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ABSTRACT

The Nationalist Perceptions on Intellectual in Turkey
1960-1980

Despite some definitive judgements that were passed in the history of thought on the meaning of intellectuality and function of intellectuals, these notions still preserve their vaguenesses. As a Western originated concept, intellectual was generally associated with the words like reason, intelligence, comprehension and meant ‘a man of thought’. Intellectual as a word was translated into Turkish firstly in the nineteenth century as ‘münevver’, an Arabic word which meant ‘enlightened’ or ‘illuminated’ and afterwards that word was used as ‘aydın’ in Turkish.

Discussions on the concepts of intellectuality and intellectuals started to vary especially in the twentieth century, in the West. Important Western thinkers like Julien Benda, Karl Mannheim, Antonio Gramsci, Jean-Paul Sartre, Michel Foucault, Noam Chomsky and Edward Said made significant contributions to these discussions in the twentieth century. In general, these thinkers discussed intellectuals in terms of the concepts like ‘reaching and speaking the truth’, ‘criticism of the authority’, ‘defending the people against power’ and the like and they emphasized more of a ‘critical’ and ‘resistant’ side of intellectual. At the same time, these discussions were made in Turkey as well. However, many nationalist thinkers expressed their perceptions on intellectual in different terms, such as ‘being a Turkish nationalist’, ‘adoption of Islamic moral values’, ‘working for the benefit of Turkishness’ etc. The aim of this study is to analyze the perceptions of nationalist thinkers on ‘intellectual’
in Turkey between 1960 and 1980, that is the decade of nationalist movements highly increased, by comparing with the perceptions in the West.
ÖZET
Türkiye’de Aydın Üzerine Milliyetçi Algılar
1960-1980


entelektüel üzerine algılamalarını, milliyetçi hareketlerin bir hayli arttığı 1960 ve 1980 arası dönemde, Batı’daki algılamalarla karşılaştırmak analiz etmektir.
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1. Chapter One

1.1 Introduction

Discussing intellectuality and functions of intellectuals is not an easy challenge at all. These concepts were examined by many different thinkers from several societies, nationalities and cultures of the world. However, according to historical and theoretical evolutions of these concepts, mainly the Western thought constituted a development space for intellectuality discussions.

First of all, as Zygmunt Bauman clearly pointed that throughout the history many and diverse definitions were made about intellectuality and intellectuals, however, these were all self-definitions which expressed by thinkers from the same group that they attempted to define (Bauman, 1987:8). Since the meaning of intellectual was defined as ‘attitudes of a person developed or guided by the intellect rather than by emotion’ and as a ‘man of thought’ in general, so, it can be said that philosophers of ancient Greece constitute the oldest image of intellectual in the Western thought. Moreover, according to Noam Chomsky “prophet” as a word, had actually meant “intellectual” in the Bible (Robert and Zarachowicz, 2003:18). Later on, in the Middle Ages, while clergy and the people who were raised in the famous universities of Europe were perceived as intellectuals, in the Enlightenment period the Enlightenment philosophers who associated themselves with the concepts like autonomous reason, criticism of clergy and superstition, progress etc. became the correspondence of intellectual at that time. Therefore, it can be said that the Enlightenment period in the eighteenth century was one of the most important station

---

1 All the translations from Turkish are mine.
2 Actually, the Enlightenment process cannot be identified as purely irreligious movement. There were both radicals who mostly denied religious beliefs like Condorcet and d’Holbach and moderates like
for that discussion, because conceptual values of the Enlightenment, especially like ‘reason’ and ‘criticism’, guided the thinkers and writers of the next generations when they define intellectuality and intellectuals in their times. In the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, the concept of intellectual was nearly formed in Europe with the Dreyfus Affair in France. With that affair, the Dreyfussards who were called as intellectuals became the symbol of resistance against the authority for defending Alfred Dreyfus.

Intellectuality discussions were diversified in the twentieth century in the West. Thinkers like Karl Mannheim, Julien Benda, Antonio Gramsci, Jean-Paul Sartre, Michel Foucault, Noam Chomsky and Edward Said who were examined in this thesis made significant contributions to these discussions historically. Although some of their ideas differentiated between each other, however, the most common characteristic of intellectuals according to them was ‘resisting against the oppression of any kind of power and hegemonical relations in the state and society’.

Intellectuality discussions started in Turkey in the nineteenth century and continued ever since. In the twentieth century, Turkish nationalists made significant contributions to these discussions by mentioning them either in their books or in various Turkist-nationalist journals. Basically, development of Turkish nationalism in political terms intensified especially when the Committee of Union and Progress [CUP] began to seize power in 1909, in the Ottoman Empire. However, it is necessary to say that Turkish nationalism here cannot be thought independently from ‘Islam’. Islam was imagined and used by the CUP as a spiritual instrument in mobilization of the people. Also, important thinkers of the time such as Ziya Gökalp
whose ideas were mainly paid attention by the CUP and Kemalist elites later on, were expressing the idea that Islam was inseparable component of Turkishness. Although Islam was tried to be suppressed and came under the control of the state in the Turkish Republic, however this combination or with the best-known term ‘Turkish-Islamic synthesis’ constituted the heart of Turkish nationalism. Therefore, except Nihal Atsız as a secular nationalist, all other nationalist thinkers who were mentioned in this thesis considered and evaluated intellectuality and intellectuals from the perspective of Turkish-Islamic synthesis and Turkish nationalism, as a broader concept, was considered as the ultimate source of the truth by them.

In this thesis, the nationalists who expressed their perceptions on intellectual in the years between 1960 and 1980 will be examined. By the way, there is a necessity to mention that time period in this thesis was not chosen randomly. In this time period, politicization process of Turkish society grew mainly by relatively more liberal characteristic of 1961 Constitution. Consequently, with 1980 coup d’etat all social and political movements oppressed and a kind of a de-politicization process was started in 1980s. In addition to that, the world was facing the Cold War conditions both politically and ideologically. So, it is presumed that nationalists in Turkey were influenced by these internal and external conditions and this situation reflected to their perceptions on intellectuals.

Methodologically, in order to determine the general idea of the modern Western perception and Turkish nationalist perception on intellectuality and intellectuals, thoughts of various Western and Turkish nationalist thinkers will be examined separately from each other. Secondly, both Western and Turkish
nationalist thinkers will be examined in the context of a ‘thinker generation’ who expressed their ideas in the twentieth century. The main reason of this chronological choice is both to try to match the time period which both side expressed their perceptions on intellectual and to answer the questions like ‘What is the ideational process of the perception of intellectual in a historical period?’, ‘Is there a change in this perception in time, if there is, how?’. Of course these questions should be considered for both sides as well.

Briefly, the concept of intellectuality, in today’s context appeared and evolved in the West. Especially from the Enlightenment period its meaning started to reflect specifically the concepts like reason and questioning, in the West. As it will be understood from the writings of important intellectuals that were mentioned above that the general Western understanding on intellectuality and intellectuals perceived these concepts in a reactive way against the authority and power. Although there are some differences about their perceptions on these concepts, however, if it is necessary to stress a general point that function of intellectual in society is to criticize all the mechanisms of power in the state and society by using critical thinking and reason. This was the way to attain the truth according to them. On the other hand, it can be stated that nationalist perceptions on the concepts of intellectuality and intellectuals were in the exact opposite direction in Turkey. According to nationalist intellectuals and torchbearers that will be mentioned later on like Nihal Atsız, Mehmet Kaplan, Alparslan Türkeş, Tahsin Ünal, Galip Erdem, Ahmet Arvasi, Necmettin Hacieminoğlu and Erol Güngör, the idea of Turkish nationalism constituted their all perceptions on the meaning of intellectuality and on the functions of intellectuals. It is also necessary to stress that the Islamic beliefs and
values have an extensive coverage in their understanding of Turkish nationalism as well, except Nihal Atsız who expressed more secular thoughts than others. According to them, intellectuals have to be at the service of their country and nation. A true Turkish nationalist intellectual must avoid foreign [the Western] thoughts, [the Western] values and [the Western] life styles and use his/her intellect to enlighten the ordinary people, in other words the Turkish nation in a patriotic direction, according to nationalist intellectuals.

This study begins with the first chapter to introduce main objectives and methods in order to create a general understanding in readers’ mind about the following chapters. In the second chapter, the perceptions and understandings of the important Western thinkers like Julien Benda, Karl Mannheim, Antonio Gramsci, Jean-Paul Sartre, Michel Foucault, Noam Chomsky and Edward Said were analyzed on the concepts of intellectuality and intellectuals to give general information about how this relative and controversial subject was understood and discussed in the West. In the third chapter, perceptions of various nationalist thinkers who expressed their ideas on intellectuality and intellectuals between 1960 and 1980 were analyzed in order to answer two main questions: How did nationalist thinkers in Turkey perceive the concept of intellectuality and functions of intellectuals? Did their perceptions change throughout 1960 and 1980, and if changed, in what direction? The fourth chapter is the conclusion chapter where both perceptions of the Western thinkers and nationalist thinkers in Turkey will be discussed and compared to each other in order to show the points that they resemble or differentiate between each other.
Chapter Two

2.1 Discussions on Intellectuality and Intellectuals in the West

In this chapter, I will be discussing the concepts of intellectuality and intellectuals in the West by examining the ideas and thoughts of important Western thinkers like Karl Mannheim, Julien Benda, Antonio Gramsci, Jean-Paul Sartre, Michel Foucault, Noam Chomsky and Edward Said. I will try to follow a chronological order of writings of the Western thinkers in order to help us to compare and contrast with the perceptions of nationalist thinkers in Turkey who wrote between 1960 and 1980 on intellectuality and intellectuals.

2.2 Historical Evolution of the Meaning of ‘Intellectuality’

As a meaning of the word, intellectual, which attitudes of a person developed or chiefly guided by the intellect rather than by emotion in dictionaries. However, this meaning cannot cover different appearances from different ages of this word. In the middle ages, ‘intellectual’ was mostly used for clerics (Le Goff, 1994). These clerics were educated in the universities like Paris, Bologne, Oxford, Cambridge etc. which were the most famous ones constituted in the Middle Ages. During the Renaissance and the Reform movements in the Western Europe both new ideas and innovations affected mainly characteristics of both the universities and students. The most important innovation at the time was emergence of printing press by Johannes Gutenberg which helped changing characteristic of universities. As religious texts at first and with other kinds of books were printed such as in Latin or about Ancient Greek afterwards, thus the first type of ‘intellectuals’ appeared within these conditions in Europe, in the Middle Ages (Bodin, 2000:24-25).
With the Enlightenment movement, content of ‘intellectual’ started to change by the definitions of the Enlightenment philosophers about ‘which kind of way of thinking is rational or intellectual’. As a common explanation, philosophers of the Enlightenment thought that the only guide of man must be his autonomous reason which will take him to ultimate truth. So, philosophers had drawn the limits of being an intellectual by refusing the guidance and oppression of religious beliefs, in other words superstition according to them. However, their understanding of intellectual was generally limited by the idea of refusal of religious oppression. They had identified the people as ignorant and backward. Tocqueville had despised both divinity and public in same degree. The people were the silliest thing according to Diderot. They were close to idea of educating the people but not enlighten them because they perceived the people as a threat (Bauman, 1987:77-78).

The epoch called the Enlightenment is a movement that has an understanding of history, politics, theology, progress in itself which affected nearly all bodies of ruling structures of states and kingdoms and also produced ‘relatively’ new arguments compared to previous eras in the history of the world. This movement was introduced as a new epoch, as “enlightened”, different from previous bad, backward and ‘dark’ ages that make people as slaves by narrow-mindend and bigoted theological flubdubs. Therefore, basic quality and aim of the Enlightenment was to rescue people from backwardness of the old ages and open them the doors of a new age that reacts by the guidance of “free reason” and liberties. That’s why the Enlightenment was called “age of reason”. However, it must be known that this was not a homogenous process which there was no common judgement, perception and
interpretation between the philosophers of the Enlightenment as well. Nevertheless, common ideas of the Enlightenment which was mentioned above were spread throughout the Europe mainly in the eighteenth century (Çiğdem, 1997:13-14).

For the most simple explanation of what is reason for the Enlightenment, as Kant stated “Sapere Aude! Have the courage to use your own understanding! is thus the motto of the Enlightenment” (Kant, 1996:58) meaning a kind of reason which has the courage to think independently from the limitations of religious authorities. Besides, Cassirer introduces the perception of reason of the Enlightenment by saying that:

Variety and diversity of shapes are simply the full unfolding of an essential homogeneous formative power. When the eighteenth century wants to characterize this power in a single word, it calls it ‘reason’. ‘Reason’ becomes the unifying and central point of this century, expressing all that it longs and strives for, and all that it achieves... The eighteenth century is imbued with a belief in the unity and immutability of reason. Reason is the same for all thinking subjects, all nations, all epochs, and all cultures. From the changeability of religious creeds, of moral maxims and convictions, of theoretical opinions and judgements, a firm and lasting element can be extracted which is permanent in itself, and which in this identity and permanence expresses the real essence of reason (Cassirer, 1960:5-6).

