

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

The Origins of the Unity Idea in the Turkic World*

Cemil Doğaç İpek**

Mehmet Çağatay Güler***

Abstract

As the Turks outside the Ottoman Empire lost their independence from 1885 and the ideas such as Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism were overwhelmed with the *zeitgeist*, the idea of unity emerged as a worldview and a new image of civilization in the Turkic World, which reinterpreted its civilizational identity within the framework of a multilevel reconstruction period. This study addresses the reconstruction of the centuries-long historical and cultural heritage of the Turkic world by the representatives of this idea based on the unity of language, i.e. having language as a unifying element, from a historical perspective. In this framework, studies published in five different languages were analyzed.

Keywords

Turkic World, Turkish Language, Turkic Civilization, Turks, Unity Idea.

* Date of Arrival: 21 December 2021 – Date of Acceptance: 09 August 2022

You can refer to this article as follows:

İpek, Cemil Doğaç, and Mehmet Çağatay Güler. "The Origins of the Unity Idea in the Turkic World." *bilig*, no. 105, 2023, pp. 129-158.

** Dr., National Defense University, Turkish Military Academy – Ankara/Türkiye

ORCID: 0000-0001-5007-7151

cdipek@kho.msu.edu.tr

*** Doctorate Research Assistant, National Defense University, Turkish Military Academy – Ankara/Türkiye

ORCID: 0000-0001-8604-0449

mcguler@kho.msu.edu.tr

Introduction

The last quarter of the nineteenth century is a period when political authority eroded in the Turkic World but national awakening gained utmost pace. Upon Turkestan's conquest by the Russians in 1885, the political and cultural independence of the Turks outside the Ottoman Empire was abolished. The occupation of Turkish Homelands and the utter decline of the Ottoman Empire caused crises in the Turkic World in every aspect. Significant changes occurred in the world and throughout the Turkic Homelands in the nineteenth century. These changes inflicted deep wounds in Turkic Homelands and Turkic Peoples. Especially after the Russian occupation, political pressures, persecutions, and exiles increased all the more in Turkestan. Turkestan's Turkish nationalist intellectuals and political leaders were hit the most by these pressures. Therefore, "The Idea of Unity in the Turkic World" became one of the most important agenda items for these intellectuals.

The Young Turks movement in Türkiye and especially the generation of Ziya Gökalp, Ömer Seyfeddin, and Yusuf Akçura, who came after the generation of Namık Kemal, Ziya Pasha, and Ahmed Mithat Efendi, struggled to simplify the Turkish language in the context of Turkish Hearth Association and the Journal of Turkish Homeland (Dumont 317). They believed that in this way, they could ensure the awakening of Türkiye's Turks while getting along better with the Turkic World. One of the most important national awakening symbols for the Turkic World in this period was Gaspıralı İsmail Bey, or Ismail Gasprinskii, (1851-1914). Gaspıralı is the heart and the main theoretician of the unity idea for the Turkic World. Gaspıralı İsmail Bey received education in Moscow and stayed in Istanbul and Paris for rather long periods. Suggesting a program for the unity of Muslims in Russia, Gaspıralı İsmail Bey regarded the constitution of a written language that may be understood by all of the Turks from the Balkans to the inner parts of China, as the first condition in this sense. According to Gaspıralı, this language would be understood everywhere from the Balkans to China and would be made use of by both Bosphorus boatmen and cameleers of Kashgar. Being published by Gaspıralı İsmail Bey, the Tercüman Newspaper was regularly read by well-educated intellectuals all over the Turkic World, with Istanbul being in the first place, and attracted attention as a respected

paper in especially Azerbaijan and Crimea (Bozkurt 61-88). The Füyüzât Journal, published by Hüseyinzade Ali Bey in Azerbaijan, was the strongest representative of Gaspıralı's idea of unity around a common language. Just like Gaspıralı İsmail Bey, Hüseyinzade Ali Bey also believed that it was not only possible but also critical to ensure unity in the Turkic World around literary language, based on the Istanbul dialect of Turkish language, i.e. Istanbul Turkish (Abdürreşidov 12-21; Hüseyinli 81-83). Significant steps were taken in the cultural field in Azerbaijan between 1905 and 1920, and an intelligentsia that would assume the country's leadership was formed. Azerbaijani Turkish intellectuals such as Mehmet Emin Resulzade, Hüseyinzade Ali, and Ahmet Ağaoğlu, made considerable contributions to Turkish nationalism in Türkiye and to the development of the idea of unity in the Turkic World. In the late nineteenth century, a remarkable tendency towards Turkish nationalism started to be witnessed among Kazakh intellectuals as well. As opposed to the Westernizers who displayed a submissive attitude towards Western and Russian thinking, Kazakh Turkish nationalists were more interested in Chagatai literature and traditional Kazakh folklore and tried to stay away from the impact of Russian culture. Most famous ones among these Turkish nationalist intellectuals were Alihan Nurmuhammedoğlu Bökeyhan, Ahmet Baytursun, Mir Yakub Dulatoğlu and Magcan Cumabay.

The idea of unity in the Turkic World was started to be discussed and uttered from these dates and has continued so far in various levels. This idea was addressed at national and international levels especially during the transition and crisis periods and was considered as a way out. The idea of unity in the Turkic World was brought to the agenda by various intellectuals and politicians at various times, with pre-and post-World War I periods, the inter-war period, the Cold War period, and the period after the dissolution of the USSR. It is deemed appropriate in this study to dwell on these persons, who are addressed hereby as founding fathers of these ideas.

There are too many people to refer to in this regard. The most noteworthy among them are (according to historical order): İsmail Gaspıralı, Ziya Gökalp, Yusuf Akçura, Ömer Seyfettin, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, Mustafa Çokay, Mehmet Emin Resulzade, Hüseyinzade Ali Turan, Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, Mirseyid Sultan Galiyev, Zeki Velidi Togan, Sabri Maksudi

Arsal, Münevver Kari, Abdülhamit Süleyman Çolpan, Abdurrauf Fitrat, Mağcan Cumabay, Hüseyin Nihal Atsız, İşenaali Arabayev and Alparslan Türkeş.

The aforementioned people fought for the ideal world where everyone has the right to speak and to be listened to and saw the Turkish language and the idea of unity in the Turkic World as important means to realize this ideal. Although the work done by the aforementioned people for the realization of the idea of unity in the Turkic World cannot be denied, as it will be analyzed in the following sections of this study, it would not be correct to limit the long-term and multidimensional studies required for the institutionalization of this ideal, with only the aforementioned names. Indeed, despite the tireless efforts of the said people, a Turkish-based institutionalization could not be exactly achieved in those periods. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to call them the architects, sources of inspiration, and tireless defenders of the idea of unity in the Turkic World.

Formation of the Idea of Unity in the Turkic World: Awakening and Reform

The period when the unity in the Turkic World started to be widely discussed and talked about was the period when Turkish and Muslim populations initiated their efforts to redefine and reconstruct their identity in the face of the rise of Western civilization. It is in fact possible to call this period an era of awakening for Turkish and Muslim communities. After starting in the field of religion in and around the city of Kazan, this awakening continued as an educational reform movement (*Ceditçilik*- Jadidism) and transformed into a widespread movement in the form of political and nationalist activities at the beginning of the twentieth century (Kanlıdere, “Rusya” 168).

Of course, it is plausible to suggest that national awakening movements which emerged in the Turkic world were affected by the contemporary developments in various parts of the world that involved national dynamism. It may be argued that the rise of movements with nationalist traits in countries like Japan, Russia, and Iran rendered the intelligentsia of the Turkic world, with Ottoman Türkiye being in the first place, closer to these movements (Zürcher 89). Similar developments occurred in both Türkiye and Turkestan. Emerging in Istanbul in 1908, the Young Turk

Revolution attracted Turkish intellectuals in Russia to Istanbul. At the time, Istanbul became an intellectual hub for intellectuals coming from Russia and Turkestan. During this period, an increasing level of cultural affinity occurred between the Ottoman Empire (also known as *Devlet-i Aliyye*) and Russian Turks in parallel with an intense exchange of views. Intellectuals from Kazan, Crimea, Caucasia, and Turkestan played important roles in Ottoman political and cultural life (Kanlıdere, “Rusya” 175).

