He rejected both the hybrid language of Ottoman and the true-Turkish theories of the regime as being unfit for science and literature.⁸ He stated the relation between the nation and the language unclearly as “what human heart is, thus it is nation’s language.”⁹ His search for the “national heart” in language was engendered in a 1926 article, “Location Names of Turks in Anatolia”, which was noticed by Fuad Köprülü, the dean of faculty, who recruited Atsız for a research assistantship position.¹⁰

Literature, Atsız regarded as inseparable from history, the amalgamation of emotions and thoughts of a nation from the past to the present. Therefore, to understand a nation’s literature it was essential to consider its history.¹¹

The work of Atsız, his studies and theses, especially in his publications, put him in a controversial position with the regime. His first journal in 1931, *Atsız Mecmua* (Magazine), including articles by famous names such as Fuat Köprülü, Zeki Velidi Togan, Sabahattin Ali, and Pertev Naili Boratav, consisted of his attempts to define the Turkish race. In an article called “*Türkler Hangi Irktandır?* (From Which Race Do Turks Come?) he criticized the widely held belief that claimed Turks were descended from white Aryans, and emphasized that the race issue was a matter of language first of all.¹² He addressed the underlying reason behind the Aryan race theory, which assumed that the Aryans were the originators of civilization, and the belief that Turks had Aryan roots.¹³ Atsız never shared the embarrassment that the *Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları* (Fundamental Contours of Turkish History)¹⁴ (TTAH) felt since the West regarded Turks as barbaric invaders.¹⁵ He especially condemned the histories that referred to ancient history and civilizations in order to prove how the Turks were civilized; for him, efforts to prove that the Turks belonged to the same race – Aryan – as Kurds and Gypsies was shameful. Instead of that racial kinship, he preferred the once-disdained Mongols, at least they had been gifted militarists like the Turks, although this talent had not given the Turks enough time to show themselves in the fields of civilization.¹⁶ He argued that children should be raised in the knowledge that their ancestors had been perfect-soldiers of a race called Turan-Altay.¹⁷

Atsız went further than simply challenging the official teachings on racial roots; he also challenged the regime’s historiography. At the first Congress of Turkish History

in 1932, during which Reşid Galib harshly criticized Zeki Velidi Togan,¹⁸ Atsız and a few of his colleagues, including Pertev Naili Boratav, declared that they were proud of being Togan's students.¹⁹ This was more than the defense of a professor: it was an indirect declaration of opposition to the regime by postulating another historiography. It was also a reaction to the monopolistic tendency of the regime on the matter of nationalism, which, for Atsız, ran the risk of turning Turkism into uncertainty and anonymity, namely into an abstract form of nationalism.²⁰ Atsız felt this uncertainty could only be overcome with a new historiography based on blood and culture, race and war. However, Atsız was forced to find new ways to express his opinions; the publication of an article in *Atsız Mecmua* (Magazine), criticizing the new dean, who had been appointed by Reşid Galib, who was now the Minister of Education, led to his expulsion and the prohibition of *Atsız Mecmua* in 1932.²¹ Atsız soon struck back with the publication of the periodicals *Orhun* and *Aylı Kurt* (Wolf on Crescent Moon) series in 1935, in which he set forth the theoretical framework of Turanism and racism, describing the racial qualities and margins of Turkism in a more concrete manner in opposition to the regime's abstract and anonymous definitions.²² In an article he edited in *Orhun* in 1935 with the title "The Turkish Race = The Turkish Nation" he equated morality with blood, and pointed to the blueprints of these racial-cultural attributes in history.²³ He first rejected discussion of other nations' nationhood, regarding the Turkish nation as the only true one. Its being one-on-the-earth was a result of the amalgamation of three qualities, which were also the criteria of being a Turk: to have Turkish blood, the Turkish language, and the Turkish will of union.²⁴ Here, Atsız gave priority to blood over language in his definition of nation. He, nevertheless, considered being a Turk a spiritual and moral matter. This morality was due to physical, psychological and anthropological attributes; in the end, he simply equated emotional matters as matters of blood.²⁵

This racial definition of nation had some elements in common with that of the TTAH as it considered race as the definitive aspect of nation.²⁶ What disturbed Atsız, however, was the type of journey that the Turkish race had taken from the distant past of Central Asia to the present under the flag of the Turkish Republic. With his rejection of the Aryan race theory, his continuous Turkish state history made up his second challenge to the regime.