Briefly, what the Enlightenment philosophers understand from reason is that “reason which is authorized to constitute itself independently”, also called as ‘autonomous reason’ (Cascardi, 2003:27) and this independence of reason was going to be achieved against the ‘authority of the church’ which was accepted as the core of “backwardness, darkness, ignorance, bigotry etc. “of the Middle Ages (Le Goff, 1994:8-9) by the Enlightenment philosophers. Moreover, according to Horkheimer, the idea of ‘autonomous reason’ demonstrated “that there is an evolutionary movement of building of ‘reason’ as an only way in order to reach the ‘universal truth’” (Cascardi, 2003:27).
The Enlightenment had chosen itself the domination and superstition of the church as the authority to be withstood and taken ‘autonomous reason’ to the center of its movement as the main instrument of this withstanding. Philosophers of the Enlightenment had seen this path as the only solution to reach the ‘universal truth’, as Horkheimer stated above. Philosophers who followed this path were mainly identified later on as ‘intellectuals of their times’ (Cassirer, 1970; Çiğdem, 1997; Munck, 2000; Barnett, 2003; Israel, 2006). However, in the following centuries, context of discussions on intellectuality and intellectuals changed and differentiated in the West. Especially, in the twentieth century western socio-political literature, many arguments were made on the characteristic of intellectual activity and on authority, and ‘intellectuality’ evolved from the discussion of ‘reason versus religion/superstition’ to a more complex mechanism and activity that has one or more than one characteristic and function in the world.

On the basis of the intellectual heritage of the Enlightenment, an important controversy about the concept of intellectual was in the Dreyfus affair in France. A captain in the French army called Alfred Dreyfus was convicted of espionage in 1896. His ranks was stripped and he sentenced to be sent prison-exile the rest of his life by military tribunal. This sensational case split France in two as Dreyfusards and anti-Dreyfusards. Emile Zola, one of France’s famous novelist, published a letter in 1898 called “J’accuse” (I accuse) from a Parisian newspaper called L’Aurore in order to accuse members of the French army of fading evidences and covering up the facts of this case (Eyerman, 1994). He ended his letter by saying:

2 Actually, the Enlightenment process cannot be identified as purely irreligious movement. There were both radicals who mostly denied religious beliefs like Condorcet and d’Holbach and moderates like Voltaire and Diderot who drew an analogy between reason and believing in God (Cassirer 1960).
I have but one passion, the search for light, in the name of humanity which has suffered so much and is entitled to happiness. My fiery protest is simply the cry of my very soul. Let them dare, then, to bring me before a court of law and investigate in the full light of day! I am waiting (Zola, 1976:99).

This action was identified as ‘the manifesto of the intellectuals’ which according to Şerif Mardin, Georges Benjamin Clemenceau who was owner and editor of *L’Aurore* had firstly introduced Dreyfussards as intellectuals (Mardin, 1992:256). So, it was an important development in re-defining and re-arguing the concept of ‘intellectual’ and its function in public.

Zola’s letter was written in 1898 mainly to the president of France and details of this case was introduced by Zola in his book called “*La verite en marche*” (The Truth is on the March) in 1902. Dreyfus was acquitted and his ranks were given back in 1906. The struggle of Zola and other Dreyfussards, in other words, ‘the radical intellectuals’, brought a feature as ‘running the risk of all sort of difficulties for another one who downtrodden and marginalized’ to the characteristic of intellectual (Ilgaz, 2002:115).

The Dreyfus case was one of the most important point for the meaning of intellectuality in Western history of thought. Through this case, ‘intellectual’ was started to be seen and perceived—also in negative meaning— as ‘a person who struggle for the rights of another person’. The characteristic and importance of Dreyfus case became an important determinant for formation of the meaning of intellectual especially after 1900s. Out of some different approaches about its meaning, characteristic and function of intellectual among Western thinkers in the twentieth century, general image of intellectual can be reflected ‘as a person who question his/her circle and the world by aiming to support people’s resistance against
any kind of hegemony and oppression that would come from any system of thought in the world whether secular or religious’. However, distinction between intellectuals and the people, in other words ‘people who know’ and ‘people who do not know’ preserve its continuity as a pure hegemonical relation in this discussion since the ancient Greece.

2.3 The Twentieth Century Projections of the Concept of Intellectual in the West

In *The New Webster Dictionary of the English Language*, meaning of ‘intellect’ and ‘intellectual’ as follows: “*intellect*, n. [L. *intellectus*, from *intelligo*, to understand—*inter*, between, and *lego*, to choose or pick, to read; seen also in *collect*, *elect*, *select*, *legend*, *lesson*, *lecture*, etc.] That faculty of the human mind which receives or comprehends ideas, as distinguished from the power to feel and to will; the understanding faculty; also, the capacity for higher forms of knowledge.—*intellectual*, a. Relating to the intellect or understanding; appealing to or perceived by the intellect; existing in the understanding; ideal; having or characterized by intellect.” (Thatcher et al, nd:448)

As it was said before there are many different definitions of intellectual according to thinkers who wrote about ‘intellectual’ in the West. In order to guide us for following discussions, it is necessary to show some of these definitions and arguments from the works of important Western thinkers who wrote in the twentieth century.
2.3.1 Julien Benda

In 1927, Julien Benda’s famous book called *La Trahison des Clercs*, in English translation *The Treason of the Intellectuals* (or *The Betrayal of the Intellectuals*) made a significant impression on intellectuality discussions Europe at the time. Briefly, he criticized intellectuals in his book because of their gravitation to “political passions”, in the meaning of high sensitivity about their national, racial or class interests and hatred for others (Danielsson, 2005:397). Despite the fact that he cannot be classified easily in an ideological tendency, however, he can be described as a “defender of universalist values” (Müller, 2006:125), and according to a clear statement of Danielsson, “the basic guiding principle of universality gave humanity a share in rights and duties, thereby safeguarding the life and well-being of others” (Danielsson, 2005:398), but Benda also added that he was not an ‘internationalist’ because of its pragmatic characteristic which has a potential to seek practical interests for any group such as workers, bankers, industrialists etc. (Benda, 2006:67).

Benda begins to define intellectuals by defining ‘non-intellectuals’ at first. As it can be realized in *The Treason of the Intellectuals* mostly, he describes ‘illiterate people’ as “the people who are self seeker and not making effort more than expected from them and perform all these characteristics systematically” (op. cit., 37). In the following characterization, he described ‘intellectual’ or ‘literate’ people as “the people who their actions not based on achieving practical interests and the people who enjoy art, science, metaphysic, shortly, the people who try to achieve nonmaterial advantages in their lives” (op. cit., 37-38). So, he perceived these literate people have a function of preaching the truth to all ‘other’ people who are not intellectuals, in the world and he thought that intellectuals are at the level of telling
people the disturbing truths and after paying the costs of their actions (op. cit.,70). Another mission of the intellectuals, according to Benda, “is to constitute solidarity between the people based on justice and truth, against the unfairness that their religions imprisoned them on earth” (op. cit.,48). “Objective mental activity” (op. cit.,59) and “desire to reach the truth” (op. cit.,61) are/should be two significant characteristics of intellectuals for Benda.

As it was mentioned earlier, Benda condemns intellectuals who are bounded to their racial or national characteristics passionately (op. cit.,54). He says that primary aim of mental or physical productions of these intellectuals is acting to increase the power of their States (op. cit.,84) and these intellectuals consider themselves as “Minister of Defence”, according to Benda (op. cit.,86). Moreover, Benda strongly criticizes the people who praise the thinkers/philosophers like Friedrich Nietzsche, Maurice Barres, Georges Sorel and Charles Peguy, because according to him, these thinkers “underestimate scientists and glorify the warrior” (op. cit.,119) and followers of these kind of thinkers created a “ruthlessness Romanticism” in the society, as Benda stated (op. cit.,115).

As Benda condemned the modern intellectuals for their passions about practical benefits and materialistic ends of their national and class interests, also, Danielsson cited from Benda that these kind of intellectuals “had aided in the construction of an “other”, filled with emotional partiality against the “other”, the political passions became the very basis for the removal of the “other”” (Danielsson, 2005:397). Julien Benda defines ‘true intellectuals’ with these words:

True intellectual is who obeys the rules of the State by not allowing rules to hurt his soul. He gives the devil his due, even it is his life. True intellectuals are Vauvenargues, Lamarck, Fresnel which they never internalized a nationalist patriotism, although they do what is
necessary for patriotism. True intellectuals are Spinoza, Schiller, Baudelaire and Cesar Franck which they never give up admiring deeply to what is beautiful and divine, on account of struggle to earn their lives (Benda, 2006:127-128).

2.3.2 Karl Mannheim

Karl Mannheim, as a key sociologist, produced guiding ideas on intellectuality discussions in the first half of the 1900s. He described intellectuals/intelligentsia\(^3\) as a stratum which its task is to interpret the world for the society (Mannheim, 1936:9), so this ‘intellectual activity’ takes them to a position which interpret the relations between “social dynamics and ideation”(Mannheim, 2003:122). Mannheim argued that intellectual stratum acted as a caste and its activities like preaching, teaching and interpretation of the world were mainly under control of the church, in other words, ‘scholasticism’ of the Middle Ages. This ‘intellectual caste’ was perceiving and interpreting the world from their own traditional perception of truth and people in the universities were educated with religious/dogmatized knowledge of the church (Mannheim, 1936:9-10). However, according to Mannheim, with the modern times, “the ecclesiastical interpretation of the world which was held by the priestly caste is broken, and in the place of a closed and thoroughly organized stratum of intellectuals, a free intelligentsia has arisen”, in the meaning of getting rid of domination of ecclesiasticism and multipolarity of intellectual production (op. cit.,10).

According to Mannheim’s understanding, intellectuals are “unanchored, relatively class-less stratum” and “socially unattached” (Kurzman and Owens, 2003:67). If necessary to say with his own statement that:

\(^3\) Russian usage of the word (Taşkın, 2007).
It should have become clear that the intelligentsia is by no means a class, that it cannot form a party, and that it is incapable of concerted action. Such attempts were bound to fail, for political action depends primarily on common interests which the intelligentsia lacks more than any other group (Mannheim, 2003:104).

On the other hand, people grow up in various socialization processes and often become members of different social classes and identities like any individual member of the intelligentsia may have. Even so, judgements of intellectuals are not focused on just one direction of thought that one class or party may benefit, on the contrary, they take into account the problems of their time from various perspectives and they are tend to change their minds and judgements on any subject, even the ones that might be against their own class interests at the end (Mannheim, 2003:105).

This, as Mannheim taken from Alfred Weber, ‘relatively uncommitted intelligentsia’ [relativ freischwebende Intelligenz], was generally criticized as “less reliable” and “characterless” by different classes or parties in society (Mannheim, 2003:105-106; Mannheim, 1936:140).

Another important area of Mannheim’s understanding on intellectuals is ‘education’. He sees education as a “unifying sociological bond between all groups of intellectualswhich binds them together in a striking way” (Mannheim, 1936:138). According to him, “participation in a common educational heritage progressively tends to suppress differences of birth, status, profession, and wealth, and to unite the individual educated people on the basis of the education they have received” (ibid.). However, the class and status ties of the individuals do not disappear completely by education. The most important characteristic of this new basis is preserving “the multiplicity of the component elements in all their variety by creating a
homogeneous medium within which the conflicting parties can measure their strength” (ibid.).

Consequently, intellectual freedom began with the modern times, in other words, with disappearance of caste type of intellectual stratum, according to Mannheim. Henceforth, intellectuals had the field that they were able to interpret any mode of thought and experience in society. There begins an intellectual competition for the favour of society, so this ‘relatively new’ social condition reflects multipolarity of thinking and disappearance of intellectual monopoly in society (Mannheim, 1936). However, all of their ideational multiplicity and liquidity in their relationship with masses, classes and parties bring with the ‘negative’ perceptions about intellectuals such as ‘characterless’ and ‘less reliable’. Also, they were generally criticized about their remoteness to daily life situations and the masses (Mannheim, 2003). It seems that being a classless stratum of ‘modern intellectual’ bears its own pros and cons about its relationship with multiplicity of ‘modern society’.

Moreover, it was mentioned earlier that according to Mannheim, with the collapse of the intellectual monopoly of the clergy in the modern times, intellectual competition accelerated, thus, “other ways of interpreting the world were increasingly recognized” and “the intellectual's illusion that there is only one way of thinking” disappeared (Mannheim, 1936:11). Mannheim understands that this competition done “for the favour of various public groups” i.e. different political parties or social classes, which can be understood as a basic function of intellectuals according to him (ibid.). Also it was mentioned earlier that Mannheim described the
intellectuals are “unanchored, relatively class-less stratum” and “socially unattached” (Kurzman and Owens, 2003:67) so, when intellectuals join different parties in society, Mannheim accepted that intellectuals must not give up their own point of views, ideational independences and unattached positions, because according to him, their function is “to penetrate into the ranks of the conflicting parties in order to compel them to accept their demands” (Mannheim, 1936:142) and at the same time they function “to diagnose and prognosticate, to discover choices when they arise, and to understand and locate the various points of view rather than to reject or assimilate them” as well (Mannheim, 2003:170).