Gaspıralı İsmail Bey and Jadidism (*Ceditçilik*)

The first name that comes to mind when the idea of unity in the Turkic World is mentioned, is beyond doubt İsmail Gaspıralı. İsmail Gaspıralı was born in Avcıköy which is located near Bahçesaray of Crimea. (Kırımlı 5) Gaspıralı’s education in Russian schools pushed him towards national sentiments and the anti-Turkish attitude in Tsardom of Russia helped the formation of his national conscience (Kırimer 16; Saray, *Gaspıralı İsmail*). He started to serve as a Russian teacher in Bahçesaray in 1868 (Ortaylı 11) and left Crimea for Paris in 1872 to receive education (Devlet, “İsmail Bey” 17). As he spent two years in Paris, İsmail Gaspıralı had the opportunity to witness Western civilization closely. After returning to Istanbul in 1874, Gaspıralı stayed in this city for a while and then went to Crimea. In 1878, he was selected as Deputy Mayor of Bahçesaray. The following year, Gaspıralı became the mayor and continued to serve as such until 1884 (Kırımlı 6). He was married to Zühre Hanımefendi (Madam Zühre), Yusuf Akçura’s aunt, in 1882 and thereby became relative with Yusuf Akçura as well (Duran 89).

Being a Tatar Turk from Crimea, İsmail Gaspıralı reflected his regret for the failure of Turks to form a unity, by saying, “If we continue this way, the future of the Turks in Russia is dark” (M. Şahin 30). If Turkish communities in Russia that were called with different names but had common kinship bonds continued to the current separation, they would encounter the risk of being lost within the Slavic sea surrounding them. And they had to act together if they wanted to put an end to the divisions. As Mehmet Şahingöz emphasizes in the section İsmail Gaspıralı Bey and Selname-i Türki, where he deals with the first publications of Gaspıralı, İsmail Bey emphasizes the greatness and importance of the Turkish-Tatar peoples. The emphasis in question goes as follows with the words taken from Şahingöz (175): “There is a great nation, the Turkish-Tatar nation, living in parts of Asia and Europe.

This nation is fragmented, scattered, weak, this nation has lagged behind other nations in terms of knowledge, ingenuity, wealth and civilization. If it continues like this, it is natural to fight for survival and to be destroyed by other nations. The real issue arises from this fact: What is the reason for the weakness of the Turkish-Tatars, why are they left behind? What should be done to save the Turkish-Tatar nation from destruction?”

Gaspıralı was concerned that Turks may be assimilated in the Tsardom of Russia. With the belief that Turks could survive by unifying around a common Turkish language, Gaspıralı designed a newspaper to achieve his ideal. Addressing all of the Turkic World, this newspaper was published in a simplified Turkish language. The name of this newspaper was Tercüman (meaning Translator), which was published with the motto of “*Unity in language, idea, and work*” (Landau 93). With his Tercüman newspaper published in 1883, İsmail Gaspıralı almost blazed a trail for a national and intellectual awakening of all of the Turkic World, with Russian Turks being in the first place. Intellectual, cultural and political movements of Russian Turks in the modern sense, started with his such initiatives (Bozkurt 61-88). According to the reform program envisaged by İsmail Gaspıralı, schools and madrasahs should have been improved, a common literary language should have been formed among Turkic peoples, and education of women should have been prioritized as much as that of men (Kanlıdere, “Rusya” 173).

The most important initiative of İsmail Gaspıralı towards reform was the school named *usûl-i cedit* (meaning “new method of education”) he opened in 1884 (Abdirashidov 7; Saifnazarov and Ernazarov 57). The easy method of reading as applied in Gaspıralı’s *usûl-i cedit* school, which was established in Bahçesaray, Crimea, became all the more widespread and reached to other Turkic-Islamic regions of Russia in a short time. İsmail Gaspıralı made efforts to raise national conscience among firstly the Turks of Russia and then the Turks in the world, by way of its activities in the areas of education and culture. In fact, the first signs of Gaspıralı’s educational personality and his views on the rise of the Turkish world, which we have discussed in terms of Jadidism, are seen in *Salname-i Türki* (Şahingöz 177).

One of the most important activities of İsmail Gaspıralı on the idea of unity in the Turkic World was his initiatives to form a common Turkish language (Gubaıdullin 148-153). His idea was to process and simplify Istanbul’s

Turkish language based on the Crimean dialect, which was a mediator between Ottoman and Tatar dialects, and to transform Istanbul Turkish into a common literary language for all Turks. Turkish language should have been cleared of unnecessary words that had been taken from Persian and Arabic languages and should have been rendered so simple that people could understand. Having become widespread thanks to Gaspıralı's Tercüman Newspaper, this language was effective on intellectuals of Crimea, Volga-Ural region, Caucasia, and Turkestan. A comprehensive literary was formed by those who wrote in this language (Kanlıdere, "Rusya" 173). However, İsmail Gaspıralı's common Turkish language movement was hindered and the development of local languages was encouraged during the USSR period.

The consciousness of Turkishness was at the top level in İsmail Gaspıralı at all times. This may be witnessed in his following remark: *"The essence of my political beliefs and views is that 'I am a Turk who is the son of a Turk'. Unless I am a Turk first, I can be neither an aristocrat nor a democrat. I can be among neither populists nor socialists. If someone tells me, 'Your condition is miserable. Give up the idea of Turkishness, in other words, nationalism, and enjoy happiness', I would prefer misery over happiness to be achieved in that manner. Failure to be me is neither plausible nor conscientious for me."* (Gaspıralı 332). The reason behind why Gaspıralı emphasized that he was a Turk with decisive statements was his reaction to the term Tatar which was used for Muslims of Russia (Duran 95). Gaspıralı mentioned that there was no nation like Tatar and those who were called Tatar were in fact Turkish (Şahingöz 176). Tsardom of Russia knew that it would be impossible for it to hold Turks under its control in case the Turks living in Russian-occupied regions were unified. Therefore, the Tsardom of Russia tried to divide Turks into various nations in different names. In this way, Tsardom of Russia tried to eliminate the Turkish nation, which the former could not assimilate for years by denominating Turks as Tatar, Kyrgyz, Kazakh, Azeri, Uzbek, Turkmen, and Bashkir (Hablemitoğlu 10). Gaspıralı delimited the definition of Turkishness by the Turkish language. He explained this limitation as follows: *"In terms of language, the communities known with the names such as Yakuts of Eastern Siberia, Siberian Turks, Baraba, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Karakalpak, Bashkir, Nogai, Kazanian, Kumuk, Uyghur, Uzbek, Taranci, Sart, Azerbaijan and Ottoman, as well as the Urughs, talk in the Turkish language; they are all Turks. Although*

the Turkish subjects of Russia are called ‘Tatar’, this is an attribution, an error. The people called as ‘Tatar’ by Russians and as ‘Nogai’ by Bukharans are in fact Turks” (Yüksel 31-32). Although İsmail Gaspıralı could not ensure complete unity of language in the Turkic World through Tercüman Newspaper, he paved the way for Turks’ conscious Turkish nationalism. The main idea of Gaspıralı İsmail Bey was to gather the Turkic World around the common Turkish language via Tercüman Newspaper (Jeong 62-63). To this end, he preferred the Istanbul dialect of Turkish as the common language in his newspaper. According to Gaspıralı, the Istanbul dialect should be simplified by removing complex phrases from it so that it could be understood throughout the whole Turkic World (Duran 103).

One of the most important contributions of the Jadidism movement was the fact that it laid the ground for national and political awareness. Developments in the area of press and publications, as well as the developments such as increased cultural relations with the Ottoman Empire and rising number of students enrolled in Russian schools, strengthened national and political awareness among the Turks of Russia and Turkestan at the beginning of the twentieth century. The sense of Turkishness came to the fore gradually among the Muslims of Russia and the identification of Turks of Russia started to be used widely instead of Muslims of Russia (Kanlıdere, “Rusya” 174). Jadidism movement developed in Turkestan in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth-century thanks to the impact of Crimea and Kazan. The impacts of İsmail Gaspıralı’s Tercüman Newspaper and the *usûl-i cedit* schools, as well as the reformist movements coming from Istanbul, Cairo, and India were effective in the development of new ideas in Turkestan (Bennigsen 119). 1905 Russian and 1908 Ottoman Constitutional Monarchy (*Meşrutiyet*) movements as well as the ideas of struggle against colonialism in India had significant effects on the formation of political awareness in Turkestan. Besides, also the technical and economic developments emerging after the Russian occupation had a significant role in the formation of ideas of novelty and change in Turkestan (Kanlıdere, “Rusya” 183).