First, Atsız never considered history a science; nevertheless he did state that the knowledge of history was compulsory.²⁷ He, therefore, gave history the role of narrating remembrance. Indeed, both remembrance and forgetting are not just matters of unconsciousness, but rather political choices. Atsız's works thus aimed a political intervention in the official historiography of the regime, though his theories and those of the TTAH intersected on the definitiveness of race for the definition of nation.

Second, for Atsız the role of the history was to tell the great story of political and military incidents that had happened throughout time which would be beneficiary to the national training and will. As Turks moved towards Turkish Union – *Turan* – they needed a history appropriating their will that would not only demonstrate the past accurately, but also would draw a line to the future.²⁸ Hence, it had to be a history devoid of ruptures, a history of unbroken linearity. The official historiography, on the contrary, dealt with the history of dynasties and regimes, according to which eighteen Turkish states had been founded and had collapsed. Atsız, regarding the Turkish nation a racial

union primarily, defended a historiography of the nation which consisted of a single race that had survived within a state for 900 years; this was the history of the state in Anatolia, in addition to 2,000 years in Central Asia.²⁹ A single, continuous state which had only suffered some dynastic and regime changes, led from the distant past to the present day. Without doubt, Atsız's theory was constituted a direct challenge to the TTAH's rupture with the past, in the form of the Ottoman state, and its claims of being a re-builder. The TTAH's theory of the establishment of the Turkish nation began with ancient civilizations, such as the Hittites, and continued to the present, yet with breaks; but Atsız's Turkish history, on the contrary, began with heroic wars and continued to the present not on civilization's legacies, but on bayonets.³⁰

This anti-civilized, even anti-modern in appearance, stance was the argument that pushed Atsız into the realm of fascism. He believed being human was possible only by following a spiritual and moral ideal which he clarified as his *Ülkü* (Ideal) – *Geist* – under three aspects: racism, Turanism, and militarism.³¹ His racism had a main background similar to that of Nazism's escape into archaism and paganism: alienation. Atsız's personal career was always under the suppression of the regime, his quarrels with his superiors brought him expulsion from university; working as a primary school teacher in exile and as a librarian and prohibition of his publications, and even prison experiences formed his approach to authority. Although he strove to clear his state of pseudo-Turks³² – this is what he called anyone who did not have Anatolian peasant origin, whether they were Muslim or non-Muslim – and to create a history of which Turks could be proud, the regime, convinced that his discourse threatened the modernist-civilizationist discourse that it constituted, set obstacles in his path. The peak of the tension between Atsız and the regime was a trial in 1944 in which he was tried for calling Sebahattin Ali a communist and demanding the resignation of Hasan Ali Yücel – for ignoring the rise of the communists in the bureaucratic cadres of the Ministry of Education – that was turned into a case against Racism-Turanism. During the trial Atsız learned that he was accused of establishing a secret racist organization bent on bringing about the collapse of the regime. Disgusted, he divested himself of all of the political, self-seeking, hypocritical relations of the present and escaped more deeply into the heroic, archaic past, full of courage and people who determined their own wills by their swords. This was why he concluded his defense speech at the trial by saying:

I do not have to love one who is loved by everyone...in a world in which I believe that there is no real happiness, the only duty and relief I embrace is an ideal (*Ülkü*) of an high emotion and thought free from individuals...I am in this way living in the past and the future, but am disgusted by the present.³³

This Nietzschean type of exuberance can be observed in his novel *Ruh Adam* (Soul Man), in which he settled the old scores in his life in the story of a discharged soldier who detested everyone as he had been accused of acting against the regime. Because he believed that heroes only existed in monarchies, he began to read and think only on war tactics and military history of the past. In the end he was executed by an imaginary *Uygur*³⁴ court when he fell in love with a young woman and lost his military capabilities.³⁵ Even though this exuberance and belief in militarist heroism undermined his political possibilities, it strengthened Atsız's ideological and spiritual-moral popularity during the racist movements in Turkey during the 1960s and 1970s.³⁶