To sum up, as Mannheim stated that intellectuals “are in a position to make up their minds in a variety of ways, is likely to stultify any simplified approach” (Mannheim, 2003:158) and at the same time, they “must remain as critical of itself as of all other groups” (op. cit.,170).

2.3.3 Antonio Gramsci

An Italian marxist, Antonio Gramsci is another key figure who wrote his ideas about intellectuality and intellectuals in the first half of the twentieth century. It is important to mention at this point that, Gramsci was a thinker who did not much separate the meaning of intellectual from its ‘function’ in society, as other thinkers like Sartre, Foucault, Said and Chomsky that it is going to be mentioned later on.

‘Intellectual’, as a word, reflected a figure or a person who his duty or reason of existence was organizing, administering, directing, educating or leading other people in society, for Gramsci (Gramsci, 2000:300). Therefore, according to him, “all
men are potentially intellectuals in the sense of having an intellect and using it, but not all are intellectuals by social function” (Gramsci, 1999:131) “thus, because it can happen that everyone at some time fries a couple of eggs or sews up a tear in a jacket, we do not necessarily say that everyone is a cook or a tailor” (op. cit., 140). This famous statement of Gramsci points that as long as every human action is practiced by mind or intellect which is there is a kind of connection between mind/intellect and nerves that move arms of a body, then this definition allows to be said that ‘all men are intellectuals’. However, this relation between ‘mind and nerves’ is not reflected equally in every man’s actions. So, there is a line that separate all men/intellectuals, called ‘function’ (Gramsci, 1967:23). Intellectuals were separated into two according to Gramsci, as ‘traditional’ and ‘organic’ intellectuals. Traditional intellectuals were mainly the ecclesiastics who were bound to the landed aristocracy which these two shared juridical and economical rights and opportunities in society (Gramsci, 2000:302). This kind of intellectuals mainly held an ideological-which is religious- monopoly over education, morality, justice, charity, good works etc. (ibid.). On the other hand, he described organic intellectuals by saying that every group or class in society irrespective of social, political or economical, produce a specific group of intellectuals according to functions of their group/class in society, in order to create a homogeneity, consciousness and awareness within them (op. cit., 301). These organic intellectuals of any group or class in society “must be an organizer of masses of men” (ibid.), but firstly of their group. These organic intellectuals get in contact with all social groups but mainly with the dominant group of society, which is ‘the ruling class/the capitalists’, and each group or class exert effort to assimilate ‘other’, in other words, ‘traditional intellectuals’ in their own group for an ideological conquest against the other groups or classes.
(Gramsci, 1999:142) which is done, as Gramsci stated, “in the exercise of hegemony” (Gramsci, 2000:300).

The concepts of “intellectuals” and “non-intellectuals” are not distinguished strictly from each other according to Gramsci’s understanding. He states that different professional qualities of people do not help to determine ‘intellectuality’ or ‘non-intellectuality’ among people because:

*homo faber*\(^4\) cannot be separated from *homo sapiens*\(^5\). Each man, finally, outside his professional activity, carries on some form of intellectual activity, that is, he is a "philosopher", an artist, a man of taste, he participates in a particular conception of the world, has a conscious line of moral conduct, and therefore contributes to sustain a conception of the world or to modify it, that is, to bring into being new modes of thought (Gramsci, 1992:9).

Traditional intellectual i.e. man of letters, the philosophers, the artists etc. considered themselves as the ‘true’ intellectuals, however, the main condition for production of a ‘new’ type of intellectual cannot be achieved by taking profession or such variable into account but by developing intellectual activity that exists in everyone in a ‘critical way of thinking’ in the world (Gramsci, 1992:9).

His affiliation with Marxism also shapes his ideas on the functions of intellectuals as more reflexive and progressive way in society. His personal intention about this ‘new’ or ‘organic’ type of intellectuals is to be connected organically with the interests of the working class. Therefore, this ‘new type of intellectual’ does not appear as an eloquent but as a ‘permanent persuader’ who encourages people to renovate the relations of the physical and social world, also by renovating the relations of the muscular-nervous effort. Otherwise, this new type of intellectual cannot proceed from ‘specialization’ to ‘directorate’ [specialized and political]

---

\(^4\) Man the maker.
\(^5\) Man the thinker.
among people (Gramsci, 1992:9-10). So this is the ideal type of an ‘organic intellectual’ that is attached to the working class politically, as Gramsci had in his mind (Gramsci, 1967:25). He also describes these kind of intellectuals as ‘the great intellectuals’ and said about their function in society as:

The great intellectual, too, must take the plunge into practical life and become an organizer of the practical aspects of culture, if he wants to remain a leader; he must democratize himself, be more in touch with the times. Renaissance man is no longer possible in the modern world, at a time when increasingly large masses of humans are participating actively and directly in history (Gramsci, 2007:7).

Moreover, Gramsci mentioned the role of the education in production process of the intellectual. He argued that schools have significant importance in the process of educating and producing intellectuals in a country. As he gave an example that just like in the successful industrial production process which has the machines that are able to produce other machines in order to achieve further technical and industrial development, so the education system of the intellectual works with similar mentality of such industrial production process, in the schools that were dedicated to this process (Gramsci, 1992:143). The intellectuals who are raised in these schools were specialized in the strata of “the petty and middle landed bourgeoisie and certain strata of the petty and middle urban bourgeoisie” according to Gramsci and these intellectuals which are the “deputies” of social hegemony and political government, work in order to take the consent of the people either voluntarily or through legal channels-forcibly-, for the benefit of the State (op. cit.,144-145). The political parties work on the same principle with the schools, in order to produce its own ‘organic intellectuals’ as well (op. cit.,151).
2.3.4 Jean-Paul Sartre

Sartre argued that ‘the philosophers’ of the past and ‘the intellectuals’, as it is called today, appeared and started to progress with the rise of bourgeoisie mainly by the seventeenth century in Europe, especially in France. In other words, common interests of the philosophers and the bourgeoisie coincided with each other against the church and the aristocracy. The philosophers demanded the freedom of expression against the church, and bourgeoisie fought to break the last remnants of feudalism that blocked capitalism and liberalism in the economical relations. Henceforth, bourgeoisie would run its eco-political relations not through clergy but the philosophers/intellectuals like “lawyers (Montesquieu), man of letters (Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau), mathematicians (d’Alembert), financiers (Helvetius), doctors etc.” as Sartre called them “practical knowledge operators/experts” and in the modern times that is the golden age of bourgeoisie, “every practical knowledge operator is not an intellectual, however intellectuals are formed among them” (Sartre, 1997:14-18). There is also a necessity to mention about the basic qualities of the practical knowledge operators briefly. According to Sartre, these practical knowledge operators are chosen and appointed by the dominant class, that is bourgeoisie, in order to its needs in the order of division of labor. Therefore, education of the practical knowledge operators is determined by the dominant class as well. They are raised, primarily, with the official knowledge of the dominant class for ideological engagement, and secondly they are trained to become officials of this class. So, because of the monetary cost of this education, class picking is done automatically and children of the petit bourgeoisie and the upper classes are raised in this educational system (op. cit.,19-22).
After drawing the general picture of the practical knowledge operator, it is the point to argue the statement of Sartre as “every practical knowledge operator is not an intellectual, however intellectuals are formed among them” (op. cit.,14). According to Sartre, the intellectuals are officials of the dominant class who feel themselves uncomfortable because of the contradiction of their own situation, because they are ‘humanists’ since the childhood, but not as the same as the bourgeoisie humanism that explained the concepts like freedom, humanism, science etc. according to its own understanding and benefit. They are humanists because they made believed that all people are equal. However when they look at their own processes in life, they find themselves as the basic proof of inequality that contradicts with their humanist equality. So, in order to shatter this situation, they need also to give up the system that provides them privileges in society. Moreover, their reason of searching for universal knowledge contradicts with the aim of the dominant class because of its mechanism to use knowledge only for its own benefits. They search for universal knowledge for practical reasons, in other words, what useful for everyone, not only for a privileged class in a given society, besides that attitude makes them ‘universalists’ as well (op. cit.,19-25).

However, Sartre’s further statements showed that he criticized also this universalist position of the practical knowledge operators and called them as ‘the classical intellectual’ (op. cit.,83). Sartre described them as the practical knowledge operators such as academicians, doctors etc. who are paid well as well as make demonstrations against the domestic or international pressures. Their actions cannot make a contact with the masses, so they remain as officials of the dominant class (op. cit.,84-89).
As the function of intellectual, Sartre claimed that ‘as a knowledge technician and as a member of little bourgeoisie it has to fight against its own class. Therefore, intellectual is a universal technician who knows universality must be reinvented constantly’ (op. cit.,36-37). Sartre criticized intellectual about its rejection of the class sensitivity (op. cit.,38). So, there was only way for intellectual to understand his society according to Sartre, that is ‘considering the society from the perspectives of the oppressed people’. These oppressed people need practical truths, not ideologies. So, intellectual has to guide these people in order to discover their ‘organical aims’, because substratum of the society cannot achieve to produce their own organical representatives, in other words, intellectuals. In this picture, intellectual represents ‘minimum ignorance’. Intellectual must be a defender of all the people who are oppressed by dominant classes (op. cit.,56). “The responsibility of the intellectual”, according to Sartre, “to be engagé, committed to freedom” (Priest, 2001:261).

If it is necessary to define intellectuals in one sentence, according to Sartre’s understanding, intellectual is a person who pry into the affairs that do not concern himself/herself and who intend to criticize all accepted truths and behaviors in the name of society and all the people in the world and they are the philosophers of the past and the intellectuals of today [since the Dreyfus Affair] who were criticized and accused of “prying into the affairs that do not concern themselves”, firstly by the aristocracy and lately by the bourgeoisie, as the dominant classes of their times (Sartre, 1997:11-18).
2.3.5 Michel Foucault

Foucault’s most common conceptual discrimination about intellectuality is ‘the universal/traditional intellectual’ and ‘the specific intellectual’. According to him “the universal intellectual, whose task was to speak the truth to power in the name of universal reason, justice, and humanity” (Foucault, 1984:23). This characteristic of the universal intellectual reflects the general mentality of the Enlightenment as ‘the universal reason’ which glorified the men who are aware of knowledge of the truth, so Foucault’s indication as identifying Voltaire as the symbol of the universal intellectual of his time becomes meaningful at this point (Foucault, 2000:18). As Ferda Keskin stated in the book called Entelektüelin Siyasi İşlevi that answers and formulations of the universal intellectual are produced from an integral point of view that describes everything in a normative and global mentality (Foucault, 2000:19) and according to Foucault, “Sartre was the last incumbent” of that (Foucault, 1984:23) which Sartre had admitted this claim and “ashamed of his political and military ineffectiveness as an intellectual rather than a fighter” according to Stephen Priest (Priest, 2001:8). As Foucault stated that preachments of the universal intellectual did not match with the historical experiences in the world and “this situation throw the legitimacy and leadership of the universal intellectual into crisis” (Topçuoğlu, 2006:223) and he thought that “a traditional intellectual type which possess knowledge, lectures about authority, justice and truth is ended” (op. cit., 224).

‘The specific intellectual’ according to Foucault, unlike the universal one, is:

He who, along with a handful of others, has at his disposal, whether in the service of the state or against it, powers which can either benefit or irrevocably destroy life. He is no longer the rhapsodist of the eternal, but the strategist of life and death (Foucault, 1984:23).
As Barry Smart stated from Foucault that:

The specific intellectual, unlike the universal intellectual, is not a ‘man of letters’, or a ‘great writer’, but a savant or expert with a direct and localized relation to scientific knowledge, politicized by virtue of immediate involvement through intellectual activity in everyday struggles and conflicts, the most fundamental and profound of which in modern society concerns that of truth (Smart, 2004:61).

Foucault thought that traditional way of struggle against political power does not go far beyond producing different kind of power relations in a society (Foucault, 2000:24), because as he claimed that:

Every society has its ‘regime of truth, its “general politics” of truth’ around which there exists a struggle concerning the status of truth and the role it plays in the socio-economic and political order of things and that is here, at this level which is central to the structure and functioning of society (...) the ‘ensemble of rules according to which the true and the false are separated and specific effects of power attached to the true’ (Smart, 2002:61-62).

Due to replacing the existing order through revolution or another way would lead an establishment of another codification of power, so, the specific intellectual, as an individual in housing, the hospital, the asylum, the laboratory, the university, family, sexual relations etc. is who multiplies and localizes his/her political struggle and his/her aim has to be breaking the cornerstones of the power in all areas where it produces disciplines, institutions, practices, technologies, knowledge and the like (Foucault, 2000:24; Foucault, 1984:68). For instance, Foucault had pointed the atomic scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer who known as ‘father of the atomic bomb’ as a symbol of transition from the universal intellectual to the specific intellectual because of his questioning the devastating results of the atomic bomb later on (Foucault, 1984:69). Oppenheimer was a specific intellectual because once he used his knowledge in order to serve the will of the government on the atomic bomb, but later he declared about probable and substantial damages of the atomic bomb as one

---

6 Oppenheimer was an American theoretical physicist who was generally known as ‘father of the atomic bomb’ because of his researchs in the Manhattan Project where the atomic bomb was produced.
of the physicists who exerted to produce it. So, Foucault said that “on this point an intellectual becomes a political threat” (Foucault, 2000:48).