The Awakening Extending from Russia to Turkestan

The effects of awakening and reform that started in Turkic-Muslim regions in Russia, reached Turkestan as a whole amid the nineteenth century. The

development of seaways and railways not only connected the people of Turkestan with their cognates in the Ottoman Empire but also led to the fact that they were impacted by the press and publication activities there. At the time, writings of opinion leaders such as Mithat Paşa, Namık Kemal, and Ziya Paşa, could reach up to Turkestan. The effects of journalism came to Turkestan from Crimea, Kazan, Azerbaijan, and Istanbul. Having been published by İsmail Gaspralı, *Tercüman Newspaper* had a considerable impact in Turkestan (Bozkurt 61-88). The modernization of the postal service facilitated the spread of newspapers. Turkestan's intelligentsia carefully followed the newspapers and journals coming from Kazan, Orenburg, Baku, and Tbilisi (Bozkurt 151-173). During the pilgrimage season, the pilgrims returning to their hometowns over Istanbul clandestinely brought Istanbul's newspapers and journals with them to their own countries by hiding them among their personal belongings such as quilts, pillows, and clothing. Mahmud Hoca Behbudî (Mahmud Khoja Bedbudî), who was among Jadidist ulema (religious scholars), thought that newspapers served as society's spiritual leaders. Indeed, newspapers had important functions in this period. Newspapers cracked the monopoly of the ulema on information (Khalid, "Printing" 195). As an increased level of freedom was granted to the press following the 1905 revolution, Tatars of Turkestan published newspapers in Turkestan's Turkish dialect, which was known also as *the Turki* language. These were followed by newspapers and journals published by Uzbeks (Kanlıdere, "Turkistan'da" 200). The newspapers and journals published in this period were mostly based in Tashkent. Modern-style schools, newspapers, and political activities in Turkestan all started in Tashkent. Until 1905, only one single newspaper named "The Newspaper of the State of Turkestan" was published in the Turkish language in Turkestan. Mahmud Hoca Behbudî and other Jadidists published articles in this newspaper under aliases. After that date, several other newspapers and journals were published in the Turkish language. Initial newspapers and journals happened to have short lifespans. Just after giving their messages, they were closed by the intervention of the government (Kanlıdere, "Turkistan'da" 201).

Tatar Turks have an undisputed place in Turkestan's modernization. As is known, madrasahs in Bukhara became a source of information for Tatar youth until the nineteenth century. After that date, however, Tatars of

Russia assumed the role of enlightening their cognates in Turkestan. First Uzbek books were published in Kazan. The first printing house in Tashkent was established by a Tatar from Kazan (Turdiyev 4-16). The first *usûl-i cedit* schools in Turkestan, too, were established by them. Gaspıralı İsmail Bey impressed the youth of Bukhara and Samarkand during his visit to these cities. As the spokesman of reformist ideas, Tercüman Newspaper was closely followed by the intellectuals of Turkestan. (Kanlıdere, “Turkistan’da” 196).

Concerned about the activities of Tatars toward the Turkic World, the Tsardom of Russia took serious measures from the very beginning. In 1886, Tsardom of Russia banned ownership of real estate by non-Christians in Turkestan to prevent the Tatars from influencing Turkestan (Kanlıdere, “Kuzey” 29). Relatedly, as Şahingöz argues, the non-Slavic part of the empire was never taken under arms. Turkestan and Kazakh steppes were exempted from military service with the regulations of Tsarist Russia in 1886 (Şahingöz, “I. Dünya Savaşında” 838). In 1911, it was stipulated that the teachers working in Muslim schools should have the same ethnic origin/nationality as their students. İsmail Gaspıralı asserted that unity among Turks could not be hindered in this way. Because the unity of Turks was based on religion, history, and kinship (Kanlıdere, “Turkistan’da” 197). In the face of the Russian government’s such measures, the people of Turkestan opened their *usûl-i cedit* schools. Russian government always looked at the activities of Jadidist intellectuals in Turkestan with suspicion. It was suspected that *usûl-i cedit* schools and Jadidist intellectuals would arouse nationalist sentiments in the region, thereby paving the way for national awareness. It was concerned that the people of Turkestan would develop relations with the Ottoman Empire and other Turkic-Muslim communities. As soon as Russian officials realized that Jadidism went beyond being a mere educational reform in Bukhara and evolved toward a national movement, they took countermeasures (Kanlıdere, “Turkistan’da” 197).

A Significant Tool for Unity Ideal: Newspapers

A newspaper titled *Buhara-yı Şerif* was published in the Persian language in March 1912 in a printing house in Kagan (Khalid, *The Politics* 123). Starting from June of the same year, the said newspaper started to publish a supplement in the Turkish language titled “Turan”. Facing challenges in continuing publication due to financial difficulties, the newspaper was

banned in early 1912 since it was criticized by negative developments in the Emirate. The newspaper was published in 153 and its supplement, Turan in 49 volumes (Tekcan 175-176). In April 1913, Mahmud Hoca Behbudî published a newspaper titled Semerkand (Samarkand) (Schinasi 469). The newspaper was published in the Turkestan dialect of the Turkish language. Following the footsteps of İsmail Gaspıralı, Behbudî defended the idea that a common Turkish written language should be formed (Kanlıdere, “Turkistan’da” 202). In this period, the intellectuals of Turkestan entered into a temporary collaboration with reformist socialist Russians. Vadim Chaikin, a Russian from that Ecole, published a newspaper named Golos Türkistana (Voice of Turkestan) in Andijan in 1913 (Irnazarov). In this newspaper, local people’s complaints about cotton sowing were expressed. Chaikin, Ubeydullah Hoca, Zeki Velidi Togan, and Münevver Karî published the Turkish version of this newspaper. The newspaper addressed topics such as granting equal rights to Turks with Russians and the necessity of modern education. Published in Tashkent in 1914, this newspaper was edited by Ubeydullah Hoca (Togan 355-356). Popular Turkish intellectuals such as Münevver Kari, Abdullah Avlani, A. Süleyman Çolpan, Tevalla, and Hamza Hakimzade wrote articles in this newspaper (Kanlıdere, “Turkistan’da” 202; Aydemir 78-81).

The curiosity for learning the developments at the fronts during First World War increased the newspaper reading rate among the people of Turkestan. Despite the ban on the newspapers coming from outside Turkestan, the newspapers published in Kazan and Azerbaijan were brought to Turkestan in several ways. With the collapse of the Tsarist regime in 1917, newspaper and journal publications were revived. Münevver Karî published a newspaper called *Necat* (Salvation) after the 1917 February revolution. This newspaper focused on the idea of Turkic unity and put forward the acts of persecution during the Tsardom era. Abdullah Battal Taymas, an intellectual from Kazan, published a newspaper called Şûrâ-yı İslam (Islamic Council) in May 1917 (Devlet, *Millet ile Sovyet* 43-45). Turkish nationalists such as Karî, Behbudî, Fıtrat, Çolpan, Mustafa Çokay, and Ahmet Baytursun wrote articles for this newspaper. Uluğ Turkestan, another newspaper published during the same period, fought for the people of Turkestan to be influential in the country’s administration. Turkestan Central Council published a newspaper called Keneş (Council), with Zeki Velidi Togan as its chief editor.

1917 Revolution: Hopes and Disappointment

Toppling down the Tsarist regime, the 1917 revolution initially came with quests for hope, freedom, and democracy. Especially Turks of Russia and Turkestan held important congresses in this period and discussed what the future would bring about, alongside forming political parties (Şahingöz and Tekinsoy 737-752). In addition, the Alliance Party (İttifak Partisi) of the Tatars of Kazan, Kazakhs, and Tatars of Crimea formed parties named Alash-Orda (Shaymukhanova et. al 330-333) and National Party (*Milli Fırka*) (Wilson 22-31) respectively. Also, Azerbaijani Turks formed two separate parties, being Hummet that leaned toward socialism, and Equality (Müsavat) that had Turkish nationalist orientation (Çelik 68-74). Formed under the Khiva and Bukhara Khanates respectively, the organizations named Young Khivans (Genç Hiveliler) and Young Bukharans (Genç Buharalılar) carried out clandestine activities (Hatunoğlu 4-12). The common denominator of all these groups was their support for unity among Turkic communities (Kanlıdere, “Sovyet” 194). Closely following Anatolia’s national struggle in this period, Bukharans decided to provide the Ankara government 100 million golden rubles as assistance under the leadership of Osman Kocaoğlu (Bayraktar 313). Transferred through Russia, only ten percent of this assistance could reach Anatolia (due to Russians’ deductions). Coming as support from Turkestan to the national struggle, this assistance has been a concrete example of the ties of affection, and of how open the channels of communication were, among them at the time. This assistance has been known wrongly as Soviet assistance in our history. Regarding this assistance, Raci Çakırgöz, who was among the Turkish military officers contributing to the establishment of the Bukhara army, explained that he was among those who were tasked with counting the golds in Bukhara treasure and loading a hundred million golden rubles on train wagons to send to Moscow, and told about the amount of assistance: “*According to what I have learned after coming to Turkey, only 10 million of the total 100 million golden rubles that Bukhara government had sent to Ankara government, could reach Ankara. Having the role of intermediary in this transaction, Moscow took 90 million golds for its treasury as a transportation charge! This is the inside of the Russian assistance mentioned in our history.*” (Kocaoğlu 45-48). In 1921, Bukhara Republic sent a two-person delegation to Ankara (Bayramol 46). This delegation brought various gifts including also three swords and a Koran with them to

Ankara and presented these gifts to the parliament on behalf of the Bukhara Republic (Saray, *Atatürk'ün Sovyet* 76; Bayramol 46).