Atsız in Context

During the period that ended with the trial of Atsız in 1944, Turkish nationalism was a battlefield between two camps: the official nationalism nourished by the TTAH and the other, consisting of devotee nationalists opposed to the regime's theses. The first camp, made up of members of the Republican elite, was comprised of high level military officers, bureaucrats and intellectuals of the old Empire, who acted within a pragmatic and politically motivated framework and therefore had strong State-protectionist tendency.³⁷ The second camp was comprised of individuals born between 1900 and 1920, educated in the institutions of the Republic, such as Faculty of Language, History, and Geography at Ankara University and Istanbul University and were employed as teachers, and both civil and military officers.³⁸ Turkism was the component of the first camp that guided the birth of second camp, which then evolved into a more militant and less politically-responsible wave of nationalism.

This struggle between the two camps between 1930 and 1944 was more productive than is regarded: Turkish nationalism, with this process, was driven into a more popular form, yet with the contribution of racism. This proves the reciprocal relation between racism and nationalism; racism is constantly emerging out of nationalism, not only towards the exterior, but towards the interior.³⁹ For instance, though the figures of first generation of Turkism, like Ziya Gökalp, regarded race in parity with culture and tradition and never gave priority to race, in their thoughts, there was always its significance.⁴⁰ However, for the figures of the Republican generation of Turkism, in the second camp, such as Nihal Atsız, race was an uncompromised essence of nationhood.⁴¹

As the most identified figure of this generation, Atsız rescued nationalism from the bounds of the State and put it in a more concrete and universalistic manner – being concrete and universalistic at the same time was what TTAH had not been able to achieve – by crossbreeding Turkism with racism-Turanism. As such, this process was possible, if we consider that nationalism emerges from racism, in the sense that it would not constitute itself as the ideology of a “new” nation if the official nationalism against which it were reacting were not profoundly racist.⁴²

Indeed, the period 1930-1944 saw the rise of racism in the Western world based on claims of the being scientific. Therefore, it should not be a surprise if a regime that strove to prove its Westernness by constructing a historiography that aimed to demonstrate in the establishment of the TTAH what sublime racial characteristics the Turkish nation had.⁴³ Following the TTAH, the regime's purpose in creating a Turkish History was embodied in 1932 by the convention of Congress of Turkish History. The delegates at the Congress worked to verify two theses: First that the Turkish Language was the first language on earth and the source of all other languages; and second, that the Turks were the descendants of the Aryan race, who were the creators of civilization.⁴⁴ As mentioned above, this second theory was one of the major points Atsız repudiated, yet his repudiation emerged from the understanding of race of the TTAH. Whereas Atsız strengthened his racism by addressing the emphasis from language, which he previously regarded prior to determining a race, to blood; the official theses stressed language in the definition of race. This was totally because of the existence of diverse languages; the

“Speak Turkish” campaign in the 1930s was part of this fact. However, this was totally unbearable for Atsız: He defined racism as a national thought that could save the material and spiritual integrity of the Turks by eliminating all foreign blood including pseudo-Turks.⁴⁵ Obviously, the influence of Nazism – in addition to racism, social-Darwinism was another component – was very common in the period of 1930-44, especially after the beginning of World War II. However, Atsız never had a profound program on the political system, the regime or the economy as Nazism or Italian Fascism did. While he proudly embraced being a racist, he responded harshly to comparisons that equated his thoughts with those of German racism: for him, German racism was only against Jews, but his racism was against every nation.⁴⁶ Here his racism served also an apparatus of opposition towards the government of the CHP; he criticized the Republic for employing foreign blood in the high ranking positions in the State and he demanded an administration staffed by the Turkish race in Turkey.⁴⁷ His stress on interior racial union was the main point that distinguished him in racist-militarist thought in the context of 1930-44. Racism as a mainstream thought found its closest place to political power in the period of 1939-44.⁴⁸ In 1942, when Şükrü Saraçoğlu was appointed prime minister, he declared that “we are Turks, Turkist, and will always remain Turkist; Turkism, for us, is a matter of conscience and culture as well as a matter of blood.”⁴⁹