2.3.6 Noam Chomsky

In accordance with the ideas of Foucault and Sartre about ‘traditional/classical intellectuals’ in general, also Chomsky’s interpretation about them did not contain positive meanings. This kind of intellectuals, in other words, ‘holders of knowledge’ compared to the masses, although there were exceptions, meant for Chomsky as who made people “passive, obedient, ignorant and guided for thousands of years” as their basic function (Robert and Zarachowicz, 2003:13).

Chomsky criticizes ‘the modern intellectual’ as they are indoctrinated and brain washed by their own ideologies because of their lack of intellectual depth (Chomsky, 1994:43-45). According to him, if ‘ideology’ can be defined as an ‘expedience mask’, then intellectuals will assume an elitist attitude when they interpret historical or political issues, so, they are not going to intend to let people join the decision making processes and claim that literates or intellectuals have the right to rule and direct the people and social change, whether liberal or communist ones (op. cit.,89-93).

On the other hand, Chomsky criticizes intellectuals for their predisposition to the state and speechlessness about its policies. He says that the people who are not followers of the system, in other words, the people who are not ‘party liners’ are incriminated and labelled easily by those who follow the official ideology of the state, namely the “secular priesthood” of the modern times (Chomsky, 1994:46);
(Chomsky, 2008:164). Therefore, Chomsky distinguished intellectuals as the “technocratic and policy-oriented intellectuals” and the “value-oriented intellectuals” and stated that:

The technocratic and policy-oriented intellectuals at home are the good guys, who make the system work and raise no annoying questions. If they oppose government policy, they do so on “pragmatic” grounds, like the bulk of the “American intellectual elite”. Their occasional technical objections are “hard political analysis” in contrast to the “moralism” or “dreamy utopianism” of people who raise objections of principle to the course of policy. As for the value-oriented intellectuals, who devote themselves to the derogation of leadership, the challenging of authority, and the unmasking and delegitimation of established institutions, they constitute a challenge to democratic government which is, potentially at least, as serious as those posed in the past by the aristocratic cliques, fascist movements, and communist parties, in the judgement of the trilateral scholars (...) We can distinguish two categories among the “secular priesthood” who serve the state. There are, in the first place, the outright propagandists; and alongside them are the technocratic and policy-oriented intellectuals who simply dismiss any question of ends and interests served by policy and do the work laid out for them, priding themselves on their “pragmatism” and freedom from contamination by “ideology”; a term generally reserved for deviation from the doctrines of the state religion of the two categories, the latter are probably far more effective in inculcating attitudes of obedience and in “socializing” the public (...) Top advisory and decision-making positions relating to international affairs are heavily concentrated in the hands of major corporations, banks, investment firms, the few law firms that cater to corporate interests, and the technocratic and policy oriented intellectuals who do the bidding of those who own and manage the basic institutions of the domestic society, the private empires that govern most aspects of our lives with little pretense of public accountability and not even a gesture to democratic control (Chomsky, 2008:163-165).

As it can be seen from the statement above, contemporary intellectual qualities are not seem to have positive meanings for Chomsky. Briefly to say that, intellectuals, in general meaning, meant for Chomsky as they have professions which can provide them privileges, capital, guns, knowledge etc. to control, organize and direct over society, including the ones who are called the ‘left intellectuals’ that present themselves as representatives of the people (Mitchell and Schoeffel, 2002:226).

Chomsky defined the figure of intellectual in his mind by saying:

Intellectuals are in a position to expose the lies of governments, to analyze actions according to their causes and motives and often hidden intentions. In the Western world at least, they have the power that comes from political liberty, from access to information and freedom of expression. For a privileged minority, Western democracy provides the leisure, the facilities, and the training to seek the truth lying hidden behind the veil of distortion and
misinterpretation, ideology, and class interest through which the events of current history are presented to us (Chomsky, 1987:60).

If it is necessary to explain in the light of the statement above, discourse and ideational traces of the Enlightenment such as freedom of thought, political liberty, seeking truth and justice etc. mainly constituted Chomsky’s understanding of the ‘ideal’ intellectual. As he stated that intellectuals had fought for realization of these values in the eighteenth century and these senses like courage and struggle increasingly maintained until today (Mitchell and Schoeffel, 2002:232). Naturally, these “honest” and “serious” intellectuals cannot be found in the institutions of power and domination. They are the activists who try to make a change in the world not only by “running around the streets waving signs” but “thinking about things, and figuring out what the problems were, and trying to teach people about them and convince them” contrary to elite/liberal intellectuals who always opposed to protests of the people against the authority (op. cit.,261). Chomsky called them “honest left intelligentsia”–different from the type that was mentioned above–“who are not serving power as either a Red Bureaucracy, or as state-capitalist commissar-equivalents” (ibid.) by adding his point that he was not even sure about the word ‘left’ while many of them were probably Christian conservatives who engaged themselves in popular movements and lives of the protesters particularly (Mitchell and Schoeffel, 2002:262).

Consequently, main function and responsibility of intellectual must be “to speak the truth and to expose lies” (Chomsky, 1987:60) and also “to bring the truth about matters of human significance to an audience that can do something about them” (Luck, 2007:945) according to Chomsky. The true profile of intellectual in his mind is related “more about a stance than a human category” which “based on
getting knowledge in general meaning, ruminating about the subjects that related to human being and attaching what he or she may understand to his or her comprehension” (Robert and Zarachowicz, 2003:17). Chomsky mentioned on this subject while he was arguing with Foucault:

There are two intellectual tasks: one, and the one that I was discussing, is to try to create the vision of a future just society; that is to create, if you like, a humanistic social theory that is based, if possible, on some firm and humane concept of the human essence or human nature. That’s one task.

Another task is to understand very clearly the nature of power and oppression and terror and destruction in our own society. And that certainly includes the institutions you mentioned7, as well as the central institutions of any industrial society, namely the economic, commercial and financial institutions and in particular, in the coming period, the great multi-national corporations, which are not very far from us physically tonight (Chomsky and Foucault, 2006:41-42)

2.3.7 Edward W. Said

Said’s views about intellectuality and intellectuals also do not differentiate much from Chomsky’s views (Selby, 2006). That is to say, according to Said in general:

The intellectual is an individual endowed with a faculty for representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to, as well as for, a public. And this role has an edge to it, and cannot be played without a sense of being someone whose place it is publicly to raise embarrassing questions, to confront orthodoxy and dogma (rather than to produce them), to be someone who cannot easily be co-opted by governments or corporations, and whose raison d’etre is to represent all those people and issues that are routinely forgotten or swept under the rug. The intellectual does so on the basis of universal principles: that all human beings are entitled to expect decent standards of behavior concerning freedom and justice from worldly powers or nations, and that deliberate or inadvertent violations of these standards need to be testified and fought against courageously (Said, 1994:11-12).

In addition to that, Said clearly states the representative function of intellectual by saying that:

The intellectual ought neither to be so uncontroversial and safe a figure as to be just a friendly technician nor should the intellectual try to be a full-time Cassandra8, who was not
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7 Foucault talks about the institutions that are not directly related to the political power such as ‘the family’, ‘the university’ and all other teaching systems in general (Chomsky and Foucault, 2006:40).
8 Cassandra was the daughter of King Priam of Troy. She has made a promise to Apollo to become his consort in return for foresight, but she broke it. Therefore, Apollo has retained her powers and consequently no one believed her predictions.
only righteously unpleasant but also unheard. Every human being is held in by a society, no matter how free and open the society, no matter how bohemian the individual. In any case, the intellectual is supposed to be heard from, and in practice ought to be stirring up debate and if possible controversy. But the alternatives are not total quiescence or total rebelliousness (Said, 1994:52).

So, basic importance and vocation of intellectual is his or her representativeness that makes various thoughts visible despite all kind of barriers which may come from dominance of the state or society. Fundamental qualities of the case of representativeness are scepticism, dependence on rational questionings and moral judgements, and also knowing how to use and to intervene language as an intellectual action (Said, 1994:12-20). Said also mentioned on the subject of nationalities in intellectual discussions. He acknowledged the fact that intellectuals, as individuals one by one, raise in various national identities and it is expected from them to use national language in their expositions. “However, this entails intellectuals becoming entrapped within dominant discourse” (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 1999:138) and some American intellectuals contributed to the perception of the negative ‘other’ by falling into this trap, for example, about Islam, communism, Russians etc. (Said, 1994:31-32). At this point, according to Said, intellectuals are faced with the problem of loyalty in their own societies. He argues that although ‘the nation’ is one of the most important ground that dominant norms are connected so intimately, however the main characteristic of an intellectual is to disrupt such prevailing norms, and he added “never solidarity before criticism” (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 1999:138).

Intellectual was metaphorically an exiled person for Said and this situation was the natural consequence of his or her characteristic of ‘criticism’. In this manner, criticism as a concept, must have a crucial component, in order to become a complete
criticism, called ‘neutrality’ when it is targeted to the ties and allegiances of society and also intellectuals in personal, like group, nation, race, gender, class etc. Therefore, the critic, “must be able to transcend the ideological boundaries that are imposed upon him or her by ‘home’” (JanMohamed, 1992:110). In the light of this description about intellectual’s exile, actually it has a positive meaning according to Said. He characterized the exilic intellectual as “unwilling to make adjustments, unaccommodated, uncoopted and resistant” that caused he or she remains an outsider, and exile ment for intellectual as “restlessness, movement, constantly being unsettled and unsettling others” (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 1999:140). Hence, the exilic intellectual feels “happy with the idea of unhappiness” (ibid.) and sees “homelessness-as-home” (JanMohamed, 1992:113). Moreover, ‘criticism’ must have a secular characteristic according to Said’s understanding:

The true intellectual is a secular being. However much intellectuals pretend that their representations are of higher things or ultimate values, morality begins with their activity in this secular world of ours where it takes place, whose interests it serves, how it jibes with a consistent and universalist ethic, how it discriminates between power and justice, what it reveals of one's choices and priorities. Those gods that always fail demand from the intellectual in the end a kind of absolute certainty and a total, seamless view of reality that recognizes only disciples or enemies(…) The morality and principles of an intellectual should not constitute a sort of sealed gearbox that drives thought and action in one direction and is powered by an engine with only one fuel source. The intellectual has to walk around, has to have the space in which to stand and talk back to authority, since unquestioning subservience to authority in today's world is one of the greatest threats to an active, and moral, intellectual life (Said, 1994:120-121).

He thought that an ideal intellectual should represent the values of emancipation and enlightenment that and this attitude can be achieved only “in a ‘secular’ manner which prevents one seeing things in extremes, with one side, good and the other irreducibly evil” (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001:40). Also he added that:

In short, the morality of the intellectual’s practice begins with its location in the secular world and is affected by where it takes place, whose interest it serves, how it jibes with a consistent and universalist ethic, how it discriminates between power and justice, what it reveals of one’s choices and priorities (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001:30).
There is also a necessity to mention about some notions that Said mentioned as his understanding of intellectuality such as ‘worldliness’, ‘amateurism’ and ‘professionalism’ all together. He mainly criticized the increasement of academic criticism that approached the texts, contexts and theory from more complex language, in other words, ‘professional language’ which led the activity of the critic out of the world and made less and less connected with it. According to him, “the intellectual’s capacity to say anything relevant in his or her society cannot dispense with the concept of worldliness, for without worldliness the intellectual can have no world from which, and to which, to speak” (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001:29). The role of criticism, as Said thought about that, “is a radical attack on the creeping ivory-tower specialisation which has come to characterise academic criticism, and which removes it more and more from the political realities of contemporary society” (op. cit.,29-30). In response to that, Said introduced the term called ‘amateurism’ to his idea of worldliness and stated that:

The critic must refused to be locked into narrow professional specialisations which produce their own arcane vocabulary and speak only to other specialists. The cult of professional expertise in criticism is pernicious because it surrenders the actual material and political concerns of society to a discourse dominated by economists and technocrats(...)It is in such ‘amateurism’ that the worldliness of the critic can be fully realised. This does not mean a superficial dilettantism, but a reversal of the trend of literary theory (in particular) to turn its back on the circumstances and real events of the society for which criticism actually exists. And a very great part of this process has been the locking of the intellectual into an inwardly focused and inwardly spiralling discourse only accessible to other professionals(...)The amateur is one who believes that to be a thinking and concerned member of society one can rise moral questions about any issue, no matter how technical or professional the activity (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001:35-36).

Lastly, there is another important discourse in Said’s works called ‘speaking truth to power’. How does one speak truth to power? He states that there is no concrete and direct answer for this question, however, he argues that there are some moral and ideational principles in order to operate this discourse, somehow, such as striving for freedom of opinion and expression on the first side (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 1999:142). Moreover, he thought that:

The intellectual must be involved in a lifelong dispute with all the guardians of sacred vision or text, whose depredations are legion and whose heavy hand brooks no disagreement and certainly no diversity. Uncompromising freedom of opinion and expression is the secular
intellec
tual's main bastion: to abandon its defense or to tolerate tamperings with any of its
foundations is in effect to betray the intellectual’s calling (Said, 1994:88-89).