While there was only one Turkish newspaper in Tashkent during the Tsarist administration, multiple Turkish newspapers found the opportunity to be published at the same time thanks to the proper atmosphere after 1918. Despite the low number of literate people, the circulation of these newspapers gradually increased. However, these days of freedom did not last long. In parallel with the strengthening of the Soviet regime, all the printing houses, newspapers, and journals in Turkestan were seized (Khalid, "Printing" 197). These were replaced by a state-sponsored press to act under state control. Printing houses, newspapers, and journals were transferred to the proponents of the Soviet regime. The only functions of newspapers and journals would then be to report the orders and announcements of the state and to serve to the benefit of the Communist ideology (Kanlıdere, "Turkistan'da" 202).

İsmail Gaspıralı tried to open new kinds of schools in Bukhara with the support of Abd al-Ahad Khan, Emir of Bukhara, with whom he had the chance to meet in Crimea (Şafakçı 1055-1057). Usûl-i cedit schools were opened in Bukhara firstly for the children of Tatars residing there. In 1902, a Tatar teacher named Kerimov opened a new-style school in Kagan for Tatar children. However, the school had to be closed after a few months of its opening due to lack of financial support and as a result of pressures coming from conservative segments of society (Becker 202). Osman Hodja opened a new school in Bukhara in 1912. Other new schools were also opened in 1913 and the first half of 1914.

The most famous figure of the Jadidist movement in Turkestan is Mahmud Hoca Behbûdi. With his works focusing wholly on the crises and problems in the Islamic world, Abdurrauf Fıtrat is another intellectual inquiring about the reasons for the decline of Bukhara Khanate. In his view, a reason for the backwardness witnessed in Islamic communities was the situation of ulema (Mixon 25-27). Fıtrat criticized hodjas' taking of bribes from their students in his famous work titled Mûnazara (Discussion). Moreover, he explained the benefits and characteristics of Jadidist schools. Also, the impacts of the Ottoman Empire were witnessed in the intellectual and political organizations of Turkestan's Jadidists. Starting its activities in the

early twentieth century and especially after 1908's Young Turk revolution (Köstem 6), the Party of Union and Progress (İttihat ve Terakki Partisi) significantly affected the youth in Turkestan. Famous Uzbek poets and intellectuals such as Abdurrauf Fitrat, Mukimiddin, and Osman Hodja, met with Young Turk leaders when they were in Istanbul, and they were impressed by their views. (Kurat 521-522). Being inspired by Young Turks' struggle against the ruling of Sultan Abdulhamid II, these Uzbek intellectuals aimed to realize a similar revolution in Bukhara and Khiva. To that end, they established an underground organization titled "Young Bukharans" in 1909 (Badan 10). And the reformist youth in Khiva Khanate came together under the name of "Young Khivans". Abdurrauf Fitrat was impressed with reformist movements during his education in Istanbul and wrote several works, in which he expressed the concepts not yet discovered by the intellectuals of Turkestan, such as freedom and constitutional monarchy (Kanlıdere, "Rusya" 185). Although he never visited Istanbul, Münevver Karı, a leader of the Jadidist movement in Bukhara, saw Istanbul as the cultural and educational center of the Turkic World and encouraged his students to visit this city.

Among the Turks of Russia, Azerbaijan became the first to come up with an independence movement. In May 1918, Azerbaijani Turks declared their independence (Prezident Kitabxanası). The city of Ganja was selected as the capital because Baku was under the control of Bolsheviks and Armenian Dashnaks at the time. An autonomous republic was declared in Turkestan in 1917, with Kokand as its capital (Altımuşova 92). The Bashkir Republic was established in Bashkortostan under the leadership of Zeki Velidi Togan, and Alash-Orda Government was formed in Kazakhstan (Şahingöz and Tekinsoy 737-752).

These initiatives were suppressed by the Bolshevik forces after a while. As he did not want to be in a position of an occupier in the eyes of the people of Turkestan, Lenin decided to adopt a softer stance toward them. In April 1918, Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Republic was established as per Moscow's directive (Yevgeniyevich 42-46). Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Republic did not cover all Turkestan, but only the south of Kazakhstan, the north of Uzbekistan, and the territories of today's Turkmenistan and Kyrgyzstan (Kanlıdere, "Sovyet" 195). Its capital was the city of Tashkent,

and it was affiliated with Soviet Federal Soviet Republic. Being the first republic established under the name of Turkestan, this country survived until October 1924. After this date, the Soviet regime tried to abolish the idea of Turkestan with all its power. One of the most remarkable witnesses of this era is Mustafa Çokay, a political leader of Turkestan Jadidists who served as the founding speaker of parliament, foreign minister, and then president of Turkestan National Autonomy and foreign minister of Alash-Orda National Autonomy (Kapağan 262-263). Mustafa Çokay lived in different and challenging periods such as the Tsarist regime, national autonomies, Bolshevik revolution, Soviet Administration, and ultimately immigration. Although his worldview and journey evolved from the autonomy of the pre-immigration period to the independence of the post-immigration period, it nevertheless revolved around a single idea: the case and national struggle of Turkestan (Hıdıraliyev 161). Mustafa Çokay thought that it would be unnecessary to sloganize the idea of the political unity of Turks, which was impossible due to the conditions of the time, in the political arena, or to prove it to certain people. He was of the opinion that such a unity already existed and was developing day by day in sentiments and thoughts (Hıdıraliyev 179). Therefore, it may be asserted that Mustafa Çokay defended first and foremost cultural unity in the Turkic World, but also political unity in Turkestan.

Istanbul became the center of attraction for the Turkic World especially between 1908 and 1914. Moreover, in the north, the city of Kazan became a center of science, culture, and art for the communities of Turkic origin residing in Russia. Intellectual and scientific movements of the Turks of Russia were developed in Kazan and then reached Turkestan, Kazakhstan, and Eastern Turkestan. However, the First World War and the developments of the post-war period negatively affected both of these centers. Istanbul quickly started to lose its feature of being a center for the Turkic World. After the Ottoman Empire was defeated and the Party of Union and Progress was closed out, the intellectuals of the Turkic World lost their anchorage (Köstem 6). Conditions deteriorated even further during the USSR period. The schools, printing houses, madrasahs, and book companies based in Kazan were closed (Kanlıdere, “Rusya” 185). The intellectuals in support of the unity of the Turkic World needed to flee from Turkestan and those who could not be incarcerated and killed by the Soviet administration.

Sultan Galiyev: The Turk Who Could Rise to the Top Level in Soviet Hierarchy

Sultan Galiyev was another figure who fell victim to Soviet administration's wrath as he was in support of unity of the Turkic World (Radikovna 82-84). Mir Seyyid Sultan Galiyev was a Turk who could rise to the top levels in the hierarchy of the Soviet regime and Communist Party. Sultan Galiyev and his friends regarded all Muslims and proletariat as a nation because they were all subject to colonial pressure. Therefore, Galiyev did not tolerate attacks against Islam. Known as nationalist communists, Galiyev and his friends drew attention to the harmonization potential of some principles of Marxism and Islam (Çay 103-146). Galiyev indicated that Islam had a progressive system, involving collectivism, equality, hard work, and zakat. Sultan Galiyev, too, was charged with being a bourgeoisie nationalist and was arrested in 1923 (Guadagnolo 1-44). Sultan Galiyev continued his activities secretly during the period from this first arrest of his until 1928, when he was expelled from the party, persisting to organize nationalist communists with his new arguments. Sultan Galiyev anticipated the establishment of an independent Turan State covering the Middle Volga Region, Azerbaijan, Dagestan, Northern Caucasia, and Turkestan. Perceiving this as a clear threat against its unity, Moscow eliminated Sultan Galiyev and other nationalist communists in ten years (Kanlıdere, "Sovyet" 199; L. Şahin 47-49).