On the other hand, in the public sense, there was sympathy and explicit support for German irredentism. Many regarded Germany’s struggle against the Versailles Treaty like the Republic’s success on the issue of the Hatay and Montreux Treaties. However, when the retreat of German army was comprehended at the beginning of 1943, the regime’s attitude was immediately changed towards figures like Atsız.⁵⁰ Therefore, in 1944, his insistence on criticizing the government in open letters and his accusation of Sabahattin Ali turned a personal defamation case into one trying racism-Turanism. During the trial, Atsız successfully demonstrated the common racial stance between the official and his racial nationalism. He gave as examples the official requirement of “being a member of Turkish race” for registration to MTA or military schools; or the declaration of Şükrü Saraçoğlu; or Fevzi Çakmak, who carried out racist applications in the army; *Turkish History* by Şemsettin Günaltay and *Revolution History* by Bozkurt. He argued that the State was also racist in its applications, and Turanist in its invasion of Hatay, and asked why all this figures were not between themselves, in court.⁵¹ He ended up his defense speech with a reference to Jesus Christ: “If I am still be guilty in front of the all racist and Turanist applications and declarations of the Republic... Then he who has the no sin throws the first stone.”⁵²

Atsız sought to further the cause of racism, but in the tension between nationalism and racism he missed the international conjecture, the defeat of Nazism, and the regime’s aim to become a member of the Western Allies. Fortunately Atsız’s racism failed to be turned into a mass movement, with the exception of a few demonstrations on the date of the trial, 3 May 1944. “The Spirit of ‘44” might have turned into a violent mass movement that aimed to overthrow the State, as in Italy and Germany, if the common positions between Atsız’s racism and official nationalism had not historically get similar. On the other hand, Atsız’s excessive anti-democratic discourse and his total-rejection of Islam prevented him from becoming an icon that could be embraced by both the urban middle classes, which was also weak in both the quantitative and qualitative senses, and

the Anatolian rural population.⁵³ For instance, whereas *Said-i Nursi* was regarded as a counter-Republican by the regime as he was able to move Islamic reactionary attitude as an opposition discourse, Atsız remained the “bad dog” of the house with his pagan-secular ultra-nationalist rhetoric.⁵⁴

Conclusion

Though Atsız seemed to be located in positions counter to the official nationalism, as at his trial in 1944, he made significant contributions during the process of the transformation of Turkish nationalism from the belief of the members of the elitist circle into a popular movement. Thus, in 1947, the regime declared with the decision of the court that the suspects of the racism-Turanism case were not guilty, and additionally recognized Turkism as a national ideology.⁵⁵ In Hegelian terms, what Atsız achieved is called a “concrete universalism.” As mentioned previously, he could not have dealt with this without adopting a historiography called racism. To extract an undistorted national kernel through historiography was universalistic just fitting the claims of the nationalist discourse, yet it was ambiguous, as he invented a militarist and warrior tradition, and that would bring him close to the Turkish fascist movement in the future. What was important is the expansion of Atsız’s historiography into the common memory and even into the public school books. The existence of web pages in the 2000s dedicated to Atsız proves the need to focus on him in order to understand the new trajectories of a brand new cultural racism with implicit references to biology.

Notes

¹ Etienne Balibar, "Race and Nationalism," in *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, ed. Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (London: Verso, 1991), 48.

² Ibid., 61.

³ Ibid., 54.

⁴ Ibid., 50.

⁵ Osman Sertkaya, *Nihal Atsız* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1987), 3.

⁶ Ibid., 4.

⁷ Ibid., 38.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ “İnsanın kalbi neyse, milletin dili de odur.” (translation by me) Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid., 5.

¹¹ Nihal Atsız, *Türk Edebiyat Tarihi (Turkish Literature History)* (Istanbul: Aylık Kurt, 1943).