According to Said, the idea of nationalism or patriotism and these kind of
affiliations of the intellectual may produce a barrier against expression of the truth.
He admits that “the intellectual is not an uncomplicated automaton, hurling
mathematically devised laws and rules across the board” and he or she may act
according to national feelings, traditions etc., however, it does not mean that the
intellectuals lose their senses of objectivity about their own national identities as well
(op. cit.,98). As a basic explanation, “Said wants the intellectual to push the
boundaries, to reconcile his or her own identity with the reality of other identities,
other peoples, rather than dominating other cultures” (Ashcroft andAhluwalia,
1999:142). He thought that it was very important for intellectuals and for their task to
make universalize common sufferings of all the people in the world and to connect
these sufferings with others’ terrible conditions. This is what Said said about
intellectuals who produce seismic shocks and shake people in the world by fulfilling
their obligations for all people (Said, 1994:56). In addition to that, there is another
concept that Said talked about as ‘the post-colonial intellectuals’. Their role,
according to Said is “to act as a reminder of colonialism and its continuing effects as
well as to clarify and expand the space which post-colonial societies have been able
to carve out for themselves” (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001:40).As a conclusion,
speaking the truth to power, as a concept, can be summarized as “affection of better
conditions to achieve peace, reconciliation and alleviation of suffering” (Ashcroft
and Ahluwalia, 1999:142) and as Said claimed that “speaking the truth to power is no
Panglossian idealism: it is carefully weighing the alternatives, picking theright one,
and then intelligently representing it where it can do the most good and cause the
right change” (Said, 1994:102).
2.4. Overview

As a very controversial concept, intellectuality, is a product of a historical process and evolution. By looking from today, ‘philosophers of ancient Greece are perceived as intellectuals of their times’. In the Middle Ages, this concept covered the ‘people who found opportunity to go to the universities in those times and clergy, which mainly controlled the universities and considered as an upper class compared to other social and political communities’. This historical process has taken the concept of intellectuality to the understanding of the Enlightenment period in the eighteenth century that mainly perceived intellectuality as ‘questioning religious way of thinking and authority of clergy’, so philosophers of the Enlightenment were called as intellectuals later on. After the Dreyfus case in France, it was added to the concept of intellectuality and intellectuals another element as ‘defending people who were downtrodden by the authority or a hegemon’. However, as a concept, intellectuality and functions of intellectuals, cannot be defined easily and made some universal judgements on it. Because, intellectuality and execution of this concept are two of the most controversial and relative concepts in the world.

Although there are various ideas on intellectuality and intellectuals which expressed by the writers that were mentioned in this work, however it is possible to distinguish them into two groups according to their general approaches to intellectuality, intellectuals and the other people. Writers who expressed their views mostly in the first half of the twentieth century like Benda, Mannheim, and Gramsci mainly perceived the concept of intellectual as a ‘holder of knowledge’ and director of the people, according to their own perceptions of truth. They perceived the people
as the unintellectual masses and as both directable and a hopeless case. On the other hand, in the second half of the twentieth century, this perception of intellectual-unintellectual dichotomy started to change in the writings and thoughts of Jean-Paul Sartre, Michel Foucault, Noam Chomsky and Edward Said. That is to say, they started to perceive the truth as a more ambiguous concept rather than Benda, Mannheim and Gramsci. Moreover, solely ‘knowledge’ was questioned and seen as an insufficient notion to explain qualities of intellectuality and intellectuals. Therefore, the people or the masses were started to perceive not as a dough to be shaped by intellectuals or enlightened minority, but as different parts and organs which constitute the integrity of a body. However, there is the one and the strongest concept that all writers and thinkers extensively mentioned of and that can be identified as the essence of intellectuality discussions in the West is ‘criticism of the authority’.

It is observed that meaning and quality of the concept of intellectuality gradually evolved from an absolute and distinctive manner to a wider and more arguable ground, especially throughout the twentieth century West. At the same time, this concept was discussed among nationalist writers and thinkers in Turkey as well. In one sense, they focused and argued intellectuality and intellectuals in some similar titles with the Westerners, like on education, relationship with the people, the truth, the function etc. However, all of their approaches about intellectuality and intellectuals were constituted by their idea and understanding of Turkish nationalism.
3. Chapter Three


In this chapter, nationalist intellectuals who wrote their perceptions about ‘intellectuality’ and ‘intellectuals’ in years between 1960 and 1980 in Turkey will be analyzed. The main importance of the period between 1960 and 1980 can be defined as the period that politicization process of Turkey increased and social movements of different ideological groups, such as nationalists, gradually intensified. It can be said that relatively more liberal characteristic of the 1961 Constitution provided a legal ground for politicization of the people of Turkey in various manners, however, with the passing years, relatively more liberal characteristic of this constitution was changed to a more repressive one and consequently with 1980 military coup any kind of social movement was shattered for many years in Turkey. Therefore, it can be strongly anticipated that these socio-political situations of Turkey between 1960 and 1980 influenced the perceptions of the nationalist intellectuals on ‘intellectual’. Moreover, ideological separations between the socialist/communist and capitalist/liberal camps of the Soviets and the U.S, as the Cold War period of the international politics, would probably be influential on the nationalist intellectuals and their perceptions on ‘intellectuality’ and ‘intellectuals’ in Turkey.

The aim of this chapter is to show that Turkish nationalism was considered as a source of the ‘truth’ by nationalist intellectuals and the main criteria to be a ‘true intellectual’ was to be a Turkish nationalist for them. According to the Western intellectuals, if it is necessary to say in one word, ‘questioning’, was a basic action for an intellectual activity in order to reach their own truth. However, for the
nationalist intellectuals in Turkey, ‘Turkish nationalism’ was perceived as the truth and all other thoughts or ideas were analyzed according to this truth by nationalist intellectuals. It is also aimed to show that Turkish-Islamic synthesis constituted the whole structure of Turkish nationalism/Turkishness both in theory and practice.

It is going to be followed a chronological order of nationalist intellectuals according to their birthdays, as a nationalist generation in Turkey. Mainly, the following names will be discussed in this chapter: Nihal Atsız (1905-1975), Mehmet Kaplan (1915-1986), Alparslan Türkeş (1917-1997), Tahsin Ünal (1920-1988), Galip Erdem (1930-1997), Ahmet Arvasi (1932-1988), Necmettin Hacıeminoğlu (1932-1996) and Erol Güngör (1938-1983). In addition to that, there will be mentioned to other nationalist reflections on intellectual mainly from the articles which were written in various Turkist journals both right before 1960 and between 1960 and 1980 in Turkey.

3.2 Nationalist Perspectives Right Before 1960s

The concepts of intellectuality and intellectual were discussed by various nationalist intellectuals and torchbearers until 1960 as well. Before to focus on nationalist perceptions on intellectuals between 1960 and 1980, I will sample a few pieces that were written right before 1960.

In 1950, M. Zeki Sofuoğlu talked about five “practical conditions” to be a “good Turkish intellectual” in his article in *Orkun* journal (Sofuoğlu, 1950a:6). According to him, for the first condition, an intellectual has to have a world view and a perception of life. An intellectual also has to have a faith [Islam] and ideology,
otherwise, they become “ratter, doubtful, colourless, opportunist and self-seeker” (ibid.). Also, Sofuoğlu described this ‘world view’ as “humanistic, national, distinct and reasonable” (op. cit., 7). The second condition is, as he stated that “a true intellectual does not accept anything without reconsidering, without getting a positive answer from his/her conscience, so he/she is not influenced and indoctrinated by others”9 (ibid.). According to Sofuoğlu, a true intellectual only pays attention to ideas and ideologies, and “for a true intellectual, anything can be arguable and it should be, except his/her religious beliefs”10 (ibid.). The third condition is that “a true intellectual is courageous that he/she never refrain from declaring and evincing his/her opinion, thought and vote openly. Yet, hiding the truth and tolerating conditions is the biggest dishonesty in the eyes of him/her”11 (ibid.). According to Sofuoğlu, the truth is solitary and a true intellectual must see, find and learn this solitary truth (ibid.). The fourth condition for Sofuoğlu is “a true intellectual neither keeps his/her knowledge and thought that based on the truth for himself/herself nor waits a question to be occured to say what he/she knows or to explain his/her opinion”12 (ibid.). According to Sofuoğlu, a true intellectual feelshimself/herself responsible to show the true path and enlighten the people (ibid.). For the fifth condition, according to Sofuoğlu, in general, a true intellectual prefers benefit of the community to his/her own benefit in any condition and all the time (ibid.). He also criticized intellectuals in his article called “An Open Letter to Today’s Intellectual” within Orkun journal. Briefly, he talked about the authoritarian regime of Turkish Republic made intellectuals like “machine-men” (Sofuoğlu,

---

9 Gerçek bir münevver, kendi muhakeme süzgeçinden geçirmeden, viedanından müsbet cevap almadan herhangi bir şeyi kabul etmez; şunun-bunun tesir ve telkin altında kalmaz.
10 Hakiki bir münevver için, dini inançları dışında kalan her şey, serbestçe münakaşa mevzuu olabilir ve olmalıdır.
11 Gerçek bir münevver cesurdur; fikrini, kanaatini, reyini açıkça beyan ve izhardan, asla, çekinmez. Zira, onun indinde, hakikatı yutkunmak, vakıalara göz yummak en büyük şerefizilikir.
12 Gerçek bir münevver, hakikate dayanan bilgi ve kanaatini, ne sadece kendisine saklar; ne de bildiyi söylemek veya kanaatini açıklamak için bir sural vaki olmasını bekler.
He accused intellectuals of being coward, shy, self-seeker and getting influenced by others’ minds. Moreover, he described them as “two-faced, adulatory, faithless-idealess” and “enemy of religion and nation” (ibid.). His negative thoughts about ‘some intellectuals’ make us to understand the nationalist perceptions reversely. That means, the characteristics he used negatively about intellectuals were the ones which a ‘good Turkish intellectual’ must not reflect. For example, being a communist was one of these negative characteristics as well. İsmet Tümtürk had described “pseudo-intellectuals” as communists in his article called “War on Communism” within Orkun journal in 1950 (Tümtürk, 1950:6). Moreover, Nejdet Sançar had stated in his article called “The National Issues and Our Intellectuals” [Memleket Meseleleri ve Aydınlarımız] within Toprak journal that intellectuals of Turkey are careless about the national issues and this situation is becoming worse day by day (Sançar, 1958:6). The true intellectual, according to Sançar is neither captive of egoism nor a windblown leaf, and he does not accept these kind of people as intellectuals who did not care about national issues (op. cit.,7).

3.3 The Nationalist Perceptions Between 1960-1980

3.3.1 Nihal Atsız

Researcher, writer and historian. He was born in 1905, in İstanbul. He registered to Military School of Medicine in 1922 and to Faculty of Literature in 1926 (Öznur, 1999a:5). He became the assistant of Fuat Köprülü in 1930 but he was discharged in 1933. He published Atsız Mecmuası in 1931, Orhun and Orkun[in Edirne] in 1933. He worked as a teacher in Boğaziçi High School between 1939-1944 (Onur, 2005:282). In 1944, he was tried in the famous “Racism-Turanism Case” [İrkçılık-Turancılık Davası] and sentenced to four years but released from jail
after one and a half years later. He established “Turkists Society” [Türkçüler Derneğ] with other Turkist figures like İsmet Tümtürk, Nejdet Sançar etc. in 1963 and the name of this society was changed as “Nationalists Union of Turkey” [Türkiye Milliyetçiler Birliği] in 1964. He was tried once more because of his writings in Ötüken journal, in 1964. He worked with Alparslan Türkeş in Republican Peasants’ Nation Party [RPNP] after 1965, however his group was disbanded because of an ideational conflict with Türkeş after 1969 (Bakırezer, 2009:352-353). He was tried and sentenced because of his article in Ötüken journal but forgiven by President Fahri Korutürk later on. He died in 1975 because of an heart attack. Some of his works: Çanakkale’ye Yürüyüş, Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi, Bozkurtların Ölümü, Bozkurtlar Diriliyor (Bozkurtlar), Deli Kurt, Türk Tarihi Üzerine Toplamlar, Türk Tarihinde Meseleler, Dokuzboy Türkler ve Osmanlı Sultanları Tarihi, Ruh Adam (Onur, 2005:282).

Nihal Atsız generally criticized intellectual from different points. For example he asked that why intellectuals always imitate? (Atsız, 1997a:353). He gives his own answer by saying that because intellectuals rarely read books and when they read a book, they consider everything they read as truth (ibid.) [from Ötüken vol.6, 1960]. According to him, developments in Turkey would be proceeded by intellectuals and these intellectuals have to pay attention to individual, social, historical, traditional and psychological structure of our ‘nation’ (Atsız, 1997b:116) [from Orkun vol.1, 1962]. On the other hand, Atsız’s criticism about intellectuals mainly intensified on the subject of leftism, socialism, communism etc. According to him, intellectuals who defined themselves with the concepts of socialism or communism were “pseudo-intellectuals” and these “internationalist” and
“Muscovist” [Moskofçu] intellectuals had sided against Turkishness and Turkism (op. cit., 310) [from Ötüken vol.13, 1965].