Yusuf Akçura: An Intellectual in Search of the Ideal of Unity from Kazan to Istanbul

One of the first names that come to mind when the idea of unity in the Turkic World is mentioned, is Yusuf Akçura. Akçura was born on 2 December 1879 in Simbir, a city in Kazan. He needed to move to Istanbul due to financial difficulties when he was seven years old (Akçura, *Yeni Türk* 9). In his fifty-nine years long life, Yusuf Akçura witnessed earth-shaking events. He lived in a period when there were intense relationships with Turks of Russia. He became part of these relationships and even played the role of a leader in many of them (Kanlıdere, "Yusuf Akçura" 236). In Yusuf Akçura's intellectual development, his brother-in-law İsmail Gaspıralı had a special role. Also, Akçura expressed this himself on several occasions. Yusuf Akçura described İsmail Gaspıralı as a perfect teacher, a reflective author, a very talented journalist and a tireless servant of Turkism (Akçura,

Türkçülüğün Tarihi 92-93). Although Yusuf Akçura was affiliated with the northern branch of the Turkic world, as an individual living within the cultural environment of the southern Turkic world, he had a perception of Turkism that covers the whole Turkic world (Vurucu 113).

In 1904, when he returned to Crimea, Akçura wrote his famous article titled *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* (Three Styles of Politics) and published it on a Turkish newspaper based in Cairo. In this article, Akçura analyzed three ideological currents that were being discussed in the Ottoman Empire at the time, namely Ottomanism, Islamism, and Turkism, with their various aspects. Believing that Ottomanism was no more a policy that could be realized, Akçura anticipated that Islamism would face various challenges and emphasized that potentially the most realistic policy would be Turkism. Although he did not come up with certain conclusions regarding Islamism and Turkism, his emphasis in the article is on Turkism (Akçura, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*).

Being prosecuted as a result of increasing pressure imposed on Turks by Tsarist Russia, Akçura returned to Istanbul in 1908, when the Second Constitutional Monarchy was declared in Ottoman Empire. Whereas he became one of the founders of “Turkish Association”, the first organization in the Ottoman Empire based on Turkish nationalism, he also gave Turkish Political History lectures at the university called *Darülfünun* (Akçura, *Tarih-i Siyâsî*). On 18 August 1911, he established the Turkish Homeland Community and published the Turkish Homeland Journal, together with Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, Ahmet Hikmet Müftüoğlu, Hüseyinzade Ali and Doctor Akil Muhtar. In this journal, generally, the Turkic World was tried to be introduced to Turkish readers (Duran 117). On the other hand, on 12 March 1912, Akçura established the Turkish Heart Association together with Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, Ahmet Ferit Bey, Ahmet Ağaoglu and Doctor Fuad Sabit Bey.

Yusuf Akçura saw the relief for the Ottoman Empire in Turkism and the policy of unity in the Turkic World. Defending the idea that Ottomanism would not be able to ensure unity, Akçura expressed his view on this matter in an article he published in 1903: “*After this much development of the idea of nationalism and the emergence of this much hatred among various nations and especially between two religions, it is impossible to form a nation by gathering*

together and reconciling various elements of the Empire” (Akçura, *Türkçülüğün Tarihi* 187). According to Akçura, who asserted that the policy of Turkism was more convenient for the Ottoman Empire than the policies of Islamism and Ottomanism, the only impediment before the policy of Turkism was Tsarist Russia. According to Akçura, the policy of Turkism could not be defined by the borders of the Ottoman Empire, it was greater than that: “As the policy of Islamism, also the policy of Turkism is universal and not constrained with the Ottoman borders. Indeed, one should look at the other points of the world inhabited by Turks” (Akçura, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* 43).

In Akçura’s view, Turks had a population of 45 to 50 million at the time and composed of five groups: Ottoman Turks, Azeri (Caucasus) Turks, Crimean Turks, Northern Turks, and Eastern Turks (Kazakhstan-centered Turkestan and Eastern Turkestan) (Akçura, “Türklük” 160-162). Yusuf Akçura defined the Turkic World as the following: “Imagine the old-world hemisphere. There are three continents there. Remove and dispose of the torn, rag-looking part that corresponds to the north-west; and twist and pull off the three-cornered, last and heavy continent on the south-west through the channel line which was dug by the weak arms of people; pare off three or four bulges dangling from the bottom of the right side... Then, you will be left with the main body of the old world. This body is the place of Turks as a whole, it is our heritage” (Akçura, “Türklük” 160). According to Akçura, this geography where Turks resided is the historical heritage of Turks. The dominant power in this geography must be the Turkish nation. Unification of Turks, who have common language, races, religion, and traditions and were scattered around most of Asia and eastern Europe, would elevate Turks to an advantageous position among other nations (Akçura, *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset* 61-62).

Ziya Gökalp: Diyarbakır-born Mastermind of Turkish Nationalism

Another prominent figure in terms of the idea of unity in the Turkic World is Mehmed Ziya Gökalp who was from the city of Diyarbakır. Known as the founding father of Turkish nationalism in the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic, Ziya Gökalp was born in Diyarbakır on 23 March 1876. He was among the descendants of the noble families of Müftüzadeler and Pirinçadeler in Diyarbakır (Jongerden and Verheij 353; Kösoğlu, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin* 65). With the declaration of the Second Constitutional Monarchy, Gökalp established and led the Diyarbakır branch of the Union

and Progress Community and accelerated his cultural and scientific activities. Ziya Gökalp gave various lectures at the Diyarbakır branch of the Union and Progress Community, with freedom and constitutional monarchy being in the first place (Heyd 33; Altın 493-495). In 1911, Gökalp started to write for the journal named *Genç Kalemler* (Young Pens) published by prominent Turkish nationalists of the time, such as Ömer Seyfettin and Ali Canip (Georgon 36). His famous poem titled “*Turan*” was published in this journal in March 1911 (Heyd 639). Upon the elections for Meclis-i Mebusan (Chamber of Deputies) that was held in 1912, he was selected as a member of parliament from Ergani. In 1913, he published a series of articles titled “Turkisation, Islamisation, and Contemporarisation¹ (*Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*)” in the Turkish Homeland Journal. Gökalp claimed in this series of articles that these three currents were not in contradiction with each other, and rather they were complementary (Gökalp, *Türkleşmek*).

Shortly after coming to power in 1919, the Damat Ferit Pasha government started to arrest members of the Union and Progress Community. On 30 March 1919, Ziya Gökalp, too, was arrested and sent to prison (Yıldız 266). Being tried together with other Unionists, Ziya Gökalp was found guilty and sent to exile in Malta together with sixty other people on 26 May 1919 (Şehsuvaroğlu 41). His period of exile in Malta came to an end as a result of an agreement signed between Ankara and English governments on the exchange of prisoners, and Gökalp returned to İstanbul on 19 May 1921 (Beysenoğlu 21). Ziya Gökalp then moved to Diyarbakır, his hometown, to give lectures there and encouraged people by organizing meetings and conferences giving support for the National Struggle (Kösoğlu, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin* 107). As from June 1922, he started to publish *Küçük Mecmua* (Little Magazine) together with Ali Nüzhet Göksel, a teacher (Gökalp, *Küçük Mecmua*). He was selected as a member of parliament from Diyarbakır in the renewed elections of August 1923 for the Grand National Assembly of Türkiye. He continued his intellectual and cultural studies during his service as a parliamentarian (Şehsuvaroğlu 53-55).

As Gaspıralı İsmail, also Ziya Gökalp believed that the İstanbul dialect of Turkish language should be the common language of the whole Turkic World. According to Gökalp, it was a duty for all Turks to render İstanbul Turkish a

literary language for the whole Turkic World. If this task was fulfilled, Turks would then become one nation (Gökalp, *Türkleşmek* 63). As Yusuf Akçura, also Ziya Gökalp believed that for the Ottoman Empire, relief from the crisis could be achieved via Turkish nationalism and the idea of unity in the Turkic World. Gökalp divided the idea of unity in the Turkic World into three levels, being Türkiye(ism), Oghuzism (Turkmenism) and Turanism (*Türkiyecilik*, *Oğuzculuk (Türkmencilik)*, *Turancılık*), and mentioned that, from a realist point of view, Türkiye(ism) was the one to focus on, as per the conjuncture of the time (Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün* 43-44). According to Nevzat Kösoğlu, Gökalp prioritized Türkiye(ism) because the Ottoman Empire was defeated during the First World War and the newly established Republic of Türkiye was not ready for the Oghuzism and Turanism levels (Kösoğlu, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin* 157).