- ¹² Nihal Atsız, "Türkler Hangi Irktandır ? (From Which Race do The Turks Come?)," *Atsız Mecmua*, no. 6 (1931). Available from <http://www.nihalatsiz.org>
- ¹³ Ibid.
- ¹⁴ Fundamental Contours of Turkish History was a survey featuring many famous early republican intellectuals from many disciplines, such as history and anthropology. Under the leadership of Atatürk, beside the intention of suggesting a new historiography for the modern Turkey, they also aimed to prove that Turks were the prime race of the western civilization, thus they were Aryans. The Survey was published in 1931.
- ¹⁵ Güven Bakırgezer, "Nihal Atsız," in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik (Political Thought in Modern Turkey: Nationalism)*, ed. Tanıl Bora (Istanbul: İletişim, 2003), 355.
- ¹⁶ Atsız, "Türkler Hangi Irktandır ? (From Which Race do The Turks Come?)." ¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁸ In the conference, Zeki Togan accused the historical theses of the TTAH of being non-scientific because of its references to the Turks as Aryans.
- ¹⁹ Sertkaya, *Nihal Atsız*, 5.
- ²⁰ Orhangazi Ertekin, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkçülüğün Çatallanan Yolları (Forked Paths of Turkism in Republican Era)," in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik (Political Thought in Modern Turkey: Nationalism)*, ed. Tanıl Bora (Istanbul: İletişim, 2003), 357.
- ²¹ Sertkaya, *Nihal Atsız*, 5.
- ²² Ertekin, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkçülüğün Çatallanan Yolları (Forked Paths of Turkism in Republican Era)," 360.
- ²³ Nihal Atsız, "Türk Irkı = Türk Milleti (The Turkish Race = The Turkish Nation)," *Orhun*, no. 9 (1934). Available from <http://www.nihalatsiz.org>.
- ²⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁶ See *Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları (Fundamentals Contours of Turkish History)*, (Istanbul: Kaynak, 1999).
- ²⁷ Nihal Atsız, *Türk Tarihi Üzerine Toplamalar (Collections on Turkish History)* (Istanbul: Aylı Kurt, 1935), i.
- ²⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁹ See Nihal Atsız, *900. Yıldönümü: Devletimizin Kuruluşu (900th Anniversary: Establishment of Our State)* (Istanbul: n.p., 1955).
- ³⁰ Ibid., 50.
- ³¹ Sertkaya, *Nihal Atsız*, 92.
- ³² Atsız, "Türk Irkı = Türk Milleti (The Turkish Race = The Turkish Nation)."
- ³³ "Ben herkesin sevdiği insanları sevmeye mecbur değilim... Hiçbir hakikî bahtiyarlığın bulunmadığına kani olduğum dünyada tek vazife ve teselli bildiğim ülkü, şahıslardan sıyrılmış yüksek bir duygu ve düşüncedir...Bugünden nefret ederek, bu yolun üzerinde geçmiş ve gelecekte yaşamaktayım." (translation by me) Nihal Atsız, *Mahkeme Savunması (Defense Speech)* (1945 [cited]; available from <http://www.nihalatsiz.org>).
- ³⁴ According the official Turkish history, *Uygur* were the last state of Turks in Central Asia. They had, in comparison with their ancestors, a settled culture, not a nomad way

of living. Again for the official history, the Uygur State collapsed because they had abandoned their customs, thus their warrior ways. Therefore, it is ironic that the main character in *Ruh Adam* was tried by an Uygur court.