3.3.2 Mehmet Kaplan

He was a literature historian and one of the founders of Erzurum Atatürk University Faculty of Literature. He was born in 1915, in Sivrihisar and died in 1986. He studied on the literature of Tanzimat and Republican period. His works: Tevfik Fikret ve Şiiri, Namık Kemal, Tanpinar’ın Şiir Dünyası, Şiir Tahlilleri [2 volumes], Akif Paşa’dan Yahya Kemal’e Kadar, Cumhuriyet Devri Türk Şiiri, Nesillerin Ruhu, Büyük Türkiye Rüyası, Türk Edebiyatı Üzerine Araştırmalar I, Hikaye Tahlilleri, Oğuz Kaan Destanı (Onur, 2005:232-233).

Mehmet Kaplan began with questioning that characteristic(s) of the intellectual such as, “in which level of literate person can be called as ‘intellectual’”, “is it enough to be called as ‘intellectual’ to have a graduation of primary school, high school or university?”, “is it possible to call a person as ‘intellectual’ who has a profession in a specific area but does not think about any beneficial situations for other people?”, “must an ‘intellectual’ be a Kemalist, communist, nationalist, internationalist?” etc. (Kaplan, 1998:247)\(^1\). Also he stated that people who have lost their religious and moral values and have materialistic thoughts of eighteenth centuries are defined as ‘intellectuals’, so how this definition can be true? (ibid.). According to him, ‘intellectual’ does not mean a person who has only specific knowledge but a person who made ‘thinking’ as a regular practice and who does not accept anything without to research on it (ibid.). If necessary to reflect

\(^1\) First version of this book was published in 1969
his ideas about intellectuals that he stated if a person attaches himself/herself to any specific ideology or a world view rigorously and consider them as the ultimate truth than this person cannot be called as an intellectual and according to him, if a person has not the methodical doubt of Descartes then he/she cannot be a thinker. (op. cit., 248). He pointed that:

‘Intellectual’ is a person who questions any situation that he/she faced over and over again(...)For him/her, the truth is the supreme value. Therefore, that person, approaches the ideas not from the aspect of benefit, propaganda, position or prestige but from the truth15 (Kaplan, 1998:247-248).

According to Mehmet Kaplan religion was one of the primary elements of national existence and nationalism in Turkey which there was a fact that Turkish nation was Muslim for thousands of years as well as today. So, even an irreligious person who interested in social realities cannot deny this situation (op. cit.,181). He added that:

A religion which the great persons like Mevlana, Yunus Emre, Şeyh Galib and Mehmet Akif found deep meanings in it cannot be bad. What is bad is that the people who are ignorant and self-seeker corrupt its meaning instead of interpenetrate in it16 (Kaplan, 1998:181).

This statement of Kaplan reminds us the characteristics of a kind of an intellectual which he called as “pseudo-intellectual” (op. cit.,31). Kaplan called “pseudo-intellectuals” as who “lost themselves in a shallow Western counterfeiting and breathe like wild animals” (ibid.) and criticized them because of their disregards about a main social fact according to him by saying that “Turkish nation is Muslim

---

14 ‘Methodic doubt’ is another usage of Cartesian doubt of Descartes.
15 “Aydın” karşılaştığı her meseleyi yeniden soran insandır(...)O’nun için hakikat en üstün kıymettir. Bunun içindeki o insan, fikirleri menfaat, propaganda, mevki, prestij değil, hakikat zaviyesinden ele alır.
16 Mevlana, Yunus Emre, Şeyh Galip, Mehmet Akif gibi büyük şahsiyetlerin içinde derin manalar buldukları bir din, kötü olamaz. Kötü olan cahil ve menfaatperest kimselerin onun hakiki manasına nülüz edecek yerde bozmalardır.
for thousands of years and the same as today, ninety nine percent of its population believed in Islam. It is a social fact, if you like it or not”17 (ibid.).

Kaplan also criticized intellectuals because of their affiliations with various ideologies like Turkism, Turanism, nationalism, Atatürkism, ultra or moderate leftism (op. cit., 254) and he added that these ideologies were used like a religion which huddles the people together and gives them spiritual excitement (ibid.). According to him, whether it is secular or religious one, any kind of bigotry harms both to religion and science which Turkey still maintains this condition in herself (op. cit., 255). He continued by saying that in Europe, the great scientists like Einstein both conserved their religious beliefs and developed their sciences at the same time, however, in Turkey, various shallow ideologies that intellectuals attached themselves with had neither religious, scientific and nor philosophical deepness according to Kaplan (op. cit., 255-256).

3.3.3 Alparslan Türkeş

He was born in 1917, in Lefkoşa. After he finished primary and high school in Lefkoşa, Türkeş and his family emigrated to Turkey in 1932. He graduated from the Military Academy and later became a lieutenant in 1939. He was tried in the Turkism-Turanism Case [Türkçülük-Turancılık Davası] in 1944 and he was imprisoned for one year. He gave speeches in Turkish radios about “heroism”, “warlikeness of the Turkish nation”, “soul of conquest”, “total defence” etc. between 1950 and 1955 (Bora, 2009:686-687). He was sent to Germany ‘Atomic and Nuclear School’ in 1958 and he was trained in some periods in the U.S. and worked in NATO...

17 Türk milleti bin yıldan beri müslümandır ve bugün de mevcudun yüzde doksan dokuzu İslamiyet’e inanır. Bu, hoşunuza gitse de gitmese de “sosyal bir vakıa”dır.
until 1960. He played a key role in 1960 military coup, however he was discharged and sent to India after a while. In 1964 he joined the Republican Peasants’ Nation Party [Cumhuriyetçi Köylü Millet Partisi] and elected as the leader of this party in 1965. Name of this party was changed as the Nationalist Action Party [Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi] in 1969. He worked as a vice prime minister in the ‘Nationalist Front’ governments in the 1970s. He was imprisoned after 1980 military coup d’etat. He continued his political life after he was released from prison until his death in 1997. His works: Temel Görüşler, Türkiye’nin Meseleleri, 1944 Milliyetçilik Olayı, Dış Politikamız ve Kıbrıs, Yeni Ufuklara Doğru, Kahramanlık Ruhu, Gönül Seferberliğine, Dokuz Işık, Bunalımdan Çıkış Yolu (Onur, 2005:36).

Before looking at the perceptions of Alparslan Türkeş on intellectual, there is a necessity to make some explanations about him. First of all, Türkeş was seen among Turkish nationalists not as an intellectual at first but as a leader of the nationalist movement in Turkey. However, besides being a movement leader, Türkeş had written many important books that guided many Turkish nationalists and also expressed his some perceptions about intellectuals in some of his books.

Türkeş called Turkish intellectuals and youth to be gathered around the idea of ‘Great Turkey’[Büyük Türkiye]. Henceforward, Turkish intellectuals should not only suggest people to read their books or listen their speech, at the same time, intellectuals should try to know and understand people by reading their books and listening their talks (Türkeş, 1976:42-43). He continues that:

Healthy sight is possible only by looking to the world with our own eyes. We believe that Turkish nation will make a breakthrough in the understanding which takes Islam as a ‘soul’ and Turkishness as a ‘body’ and by making its self culture dominant over life, it will move up the modern level as materially and morally. Turkish intellectuals are responsible to form a habit of thinking like a Turk and guide its nation with these way of thinking by avoiding
pressures of external cultures. Turkish intellectual is a victory of The National Movement and national thought of Turkish nation (Türkeş, 2000:105-106)

According to Alparslan Türkeş, there are three types of intellectual in Turkey as;

1) Sincere, faithful, idealist, nationalist intellectual;
2) An intellectual who engaged to external ideologies and foreigners with delusion and expedience;
3) Self seeker, expedient, unbothered intellectual (op. cit.,109).

According to him, “Turkish intellectual must think like a Turk” (op. cit.,105).

Türkeş thinks that industrial and technological development of the state are also dependent to nationalist intellectuals who must take charge in these kind of works. Therefore, he stated that this national elite called ‘Brain or Ruling Staff’, in other words, ‘Idealist Intellectual Staff’ will become the main ingredients of development of the Turkish nation (op. cit.,103-104). According to him, dividing workers as white collars and blue collars for ideological aims like ‘leftists’ do, is impolitic for the benefit of Turkey. His type of ‘intellectual’, in other words ‘nationalist intellectual’, does not divide workers to these kind of parts, on the contrary, appreciates them in same way. Therefore, in order for development of Turkey, ‘nationalist intellectuals’ must be in charge of this country (Türkeş, 1976:60).

18 Sıhhatli görmek, ancak dünyaya kendi gözümüzle bakmakla mümkündür. İnanıyorum ki, Türk milleti Müslümanlığı ruh, Türklüğü beden kabul eden anlayışı içinde, kendi öz kültürünü hayata hakim kılınma, büyük atılmlara girecek, maddeten ve manen çapraz şevyenin üstüne çıkacaktır. Türk aydınları yabancı kültürlerin baskılarından kurtularak bir Türk gibi düşünme alışkanlığını kavuşmak ve meselelerine bu açıdan çiş yolları getirerek milletine öncülük etmek vazifesi ile yüküldür. Türk aydını Milliyetçi Hareketin zaferi, Türk milletinin milli fikridir. 
19 First version of this book was published in 1977.
20 Türk aydını Türk gibi düşünmelidir.
Alparslan Türkeş, stated that an educational system which is non-national, bereft of national culture, national character and national consciousness is nothing more than a primitive, harmful and insolvent system which current educational system fits with this definition. However, education has two duties:
1) Constituting a national culture and national consciousness,
2) Making contribution to economical development, environmental development and national development by these culture and consciousness.

Turkish national education system has to focus on teaching young brains their national history, culture and values, also they must be blended with these concepts (op. cit.,114-115). According to Türkeş criticized left sided students and views are increasing in the universities. In order to stop these kind of harmful thoughts and ideologies for Turkish people that students must be trained with a national ideal, a national philosophy and a national world view in the universities and they must be thought that communism is not a convenient ideology for development of Turkey (op. cit.,114).

On the other hand, national education system of Turkey was criticized by these nationalist thinkers as well. Türkeş claimed that national education of Turkey was ruled planless and totally wrong since its establishment until today. Plans and programmes of the Ministry of National Education is far from the target of raising a nationalist youth. Turkey has to determine its needs and qualified people who will develop herself. The schools has to be saved from its current characteristic that teaches only according to the encyclopedical knowledge and they must carry students up to the sublimity of science, faith and morality. Because of these wrong
educational implementations that maintained for many years, so there is also an unhealthy relationship between the people and intellectual. Intellectual is distanced from the people and the people are hopeless from intellectual. It has to be remembered that mind which given by God is superior than anything and it has to be mounted on the basis of national education, science, faith and morality (op. cit.,109-110).

Alparslan Türkeş also sees educational differences and mistakes as a reason of separation between the people and intellectuals by saying that “intellectual is distanced from the people, the people despair of intellectual”\textsuperscript{21} (Türkeş, 2000:59) and complains about ‘harmful thoughts’ among university students who will probably educate the next generations of Turkish society (op. cit.,63). According to him the educational system of the Turks was occupied by foreign cultures and at the end of this process, intellectuals and the people were made the defenders of opposite cultures (Türkeş, 1976:146).

He also mentioned what was done in order to make closer the people and intellectuals in the book called \textit{Bazı Gerçekler (Savunmalar)} as ‘Turkish Culture Associations were formed in order to make closer the people and intellectuals each other and by reserve officer education system, young intellectual was sent to villages and as a result, intellectual and villager made contact and started to know each other (Türkeş et al. 1964:7-9).

\textsuperscript{21} Aydınlık halktan uzak, halk aydından umıtsızdır.
3.3.4 Tahsin Ünal

He was born in 1920, in Karaman. He finished high school in Konya and became a military teacher. He worked as a political history teacher in Kuleli Military High School and Military Academy (Onur, 2005:354). He retired from the military as a colonel in 1974 and joined the Nationalist Action Party [NAP]. He was tried and tortured in jail after the 1980 military coup d’etat. In 1988, he died because of an heart attack when he was making pilgrim age in Mecca and he was buried there (Küçükizsiz, nd). His works: *Türklüğün Sembolü Bozkurt, Tarım Kentleri, Türkün Sosyo Ekonomik Tarihi, Osmanlılarda Fazilet Mücadelesi, Fikir Akımları ve Emperyalizm, Türk Siyasi Tarihi, Şehitler ve Gaziler, Ülkücü ve Ülkücüler Üzerine* (Onur, 2005:354).

Tahsin Ünal constituted a good example of what was claimed about Turkish-Islamic synthesis in the introduction of this chapter:

Nationalism is not fooled and fallen into the trap of irreligiousness too. Yet, its dough of ideal is kneaded with religion. It can be said that Islam became the biggest creator of Turkish nationalism. If nation is an apple, it can be said that its one half is being a Turk and the other half is being a Muslim. Therefore, nationalists are called both ‘nationalists and islamist’. In this respect, nationalists are not unbelievers, so they do not be friends with unbelievers hence cannot be trapped and fooled by them. Moreover, they consider unbelievers equal with communists.