Gökalp denominated Oghuzes as Turkmens and thought that it would be easier for them to unify because they were closer to each other in terms of culture and language. Therefore, Gökalp proposed Oghuzism as a short-term ideal and especially noted that this should be a cultural unity, not a political one. According to Ziya Gökalp, what was aimed with Turanism, which was the long-term ideal of Turkish nationalism, was the unification of Oghuzes, Tatars, Kyrgyz, Uzbeks, and Yakuts in terms of language, literature, and culture (Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün*). Gökalp regarded Turanism as an important factor for the development of Turkish nationalism/Turkism: “*Unification of a hundred million Turks as a nation is a strong source of excitement for advocates of Turkism. Without the ideal of Turan, Turkism would not have been developed this much. Yet who knows? Maybe also the realization of the ideal of ‘Turan’ will be possible in the future. The ideal realizes the future. The ‘nation-state’ which was an imaginary ideal yesterday for Turks, became the truth in Turkey today.*” (Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün* 43-44). With these statements, Ziya Gökalp left an objective to next-generation Turkish nationalists as a heritage: Cultural cooperation with Turkic communities outside Türkiye and, if possible, political integration in the future. By saying, “*Homeland is neither Turkey for Turks, nor Turkestan/ Homeland is a great and infinite country: Turan*” (Gökalp, *Kızıl Elma* 21-22) in his famous poem, Ziya Gökalp referred to ‘Turan’ as the ultimate homeland for the Turkish nation. Turkish people were in quest of renewed enthusiasm and new targets while the Turkic World was losing its greatest empire in the early twentieth

century. Ziya Gökalp's idea of Turan became a response to this quest for enthusiasm (Kösoğlu, *Türk Dünyasında* 14).

Ziya Gökalp emphasized that Turkic communities were slow in improvement because the Turkish language was not attributed sufficient importance, and a gap emerged between the public and the elite. He defended simplification of language and enlivening of Turkish language and mentioned that unity of language must be established in the Turkic World. This language unification would not only cover Anatolia, but it would be one that may be understood throughout the whole Turkic World. Dwelling on how and in what ways language simplification needs to be made, Gökalp said that the Istanbul dialect, the most beautiful dialect of the Turkish language must be taken as basis in this regard (Gökalp, *Türkleşmek* 63). Gökalp attributed utmost importance to the use of a common Turkish language for the unity of the Turkic World and referred to Istanbul Turkish as the common language for the whole Turkic World (Timurtaş 97), and opposed to the development of local dialects as a new language.

According to Ziya Gökalp, Turkic World is the vast geography called Turan, where all Turks reside. In the dictionary, Turan means Turks; and in time, it gained the meaning of the geography where Turks live. Mentioning that the term Turk was used only for those living in Anatolia at the time, Gökalp stated that Oghuz Turks, who were close to Anatolian Turks from every aspect, would soon be called Turks as well (Bars 47). Ziya Gökalp suggested naming other Turkic tribes such as Uzbeks, Yakuts, and Kyrgyzes, which remained a bit far from Anatolia, as Turan instead of Turk for the time being, because they had developed their own cultures. However, he stressed that Turan is also the name of the geography where all Turks lived (Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün* 42-43). Ziya Gökalp did not exactly indicate the borders of Turan, however, he named all the countries where the Turkish language was spoken, as Turan (Grigoriadis and Oççin-Kıdal, 487-489).

Ziya Gökalp is the first person to use the term of ideal (*mefkûre*). He also attributed sociological content to this term. Gökalp conceptualized this term as the fact that communities realize their own identities during times of huge crises on the occasion of which national identities replace individual identities. Ideal mainly means that current reality is perceived by individuals during harsh times of society. According to Gökalp, the idea is a source

of power that vitalizes society, stimulates lazybones, and transforms a lazy person into a hard-working one and selfish people into altruists (Kösoğlu, *Türk Milliyetçiliği* 43). Consequently, Ziya Gökalp became the person who rendered the idea of unity in the Turkic World an ideal.

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who is the founder of the Republic of Türkiye and who referred to Ziya Gökalp as his intellectual mastermind, regarded the Turkic World as one of his top agenda items. The Turkish Republic followed a stable and prudent foreign policy in pursuit of certain fundamental objectives from 1923, its founding year. It was Atatürk who determined and shaped the main principles of Turkish foreign policy during the Republican era (Öksüz 95). For Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the unity that needs to be achieved primarily in the Turkic World is cultural unity. In this regard, he stated: *“For the Turks living outside Turkey, firstly cultural matters must be the area of interest. Indeed, we have handled the case of Turkism favorably in this way. We attach utmost importance to great Turkish history, sources, and rich dialects of the Turkish language and old Turkish works. We do not ignore the language and cultures of even Yakut Turks residing beyond Baikal Lake.”* (Karakoç 26). Atatürk made the reform to shift to the Latin alphabet on 1 November 1928 as a result of the transition of Turkic peoples by Soviets to the same alphabet, to prevent the emergence of further cultural gaps in the Turkic World and of regularly carrying out relations with the West. With this alphabet change, great potential emerged for addressing the cultural gap with the Turkic World. However, being afraid about the idea of the unity of the Turkic World, the Soviet Union imposed usage of the Cyrillic alphabet on Turks before the Second World War, trying to break the cultural ties between Türkiye and the Turkic World (Aslan 357-374).

Conclusion

As a result, the Turkic World was reinterpreted by the founding fathers of the idea of unity in the Turkic World in terms of its geography, history, culture, and socio-economic structure, in a different way than other systems of thought. It is observed that, despite socio-economic challenges during the emergence and development of the idea of unity in the Turkic World, Turkish culture preserved its dynamism at a certain level in many areas, intellectual discussions were held, and press activities continued unabated. The founding fathers tried to interpret the meaning of historical events which involved the Turkic World, made intellectual discussions about the

future, and published an amazing number of publications in this respect. For the founding fathers, unity in the Turkic World is not an option, but an obligation and a matter of life and death for the Turks. For them, the idea of unity in the Turkic World was the primary national ideal of Turkism.

It is important to note that the founding fathers were inspired by the historical and cultural heritage of the Turkic World and by the Turkish Civilization. Despite the periods of crisis, they believed in the originality of their civilization and embarked on establishing their worldview based on their belief that the potential is great in this regard. Because they believed that each civilization may develop with its dynamics. Founding fathers developed a futuristic discourse in a sense. They were inspired by the tradition but focused on the future. Because they reinterpreted Turkish civilization identity and, in this way, this identity was rendered more comprehensive, more acceptable, and more practical. Ultimately, the idea of unity in the Turkic World is a multidimensional and multilevel system of thought, a worldview, and imagination of civilization, reinterpreting and constructing the civilizational identity of the Turkic World and its surroundings. The representatives of this idea that emerged as the representatives of Turkish Civilization, which features an original geographical, historical, political, cultural, and socio-economic character, shed light on the reawakening of the 1990s. With the dissolution of the USSR in the 1990s, this idea was revitalized and reinterpreted in a continuum but with some elements of change. It was observed that, under the new conditions, this idea had some important effects on both intellectual lives and the minds of the administrative elite. Representatives of this idea reinterpreted the civilization identity of the Turkic World based on Turkish Civilization, by taking into account the century-long historical experience of the Turkic World and the cultural heritage taken over from various civilizational basins. They strove for reconstructing the area of life, the borders of which were drawn as the Turkic World, in political, social, economic, and cultural terms.

Contribution Rate Statement

The authors' contribution rates in this study are equal.

Conflict of Interest Statement

There is no conflict of interest with any institution or person within the scope of this study. There is no conflict of interest between the authors.

Notes

1 Contemporarisation (Muasırlaşmak): It has been used to catch up on the most advanced practices and technics of the age.

References

- Abdirashidov, Zaynabidin. *Ismail Gasprinskiy i Turkestan v nachale XX veka: svyazi – otnosheniya – vliyaniye*. Akademnashr, 2011.
- Abdürreşidov, Zeynelabidin. *İsmail Gaspirinski ve Türkistan'da Ceditçilik*. Taşkent, 2018.
- Akçura, Yusuf. *Türkçülüğün Tarihi*. Ötüken Neşriyat, 2016.
- Akçura, Yusuf. "Türklük", *Salname-i Servet-i Fünûn*, 1912, pp.189-192'den aktaran; François Georgeon, *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri: Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935)*, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996.
- Akçura, Yusuf. *Yeni Türk Devleti'nin Öncüleri*, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1987.
- Akçura, Yusuf. *Tarih-i Siyâsi, 1926-1927-1928 Ders Notları*, Ötüken Neşriyat, 2004.
- Akçura, Yusuf. *Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*, ed. Mehmet Ali Erdem. Lotus Yayıncılık, 2005.
- Altımuşova, Zuhra. "Kırgızistan'da Basmacı Hareketiyle İlgili Yeni Bilgiler (1925-1934)." *bilig*, no. 82, 2017, pp. 91-116.
- Altın, Hamza. "Ziya Gökalp'in Eğitim Tarihimiz Açısından Önemi." *History Studies*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2010, pp. 493-509.
- Aslan, Betül. "Sovyet Rusya Hakimiyetinde Yaşayan Türklerin Ortak Birleştirilmiş Türk Alfabesinden Rus Kiril Alfabesine Geçirilmesi." *TAED*, vol. 40, 2009, pp. 357-374.
- Aydemir, Fatma Betül. "Türkiyeli araştırmacılar Güney Türkistan'daki Basın Hakkında." *Türk Dünyası Genç Tâdqıqatçılar dârnâyninin Araştırmaları*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2018, pp. 76-85.
- Badan, Phool. "Socio-Cultural Reform Movement in Central Asia." *The Journal of Central Asian Studies*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2016, pp. 1-16.
- Bars, Mehmet Emin. "Ziya Gökalp ve Türkçülük Üzerine Bazı Değerlendirmeler." *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 2017, pp. 38-51.