- ³⁵ See Nihal Atsız, *Ruh Adam* (Istanbul: Baysan, 1992).
- ³⁶ Ertekin, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkçülüğün Çatallanan Yolları (Forked Paths of Turkism in Republican Era)," 371.
- ³⁷ Ibid., 351.
- ³⁸ Ibid.
- ³⁹ Balibar, "Race and Nationalism," 53.
- ⁴⁰ See Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları (Principles of Turkism)* (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1970), 16-23.
- ⁴¹ Ertekin, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkçülüğün Çatallanan Yolları (Forked Paths of Turkism in Republican Era)," 350.
- ⁴² Balibar, "Race and Nationalism," 53.
- ⁴³ *Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları (Fundamentals Contours of Turkish History)*, 25.
- ⁴⁴ Emre Arslan, "Türkiye'de Irkçılık (Racism in Turkey)," in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik (Political Thought in Modern Turkey: Nationalism)*, ed. Tanıl Bora (Istanbul: İletişim, 2003), 412.
- ⁴⁵ Ertekin, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkçülüğün Çatallanan Yolları (Forked Paths of Turkism in Republican Era)," 379.
- ⁴⁶ Arslan, "Türkiye'de Irkçılık (Racism in Turkey)," 415.
- ⁴⁷ Ertekin, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkçülüğün Çatallanan Yolları (Forked Paths of Turkism in Republican Era)," 378.
- ⁴⁸ Arslan, "Türkiye'de Irkçılık (Racism in Turkey)," 410.
- ⁴⁹ Ertekin, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkçülüğün Çatallanan Yolları (Forked Paths of Turkism in Republican Era)," 366.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid., 367.
- ⁵¹ Atsız, *Mahkeme Savunması (Defense Speech)* ([cited]).
- ⁵² "Cumhuriyetin bütün bu ırkçı ve Turancı uygulamaları ve demeçleri önünde hala suçlu sayılıyorsam... O zaman içinizde hiç günahsız olan kim ise ilk taşı o atsin." (translation by me) Ibid.([cited]).
- ⁵³ Yüksel Taşkın, "Reaksiyonerlik: Muhafazakarlığın Uslanmaz Çocuğu (Reactionism: The Mischievous Child of Conservatism)," in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Muhafazakarlık (Political Thought of Modern Turkey)*, ed. Ahmet Çiğdem (Istanbul: İletişim, 2004), 191.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid., 191.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., 358.

Bibliography

Arslan, Emre. "Türkiye'de Irkçılık (Racism in Turkey)." In *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik (Political Thought in Modern Turkey: Nationalism)*, edited by Tanıl Bora. Istanbul: İletişim, 2003.

Atsız, Nihal. *900. Yıldönümü: Devletimizin Kuruluşu (900th Anniversary: Establishment of Our State)*. Istanbul: n.p., 1955.

———. *Mahkeme Savunması (Defense Speech)*, 1945. Available from <http://www.nihalatsiz.org>.

———. *Ruh Adam*. Istanbul: Baysan, 1992.

———. *Türk Edebiyat Tarihi (Turkish Literature History)*. Istanbul: Aylık Kurt, 1943.

———. "Türk Irkı = Türk Milleti (The Turkish Race = The Turkish Nation)." *Orhun*, no. 9 (1934).

———. *Türk Tarihi Üzerine Toplamalar (Collections on Turkish History)*. Istanbul: Aylık Kurt, 1935.

———. "Türkler Hangi Irktandır ? (From Which Race Do the Turks Come?)." *Atsız Mecmua*, no. 6 (1931).

Bakırgezer, Güven. "Nihal Atsız." In *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik (Political Thought in Modern Turkey: Nationalism)*, edited by Tanıl Bora. Istanbul: İletişim, 2003.

Balibar, Etienne. "Race and Nationalism." In *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, edited by Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein. London: Verso, 1991.

Ertekin, Orhangazi. "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Türkçülüğün Çatallanan Yolları (Forked Paths of Turkism in Republican Era)." In *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik (Political Thought in Modern Turkey: Nationalism)*, edited by Tanıl Bora. Istanbul: İletişim, 2003.

Gökalp, Ziya. *Türkçülüğün Esasları (Principles of Turkism)*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1970.

Sertkaya, Osman. *Nihal Atsız*. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1987.

Taşkın, Yüksel. "Reaksiyonerlik: Muhafazakarlığın Usulanmaz Çocuğu (Reactionism: The Mischievous Child of Conservatism)." In *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce:*

43 *Murat Altun*

Muhafazakarlık (Political Thought of Modern Turkey: Conservatism), edited by Ahmet Çiğdem. Istanbul: İletişim, 2004.

Türk Tarihinin Ana Hatları (Fundamentals Contours of Turkish History). Istanbul: Kaynak, 1999.