However, let me add in order to avoid misunderstanding that, religious understanding of nationalists is not a passivened understanding and idea which lost its dynamism by getting into the deepness of mystical and sect philosophy. Its understanding of religion is the understanding that takes its source only from the Quran and hadiths; by refusing pacifism and supineness, it wants to encourage and rouse the science, civilization, culture, working, direction, unification, it wants dynamism in the community. There is no materialistic view in nationalism that attributes all geographical and social conditions purely and simply to the material by refusing the God, the Prophet totally22 (Ünal, 1961:38).


Yalnız yanlış anlaşılmasını diye ilave edeyim ki, milliyetçilerin din anlayış; hurafalarla tamamen asını ve şafiyetini kaybetmis, mistik ve tartık felsefesinin içinde gömülerek dinamizmini kaybederek, pasifeşmiş, bir anlayış ve görüş değildir. Onun din anlayışı, kaynağı sadece Kur’andan ve
Tahsin Ünal stressed that “yet the intellectuals of a nation raise through studying on the courses which are studied and determined by the syllabuses in the schools of that country. The thought, level and systems in the programmes determine and set the thought levels and the thought systems of growing generations”23 (op. cit., 45-46). According to him, Atatürk had seen these situations many years ago and focused his efforts on people’s education. Atatürk’s quote as: “Unless we do not unify our schooling and manner so it is impossible to train the mass as intellectual on the same opinion and mind. Trying to generate a nation in the opposite way would be fooling around”24 shows that he was close to nationalist ideas (op.cit., 48). At the same time, Tahsin Ünal complained about the implementations which are totally opposite of Atatürk’s ideas. He indicates that one but very important reason of this theoretical and practical divergence from Atatürk’s ideas as polarizations, separations and failures of intellectuals (op. cit., 49-50).

3.3.5 Galip Erdem

He was known as the ‘big brother’ of Turkish idealists [ülkücüler]. He was a jurist and Turkish-Islamic idealist. He was born in 1930, in Rize and died in 1997. His articles were published in the various journals and newspapers like Devlet, Son Havadis, Ortadoğu, Tercüman and Zafer. He defended the Turkish-Islam idealists

23 Zira, bir milletin münevverleri, o memleketin mekteplerinde okunan ve ders programları ile tesbit edilen dersleri okuyarak yetiştirilir. Programlarda fikir, seviye ve sistemler, yetişen nesillerin fikir seviyelerini ve fikir sistemlerini tesbit ve tayin eder.

24 Tedrisatımızı ve terbiyemizizi birleştirmedikçe, aynı fikirde aynı zihniyetle bir kitleyi münevver yetiştirmek mümkün değildir. Bunun aksi ile bir millet meydana getirmeye çalışmak, abesle uğraşmaktr.

His way of identifying intellectuals with negative meaning was to call them as “intellectual at the middle” [ortacı münevver] and he defined them in general as committed to the Western civilization, laicist, consider all kinds of right and absolutist left as dangerous. They wanted nationalism, religiosity and absolutist left to be crushed which this is why they were called as ‘at the middle’ according to Erdem (Erdem, 1978:180). He stressed that this kind of intellectuals inspired from the Imperial Edict of 1839 [Tanzimat] and most of them constitutes the ruling class of Turkey. However, Erdem says that “they lose their place that stands in ‘the middle’ and taking the side of the left which is very dangerous for themselves and Turkish nation” (ibid.). He also describe ‘negative intellectual’ as who beats and swears to nation and left the people which came from and became a nightmare for Turkey (op. cit.,194). In addition to that, Erdem defined socialist and communist intellectuals as “semi-intellectuals” (Erdem, 1975:85).

### 3.3.6 Ahmet Arvasi

The son of important Islam scholar called Abdülhakim Arvasi and was a defender of ‘Turkish-Islam ideology’. He was born in Ağrı, in 1932 and died in Istanbul, in 1988. He became a teacher after he graduated from Erzurum Teacher High School for Boys in 1952. He worked as a teacher in several cities of Turkey like Konya and Ağrı. After his military service he graduated from Pedagogy in Ankara Gazi Training Institute. He worked in training institutes of Balıkesir, Bursa and Istanbul. He defined himself as a Turkish nationalist who committed to Islam.
and who against any kind of racism. His works are Türk-İslam Ülküsi (3 volume), Kendini Arayan İnsan, İnsan ve İnsan Ötesi, İlmi Hal, Eğitim Sosyolojisi, Doğu Anadolu Gerçeği, Şükrülerim, Akl ve Gönül, İnsanın Yalnızlığı, Şüphe ve İman, Kadın Erkek Üzerine, Medenileşme ve İslamiyet, Sahte Dindarlar Sahte Laikler, Milletin İtibarı, Fikir Sefaletine Örnekler, Devletin Dini Olur Mu? (Onur, 2005:17-18).

Ahmed Arvasi defined ‘intellectual’ by saying that:

Intellectual, means the ‘brain stuff’ that was educated according to national and modern needs of a nation. He/she did not just inherit national or individual values, also he/she could become the real intellectual who can make brand-new synthesis and can produce an idea by assimilating these values25 (Arvasi, 1994:353)26.

Ahmed Arvasi identified the characteristic of a Turkish-Islamic idealism as a movement of intellectuals who are modernized and nationalist, not alienated to their national values (ibid.).

Ahmed Arvasi also stressed the effect of education in producing ‘colonial intellectual’ by saying that:

For a country, it is a big disaster to be destitute of well-trained intellectual staffs. However, worse than that is raising of intellectualss according to foreign intentions and aims by subjecting them to a colonial training, making them alienated to their national existence and values, making them ‘a colonial intellectual’ by conditioning them according to ‘foreign ideologies’ that are the mask of imperialist aims. Let us state regretfully that today in many Turkish and Islamic states, intellectuals are conditioned according to aims and programmes of black and red imperialisms (Arvasi, 1994:354)(…) Turkish-Islamic idealist is the movement of nationalist intellectuals who modernized without alienating to their national and sacred existence and values. He/she is on duty to stave these ‘colonial intellectuals’ off as much as to defeat ignorance27 (op. cit.,355).


26 First version of the book was published in 1980.

3.3.7 Necmettin Hacıemoğlu

He was born in 1932, in Kahramanmaraş and died in 1994. He finished Adana High School for Boys and graduated from Istanbul University Faculty of Turkish Literature in 1959. He worked as a teacher in Bitlis and Osmaniye. He became an assistant in Istanbul University Faculty of Turkish Literature and he gained his professorship in the same university. He worked in Trakya University as a lecturer and dean after 1985. He was a member of “Intellectuals Association” [Aydınlar Ocağı] and his articles were published in some journals and newspapers like Türk Dili, Türk Yurdu, Türk Kültürü, Hisar, Töre, Devlet, Türk Edebiyatı and Hergün, Ortadoğu, Tercüman. Some of his literary works: Milliyetçi Eğitim Sistemi, Türkçe’nin Karanlık Günleri, Milliyetçilik-Ülkücülük-Aydınlar, Türkiye’nin Çıkmazları, Yeni Bir Dünya (Hacıemoğlu, 2004).

Most of the thoughts of Necmettin Hacıemoğlu on intellectuals were gathered in his book called Milliyetçilik-Ülkücülük-Aydınlar, including some of his writings in several nationalist journals such as Töre. By giving reference to his thoughts that “intellectuals who will manage and give direction to Turkish nation must be sophisticated before everything else”28 (Hacıemoğlu, 1993:334)29. He continued that:

Afterwards, intellectual must know well his/her nation that he/she at its service. Obligation of knowing its history, stages that it passed, culture and custom, deficiencies and qualities, structure, national characteristic, friends, enemies comes first. An intellectual who has these skills is a brain which thinks, investigates and can make compilation and suggestion. Because of that he/she can diagnose the diseases well. He/she can write “prescription of treatment” without consulting others. Because of he/she knows National structure so he/she can determine prophylactically that what is abhorrent and what are convenient to Turkish Nation. Consequently, he/she does not become emulative, imitator and formalist30 (Hacıemoğlu, 1993:334).

28 Türk milletini idare edecek ve hayatına yön verecek aydınlar her şeyden önce bilgili olmalıdır
29 First version of the book was published in 1975.
30 Sonra da aydının, hizmetinde olduğu milletini iyi tanması gerekir. Onun tarihinin, geçirdiği merhaleleri, kültür ve törenini, kusur ve meziyetlerini, bünüyesini, milli karakterini, dostlarını, düşmanlarını bilmek mecburiyeti başta gelir. Bu vasıfları taşıyan bir aydın ise düşünden, araştırıran, telif
Hacıeminoğlu also stipulates that intellectuals who will manage destiny of the nation must be “nationalist” and “Turkish idealist” [Ülkücü], both theoretically and practically (ibid.).

Like most of the other nationalists, the image of ‘intellectual’ in general meaning did not create positive perceptions in the mind of Hacıeminoğlu. He talked from many different ways on the negative sides of intellectuals in his writings. If it is necessary to give some examples that he stated the most crucial illness of Turkish society was because of non-idealism of intellectuals [aydınların ülkülsüzlüğü] (Hacıeminoğlu, 1993:146). He defined these ‘non-idealist intellectuals’ with the words like “selfishness”, “unconcernedness”, “self-seeking” and “cowardliness” (op. cit., 146-147). Within Töre journal, Hacıeminoğlu had written an article called the “Unconcerned Intellectuals” [Nemelazımcı Aydınlar] in 1975. In his article, he had criticized intellectuals by saying they were both “unconcerned about the political, economical, social depressions of Turkey” and about the “red anarchy” [communism] in Turkey (Hacıeminoğlu, 1975:18).

On the other hand, Hacıeminoğlu complained about the cultural imperialism of the West in Turkey. According to him, cultural imperialism of the West had broken off the national and cultural characteristics of Turkish people. Consequently, it also broke intellectuals off from the people and alienated to them, which as he said “if today’s Turkish intellectual mostly have the characteristics of the citizen of the...
world, so it is because of that reason as well”
(Hacıeminoğlu, 1993:227). Therefore, Hacıeminoğlu stated that these kind of intellectuals got stoned with the opium of neo-humanism, and various alien culture and thought were adopted by intellectuals (op. cit., 107).

Necmettin Hacıeminoğlu also criticized non-national characteristics of education and non-national elements which are thought to students in the schools. He said that after İsmet İnönü became the president and Hasan Ali Yücel became the Minister of National Education, they had begun the implementation of translation of ancient Latin and Grek classics in 1941. Thus, Turkish intellectual and youth who were subjected to these kind of knowledges learnt nothing about the Turkish culture. He continued by saying that:

Nationalists who defended Turkish culture against the foreign culture were called bigoted, chauvinist, racist and Turanist(...). Eventually, according to us the European humanism was interpreted by despising, denying, also considering the Turkish culture and Turkish civilization too dangerous. Latin, Greek, Christian and Jewish cultures were glorified and praised fully(...). Because of this wrong cultural policy of the state, the rising generations despised everything that is national and domestic; embraced everything which carry foreign label with an admiration. This is the reason of rude and ugly American culture and destructive Maoism rallied supporters quickly among Turkish intellectuals32 (Hacıeminoğlu, 1993:102-103).

Hacıeminoğlu interpreted these situations as divergence from Atatürk, from his ideas and efforts which were done in order to return the sources of Turkish nation by referring Gokturks, Uyghurs, Seljuks and the like. He says that these kinds of examinations which concerned ancient sources of the Turkish culture and civilization were begun in the time of Atatürk. Scientists considered a national duty of studying

31 Bugünün Türk aydın çoğunlukla dünya vatandaşı karakterine sahipse, gene bu yüzden.
32 Yabancı kültür karşısında Türk kültürünü savunan miliyetçilere “yobaz, şoven, kafatasçı, Turancı” dedi(...).Netice etibariyle Avrupa humanizmini bize Türk kültür ve medeniyetini küçümseyerek, inkar etmek, hatta çok tehlikeli görmek, şeklinde yorumlandı. Latin, Grek, Hristiyan ve Yahudi kültürleri ise alabildiğine övülüp şekilde yuveltildi(...).Devletin bu yanlıs kültür politikalarını yüzünden, yetişen nesiller, milli ve yerli olan her şeyi küçümsettiler; yabancı etiket taşıyan her şeye de hayranlıkla sarılarlars... Çok kaba ve çirkin Amerikan kültür ile çok sert ve yıkıcı Maoculuğun Türk aydınları arasında bu kadar çabuk taraftar toplaması, gene bu yüzden.
on Turkish language, Turkish history, Turkish law and thought. However, these examinations ended by the death of Atatürk. Instead of his concerns, Latin and Grek culture were emphasized in national education. This behaviour also is a betrayal against Atatürk (op. cit., 104-105).

Necmettin Hacıeminoğlu also was a nationalist intellectual who mentioned the subject of ‘intellectuals-the people’ relationship in his writings. He stated that

The people and intellectuals are like two enemies who are in same country, because there is no any moral tie except sharing same country, so there is a tension between the people and intellectuals for one hundred and fifty year in Turkey. Intellectuals said to the people that it must be westernized by leaving its national culture, tradition and religious belief and the people responded by saying that it will be modernized by not leaving its national culture, tradition and religious beliefs (Hacıeminoğlu, 1993:257-258; 1972:6-7). However, Hacıeminoğlu pointed that intellectuals always tried to impose their so called modernized and westernized mentalities on the people, but, all these ‘pressures’ were watched by the people and pushed back hardly (op. cit., 258; 7).