- Bayraktar, Rasim. "Türkistanlı Aydınlarımızın Siyasi ve Yayın Mücadelesi: Mustafa Çokayoğlu ve Etrafındakiler." *Atatürk Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, vol. 39, 2013, pp. 307-336.
- Bayramol, Eray. "Atatürk'ün Sovyet Coğrafyasındaki Türkler ile İlgili Politikaları." *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, no. 197, 2012, pp. 39-52.
- Becker, Seymour. *Russia's Protectorates in Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva: 1865-1924*. Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Bennigsen, Aleksandr. "Ismail bey Gasprinskiy (Gasprali) i voznikoveniye dzhadidizma v Rossii", *Etnograficheskoye Obozreniye*, vol. 6, 1992, pp. 116-124.
- Beysenoğlu, Şevket. "Ziya Gökalp'te Diyarbakır, Diyarbakır'da Ziya Gökalp." *Istanbul Journal of Sociological Studies*, vol. 14, 1976, pp. 17-24.
- Bozkurt, Giray Saynur. *1905-1907 Yılları Rusya Müslümanlarının Siyasi Kimlik*. Doğu Kütüphanesi, 2008.
- Çay, Mustafa Murat. "Türkiye'de Sultan Galiyev Algısı Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme." *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, vol. 124, no. 244, 2020, pp. 103-146.
- Çelik, Dursun. "XIX ve XX. Yüzyıllarda Azerbaycan." *bilig*, no. 3, 1996, pp. 60-79.
- Devlet, Nadir. *İsmail Bey Gasprali*. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1988.
- Devlet, Nadir. *Millet ile Sovyet Arasında: 1917 Ekim Devriminde Rusya Türklerinin Varoluş Mücadelesi*. Ötüken Neşriyat, 2011.
- Dumont, Paul. "La revue Türk Yurdu et les musulmans de l'Empire russe, 1911-1914." *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*, vol. 15, no. 3-4, 1974, pp. 315-331.
- Duran, Murat. *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Üç İdeoloğu: Gasprali İsmail, Yusuf Akçura ve Ziya Gökalp*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, 2011.
- Gasprali, İsmail. *Seçilmiş Eserleri-II: Fikri Eserleri*, ed. Yavuz Akpınar. Ötüken Neşriyat, 2004.
- Georgeon, François. "La montée du nationalisme turc dans l'État ottoman (1908-1914). Bilan et perspectives." *Revue de l'Occident musulman et de la Méditerranée*, no. 50, 1988, pp. 30-44.
- Gökalp, Ziya. *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, Ötüken Neşriyat, 2016.
- Gökalp, Ziya. *Kızıl Elma*. Ötüken Neşriyat, 2016.
- Gökalp, Ziya. *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, Ötüken Neşriyat, 2017.
- Gökalp, Ziya. *Küçük Mecmua Yazıları*, ed. Ali Durmaz, Ötüken Neşriyat, 2020.
- Guadagnolo, Gary. *Revolutionary Narrative, Revolutionary Defense: Reading Stalin's First Victim*, Master's Thesis, University of North Carolina, 2011.
- Gubaıdullin, Gaziz. "Gasprinskiy i yazık." *Krymskoye İstoricheskoye Obozreniye*, no. 2, 2017, pp. 147-155.
- Grigoriadis, Ioannis, and Arzu Opçin-Kıdal. "Imagining Turan: homeland and its political implications in the literary work of Hüseyinzade Ali [Turan] and Mehmet Ziya [Gökalp]", *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 56, no. 3, 2020, pp. 482-495.

- Hablemitoğlu, Necip. *Gaspıralı İsmail*. Bir Harf Yayınları, 2004.
- Hatunoğlu, Nurettin. “Buhara’daki Ceditçilik Hareketi ve Yaş Buharalılar.” *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, vol. 4, 2015, pp. 1-33.
- Heyd, Uriel. *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökleri*. Çev. Adem Yalçın. Pınar Yayınları, 2001.
- Hıdıraliyev, Darhan. *Mustafa Çokay: Hayatı, Faaliyetleri ve Fikirleri*. Yeni Avrasya Yayınları, 2001.
- Hüseyinli, Nazım. “Türkler için ortak iletişim dili ve problemleri.” *Eurasia Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2021, pp. 79-90.
- Irnazarov, Rashit. “Sotsiologicheskoye naslediye Akhmet-Zaki Validi Togana.” *Problemy Vostokovedeniya*, vol. 4, no. 58, 2012, pp. 19-24.
- Jeong, Eun Kyung. “A Study on The Formation of Early Turkish Nationalism.” *Acta Via Serica*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2018, pp. 57-83.
- Jongerden, Joost, and Jelle Verheij. *Social Relations in Ottoman Diyarbekir, 1870–1915*, Brill, 2012.
- Kanlıdere, Ahmet. “Yusuf Akçura ve Kuzey Türkleri.” *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, vol. 3, no. 18, 2009, pp. 235-258.
- Kanlıdere, Ahmet. “Rusya Türklerinde Fikir Hareketleri.” *Orta Asya Türk Tarih*, ed. Ahmet Kanlıdere, Eskişehir Anadolu Üniversitesi, 2011, pp. 168-190.
- Kanlıdere, Ahmet. “Sovyet Döneminde ve Sonrasında Orta Asya.” *Orta Asya Türk Tarih*, ed. Ahmet Kanlıdere, Eskişehir Anadolu Üniversitesi, 2011, pp. 192-213.
- Kanlıdere, Ahmet. “Türkistan’da Ceditçilik.” *XIX. Yüzyıl Türk Tarihi*. ed. Ahmet Kanlıdere. Eskişehir Anadolu Üniversitesi, 2013, pp. 194-219.
- Kanlıdere, Ahmet. “Kuzey Türkistan’da Uyanış ve Modernleşme.” *XIX. Yüzyıl Türk Tarihi*. ed. Ahmet Kanlıdere. Eskişehir Anadolu Üniversitesi, 2013, pp. 2-26.
- Kapağan, Enver. “Alaş Orda Partisinin Kazak Aydınlanmasına Etkisi.” *Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken/Journal of World of Turks*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2015, pp. 253-265.
- Karakoç, Ercan. *Atatürk’ün Dış Türkler Politikası*. IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 2004.
- Khalid, Adeeb. “Printing, Publishing, and Reform in Tsarist Central Asia.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 26, no. 2, 1994, 187-200.
- Khalid, Adeeb. *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia*. University of California Press, 1999.
- Kırırmer, Cafer Seydahmet. *Gaspıralı İsmail Bey: Dilde, Fikirde, İşte Birlik*. Avrasya Bir Vakfı Yayınları, 1997.
- Kırımlı, Hakan. *İsmail Bey Gaspıralı. Kırım Türkleri Yardımlaşma Derneği Yayınları*, 2001.
- Kocaoğlu, Timur. “Türkistan’da Türk Subayları.” *Türk Dünyası Tarih Dergisi*, vol. 1, 1987, pp. 20-23.

- Köstem, Seçkin. “When Can Idea Entrepreneurs Influence Foreign Policy? Explaining the Rise of the “Turkic World” in Turkish Foreign Policy.” *Foreign Policy Analysis*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2017, pp. 722-740.
- Kösoğlu, Nevzat. *Türk Milliyetçiliği ve Osmanlı*. Ötüken Neşriyat, 2000.
- Kösoğlu, Nevzat. *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu ve Ziya Gökalp*. Ötüken Neşriyat, 2005.
- Kösoğlu, Nevzat. *Türk Dünyasında Yeni Bir Medeniyet Tasarımı*. Ötüken Neşriyat, 2013.
- Kurat, Akdes Nimet. “Tsarist Russia and the Muslims of Central Asia.” *The Cambridge History of Islam*, ed. Peter Malcolm Holt et. al. Cambridge University Press, 1970, pp. 503-523.
- Landau, Jacob M. *Pan-Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation*. Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Mixon, Candace. *The Jadids in Bukhara: The juxtaposition of the reforms of Aini and Fitrat*. Master’s Thesis, McGill University, 2011.
- Ortaylı, İlber. *Çarlık Rusyasında Türkcülük Hareketleri ve Gaspıralı İsmail Bey*. Anadolu Matbaası, 1968.
- Öksüz, Hikmet. *Batı Trakya Türkleri*. Karam Yayınları, 2006.
- Prezident Kitabxanası. “Ümumi məlumat: Azərbaycan Xalq Cümhuriyyəti - Şərqdə ilk parlamentli respublika.” 2018, <https://axc.preslib.az/az/page/qHQJ2aWo4P>.
- Radikovna, Islamgulova Ilmira. “Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev o tjurkskom edinstve.” *Vestnik Baškirkogo Universiteta*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2005, pp. 82-84.
- Saifnazarov, Ismoil, and Dilmurod Ernazarov. “rol’ dzhadidov v formirovanii sovremennoy obrazovatel’noy sistemy v Sredney Azii.” *Arkhiv Nauchnykh Issledovaniy*, vol. 1, no. 29, 2020, pp. 56-58.
- Saray, Mehmet. *Atatürk’ün Sovyet Politikası*. Acar Yayınları, 1987.
- Saray, Mehmet. *Gaspıralı İsmail Bey’den Atatürk’e Türk Dünyasında Dil ve Kültür Birliği*. Nesil Matbaacılık Yayıncılık, 1993.
- Schinasi, May. “Sirâdj al-akhbâr: L’opinion afghane et la Russie.” *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*, vol. 12, no. 4, 1971, pp. 467-479.
- Shaymukhanova, Saule Dyusetayevna et. al. “Vklad Alikhana Bukeykhanova v politicheskuyu i nauchno issledovatel’skuyu deyatel’nost’ Kazakhstana.” *Mezhdunarodnyy Zhurnal Prikladnykh i Fundamental’nykh Issledovaniy*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2016, pp. 330-333.
- Şafakçı, İnci Yelda. “XIX. Yüzyılda Buhara Medreseleri.” *Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 2014, 1049-1059.
- Şahin, Liaisan. “Sovyet Yönetiminde İdil-Ural Bölgesi.” *Çağdaş Türk Dünyası*, ed. Ahmet Kanlıdere and İlyas Kemaloğlu, Anadolu Üniversitesi, 2014.

- Şahin, Murat. *Sırat-ı Müstakim Dergisine Göre Rusya Müslümanları*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, 2019.
- Şahingöz, Mehmet. “İsmail Bey Gaspıralı ve Salname-i Türki.” ed. Hakan Kırımlı et. al. İsmail Bey Gaspıralı *İçin*. Kırım Türkleri Yardımlaşma Derneği Yayınları, 2004.
- Şahingöz, Mehmet. “I. Dünya Savaşında Kazakların Askere Alınması Meselesi ve Kazak Aydınlarının Faaliyetleri”. *20. Yüzyıl Başlarından Günümüze Türk Dünyası’ndaki Siyasi, İktisadi ve Kültürel Gelişimler*. Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, 2018.
- Şahingöz, Mehmet, and Yunus Emre Tekinsoy. “Yirminci Yüzyılın İlk Çeyreğinde Türk Dünyası’nda Milli Hâkimiyeti Gerçekleştirmeye Yönelik Girişimler.” *TBMM’nin Açılışının 101. Yıl Dönümünde Türk Demokrasi Tarihi Yazıları*. ed. İsmet Türkmen et. al. Berikan Yayınevi, 2021.
- Şehsuvaroğlu, Lütfü. *Türk Düşünce Tarihinde Ziya Gökalp ve Türkçülüğün Boyutları*. Bilgeoğuz Yayınları, 2008.
- Tekcan, Münevver. “Türkistan-Özbek Ceditçiliği.” *Düşünce Dünyasında Türkiz*, vol. 3, no. 17, 2012, 167-184.
- Timurtaş, Faruk. “Dil Davası ve Ziya Gökalp.” *Istanbul Journal of Sociological Studies*, vol. 5, 1964, pp. 71-105.
- Togan, Zeki Velidi. *Bugünkü Türkili Türkistan ve Yakın Tarihi*. Enderun Kitabevi, 1981.
- Turdiyev, Şerali. “Orta Asya Tatarları.” Çev. Gün Soysal. *Tarih ve Toplum*, vol. 194, 2000, pp. 4-16.
- Wilson, Andrew. “The Crimean Tatar Question: A Prism for Changing Nationalisms and Rival Versions of Eurasianism.” *Journal of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2017, pp. 1-45.
- Vurucu, İkbâl. *Osmanlıdan Türk Cumhuriyetlerinin Bağımsızlığına Kadar Türk Milliyetçilerinde Turancılık Algısı*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, 2009.
- Yevgeniyevich, Razmakhov Konstantin. “Sozdaniye Sovetskoy avtonomii v Turkestane v 1917-1918 gg.” *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta MVD Rossii*, vol. 9, 2013, pp. 42-46.
- Yıldız, Saadetin. “Sürgün Mektuplarındaki Ziya Gökalp.” *Türk Dil, Edebiyat ve Halkbilimi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2013, pp. 265-288.
- Yüksel, Zuhâl. “Gaspıralı ve Dil Birliği.” İsmail Bey Gaspıralı ve Ziya Gökalp Sempozyumları-Bildiriler, ed. Dündar Karaca. TÜRKSOY Yayınları, 2003, pp. 31-32.
- Zürcher, Erik Jan. *Turkey: A Modern History*. I.B Tauris, 2004.

Türk Dünyasında Birlik Fikrinin Kökenleri*

Cemil Doğaç İpek**

Mehmet Çağatay Güler***

Öz

1885 yılından itibaren Osmanlı İmparatorluğu dışındaki Türklerin bağımsızlıklarını kaybetmeleri ve Osmanlıcılık, Ümmetçilik gibi fikirlerin zamanın ruhuna yenik düşmesiyle birlikte, medeniyet anlayışını çok katmanlı bir yeniden inşa sürecine tabii tutan Türk Dünyasında birlik fikri, bir dünya görüşü ve yeni bir medeniyet tasavvuru olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu çalışma; Türk Dünyasının asırlara dayanan tarihi ve kültürel mirasının, dilde birlik fikrinin diğer bir ifadeyle dilin birleştirici bir unsur olarak ele alınması yaklaşımının temsilcileri tarafından, nasıl yeniden inşa edildiğini ele almaktadır. Bu kapsamda beş farklı dilde neşredilmiş araştırmalardan istifade edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Türk Dünyası, Türk Dili, Türk Medeniyeti, Türkler, Birlik Fikri.

* Geliş Tarihi: 21 Aralık 2021 – Kabul Tarihi: 09 Ağustos 2022

Bu makaleyi şu şekilde kaynak gösterebilirsiniz:

İpek, Cemil Doğaç, ve Mehmet Çağatay Güler. "The Origins of the Unity Idea in the Turkic World." *bilig*, no. 105, 2023, ss. 129-158.

** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Milli Savunma Üniversitesi, Kara Harp Okulu – Ankara/Türkiye

ORCID: 0000-0001-5007-7151

cdipek@kho.msu.edu.tr

*** Araştırma Görevlisi, Milli Savunma Üniversitesi, Kara Harp Okulu – Ankara/Türkiye

ORCID: 0000-0001-8604-0449

mcguler@kho.msu.edu.tr

Истоки идеи единства в тюркском мире*

Джемилъ Доач Ипек**

Мехмет Чаатай Гюлер***

Аннотация

Поскольку тюрки за пределами Османской империи потеряли свою независимость с 1885 года, а такие идеи, как османизм и панисламизм, были подавлены духом времени, идея единства возникла как мировоззрение и новый образ цивилизации в тюркском мире, который переосмыслил ее цивилизационную идентичность в рамках многоуровневого периода реконструкции. В данном исследовании рассматривается реконструкция многовекового историко-культурного наследия тюркского мира представителями этой идеи на основе единства языка, т.е. наличия языка как объединяющего элемента, с исторической точки зрения. В этих рамках использовались исследования, опубликованные на пяти разных языках.

Ключевые слова

Тюркский мир, тюркский язык, тюркская цивилизация, тюрки, идея единства.

* Поступило в редакцию: 21 декабря 2021 г. – Принято в номер: 09 августа 2022 г.

Ссылка на статью:

İpek, Cemil Doğaç, and Mehmet Çığatay Güler. "The Origins of the Unity Idea in the Turkic World." *bilig*, no. 105, 2023, pp. 129-158.

** Д-р, Университет национальной обороны, Турецкая военная академия – Анкара/Турция

ORCID: 0000-0001-5007-7151

cdipek@kho.msu.edu.tr

*** Аспирант, ассистент, Университет национальной обороны, Турецкая военная академия –

Анкара/Турция

ORCID: 0000-0001-8604-0449

mcguler@kho.msu.edu.tr