According to him, the people respected the Turkish tradition and Turkish-Islam morality. The people is hospitable, kind and helpful, they respect parents, teachers and women. They are brave, patient and cold blooded. On the other hand, intellectual, has lost its national pride. It is emulateive, formalist, self-seeker, materialist and selfish (Hacıeminoğlu, 1993:262). Hacıeminoğlu used many other adjectives for both the people and intellectuals as positive and negative. However, he put a note end of his writing that it must not be forgotten there could be individuals
who are not fit with the good qualities of the people and there could be intellectuals as nationalist, idealist and patriotist in the society (op. cit.,263).

He also talked about inferiority complexes of the people of colonized countries and gives Lebanon, its educational system, public life, economy etc. and her people as an example of this situation and he likens Turkey to Lebanon because of effect of foreign materials especially in education and public life, for example teaching foreign languages and non-national symbols in music, restaurants, cinema and the like (op. cit.,306-307). He added that “so, a large group of intellectuals do not have national proud and national honour anymore. Thus, the most appropriate adjective for our ‘progressive, revolutionarist, humanist and open to the left’ intellectuals who were raised in the last fifty years is: The colonial intellectual”33 (op. cit.,309). He also pointed for “the children of colonial intellectuals” as “socialists-communists” who are servants of Moscow and lovers of foreign thinkers, writers etc. but enemy of any national, historical figures and symbols and enemy of Turkish existence and Turkish state (op. cit.,310).

3.3.8 Erol Güngör

He was born in Kırşehir, in 1938 and died in 1983. He firstly registered to Law Faculty of Istanbul University but following the advice of Mümhtaz Turhan, he left law faculty and registered to Faculty of Literature of Istanbul University. He finished the university in 1961 and earned his Phd. Degree in 1965. He worked with a well known social-psychologist Kenneth Hammond in the U.S. Colorado University, in the Institute of Behavioral Sciences. He returned to Turkey in 1968

33 Demek ki büyük bir aydın grubunda artık milli guürşan ve milli haysiyetten eser kalmamıştır. Onun için bizim son elli yılda yetişen “ilerici, devrimci, hümanist ve sola açık” aydınlarımıza uygun sıfat şudur: Müstemleke aydın!

Erol Güngör had criticized ‘nationalist intellectual’ because of its deficits about the relations with the people or masses, according to his perception. He thought that the existence of intellectuals is extremely important in development of a country which these intellectuals are the nationalists who are in the minority. Their basic action is to make people to embrace their thoughts in this progress. Also, these intellectuals think that their thoughts will be accepted in a short time by the people because of ‘national’ and ‘domestic’ characteristics of their thoughts. However, their thoughts might be perceived as ‘alien’ or ‘foreign’ by the people because this ‘intellectual elite’ represents ‘modernity’ vis-a-vis ‘premodernity’ of the people, even intellectuals feel themselves closer to them. Unfortunately, ‘nationalist intellectual’ do not pay attention to these crucial social and cultural differences rather it focuses on the differences about ‘private life’, in other words, ‘life style’, between them and the people. This gap makes people to think that they will never adopt this kind of life so, they blame intellectuals for insincerity (Güngör, 1980:41-42).
According to Güngör nationalist intellectuals thought that their difference from the people is due to their high level of ‘scholarship’ or ‘knowledge’ compared to the ordinary people. However, except some basic cultural values, nationalist intellectuals have completely different life style than other people. While this situation is asked to them, they would respond as ‘this issue is a matter of private life which does not interest or harm anybody (op. cit., 43). He added that these kinds of behaviors reflected the characteristics of small group of people, not the general, so this brings separation, not unity and solidarity (op. cit., 43-44).

Erol Güngör had laid place about this subject largely in his book called Türk Kültürü ve Milliyetçilik, in 1975. According to him, ‘general usage of ‘the people’ is the mass who are ruled by rulers of the state. Social scientists use concept of ‘the people’ as ‘nation’ to define all people in a country and rarely ‘the people’ meant the population which has a power to affect political life. Eventually, before modern nations were constructed and after, ‘the people’ meant the masses who are ruled by the rulers (Güngör, 2006:25)\textsuperscript{34}. His common point that he tries to stress that ‘the people’ has always become ‘the other’ according to the ruler and the ruler also was the ‘other’ according to the people. He states that, ‘this situation was the same both in the Ottoman Empire and Turkish republic. Today, ‘intellectuals’ mostly constitute both the ruling class and other professions that are close to the people. However, there is a difference felt still between intellectuals and the people, so we can say that source of this difference is not about only on masses and rulers, this difference can be explained mostly with the concept of ‘cultural difference’ between intellectuals and the people (op. cit., 25-26). According to him, the basic source of this difference

\textsuperscript{34} First version of this book was published in 1975.
is different educational processes between the people and intellectuals. This problem can be seen in any societies, however, this situation forms a danger for the ‘national culture’. Therefore, primary policy for a nationalist here must be to erase these kind of differences between the people and intellectuals and blending them into the ‘national culture’. Because, in this situation, the people perceive intellectuals as arrogant, self-seeker, emulative [of the Western ideas], enemy of the religious spirit [maneviyat], disrespectful and rootless. On the other hand, intellectuals perceive the people as ignorant, superstitious, narrow-minded and gullible (op. cit.,28). Another, and may be the most important source of this difference between the people and intellectuals is “inequal distribution of the Western ideas between the people and intellectuals” and “captivation of intellectuals to the West”, according to Güngör (op. cit.,29-34). He states that peaceful cultural transitions may be counted as a positive action but this action was cheated by malevolent spies in this example. In that situation, there are the people who are saved from shattering impact of the West and intellectuals who were captivated to the Western ideas. The points that are unfamiliar for the people are positivism and empiricism of the West. Because this mentality brings atheism, scorning religiosity of the people and marking anybody who believes in religion which these kind of thoughts can be found in Turkish intellectuals (op. cit.,35-36). According to these “standard Turkish intellectuals”, the people are religious and intellectuals are the reformers, also, according to them, Turkish people regressed because of the effect of religion and it is impossible to become a religious for educated person (op. cit.,37). In this mentality, moral values of intellectuals resembled to the Western values as well. He also thinks that People’s Houses [Halkevleri] which were constituted by the government of Turkish republic mostly indoctrinated people with the Western thought systems and the Western cultural
values, so produced a kind of intellectuals who were alienated to their ‘people’s culture’ (op. cit.,46).

On the other hand, there was a commonly used concept in negative meaning among nationalist thinkers called ‘colonial intellectual’. The roots of the reason of why nationalist thinkers specifically put a name as ‘colonial’ in order to define these kind of intellectuals that can be found in Erol Güngör’s ideas. He gives examples of Mustafa Reşid Pasha and Midhat Pasha and their relations with foreign officials to explain that Turkish intellectuals do not have sedateness in themselves. If necessary to say in brief he stated that revolutionary grandsons/intellectuals of Mustafa Reşid Pasha who cried in front of English ambassador and Midhat Pasha who explained his works to the U.K.’s secretary of Ministry of Foreign Affairs do not have sedateness, and intellectuals who are constituted from this group have inferiority complex in front of these foreign elements. Like the officials of many colonial states, these ‘colonial intellectuals’ left their national values and copied the values of colonial states-the West- in their lives (op. cit.,59).

Güngör also stressed that how colonial states used education for their own ideological benefits by giving example of rising demands of Burmese students for Law education after English officials changed syllabuses of Law faculties into their own idea system (op. cit.,61).
3.4 Further Nationalist Reflections on Intellectual

There are also other nationalist perceptions of various nationalist writers and in the articles from various Turkist journals. For example, Hüseyin Bahar, in his article called “Crisis of Intellectual” [Münevver Buhranı] within Toprak, stated that because of conception of intellectual is misunderstood and interpreted superficially, therefore, some people or groups are called as intellectuals rashly, in Turkey (Bahar, 1962:12). According to him, the main point is that intellectuals must be inoculated with the passion of reading, upskilled to deep interpretation in any condition and at the same time, they must be fit up with national consciousness and love of country (ibid.).

In an anonymous article called “A Call For Turkish Intellectuals” [Türk Ayaşılara Çağrı] in Orkun journal, it was pointed that, ideologies like ‘communism’ and ‘socialism’ were constantly mentioned and defended in many publications and it is obvious that these kind of ideologies bear hostility against Turkish nationalism. (“Orkun”, 1963:1). Therefore, in this article, the call was made for Turkish intellectuals and it was said briefly that, in order to secure the state and society, Turkish intellectuals must put their heads together and solve the problems through “scientific and reflexive” thought that fit with social reality of Turkey (ibid.). The main point of the last paragraph of the article is the sentence that the Muslim-Turkish intellectuals are responsible to solve problems of the people in solidarity with both each other and the people (ibid.). In addition to that, the Artillery Staff Colonel Abdülvahit Erdoğan, also known as ‘Kara Vahit’, who was a participant of 1960 coup d’etat (Erdoğan, 1970) stated in his book called Türk Milliyetçi-Toplumcu Doktrinin Umumi Esasları, by using the nickname Mürşid Altaylı that Turkey has
taken the lead of the Islamic World for centuries and because of that, she was attacked by the “Jew, cosmopolitan, converted, sold, the Christendom and communism” for centuries (Altaylı, 1969:102). He enumerated the principles of the ‘Right Front’ as:

1) Nationalism
2) Islamism
3) Development Communitarianism (bread struggle) (op. cit., 103) and he perceived these principles necessary for Turkish intellectuality phase to be completed (ibid.).

In his article called “Intellectuals-An Address” [Aydınlar-Bir Hitap] in Orkun journal, Mithat Akaltan criticized the education system and intellectuals of Turkey. It can be said according to article, in general, Akaltan thought that education system was insufficient to raise conscious generations and intellectuals neither thought religion, nationality nor morality to the youth (Akaltan, 1962:11). Ali Muzaffer Ersöz, on the other hand, stated in his book called Milli Strateji that with modern type of education which was implemented espacially by the establishment of the republic created a group of intellectuals in good amount of both quality and quantity (Ersöz, 1965:19). He added that education is not only a concern of the Ministry of National Education, it is a concern of all Turkish nation. Especially the awareness of intellectuals and masses must be raised about educational programmes and about their implementations (op. cit.,20).

According to Ilgar, Turkey was a backward country compared to other countries which faced the same conditions after the WWI and he blamed ‘intellectuals’ for that situation in Turkey, in his article called “Intellectual Treason”
[Münevver İhaneti] within Ötüken journal (Ilgar, 1965:5). He stated that Turkish people abandoned their fate in the hands of the state and intellectuals, however, these intellectuals could not provide them the conditions of development, felicity and modern civilization, because intellectuals consistently struggled against each other and blamed on the people (ibid.). Consequently, Turkey was betrayed by intellectuals, according to Ilgar (ibid.).

A. Okçuoğlu stated in his article called “Idealess Intellectuals” [Fikirsiz Aydinlar] within Ötüken journal that “however, unfortunately, most of these people who are in the intellectual staff of our Turkey are men of their professions, they do not have the national culture”\(^{35}\) (Okçuoğlu, 1971:13). According to him, a person could be an intellectual if other people benefit from him/her and this situation can be realized if this intellectual be aware of the conditions of his/her country and the world. Therefore, Turkey needs that kind of “patriotic intellectual” [Memleketçi Aydın] and increasement of the number of this intellectual is indispensable (ibid.). A. Okçuoğlu also argued that there are two kinds of intellectual as “true intellectual” and “pseudo-intellectual” in his article called “True Intellectual-Pseudo Intellectual” [Gerçek Aydın-Sözde Aydın] within Ötüken journal (Okçuoğlu, 1973:13). He defined ‘true intellectual’ as the ‘patriotic intellectual’ who has well based knowledge about his/her country and the world, and who uses his/her knowledge, intelligence and labour in favour of the country and society (ibid.). On the contrary, ‘pseudo-intellectual’ was an “unpatriotic intellectual” who has not enough knowledge about his/her country and the world, and also it is a kind of intellectual that “uses his/her knowledge, intelligence and labour for personal interests”

\(^{35}\) Fakat ne yazık ki, Türkiye’ımızın aydın kadrosunda yer alan bu insanların pek çoğu, sadece mesleklerinin adamıdır. Milli kültür sahibi değildirler.
according to Okçoğlu (ibid.). He stressed that graduating some educational degrees, learning foreign languages or working on science is not enough to be an intellectual, so for example, if a person who studied law, medicine or etc. does not have a patriotic soul and mind and works only for his/her benefit, then he/she cannot be identified as a ‘true intellectual’ (ibid.). According to him, in order to ensure the “continuity of national presence of Turkey” and “its future”, Turkey needs ‘patriotic intellectual’ who is nationalist, patriotic and fearless (op. cit.,14). In another nationalist journal called Hasret, Ali Batman wrote an article called “End to Intellectual-The People Alienation” [Aydın-Halk Yabancılaşmasına Son] in 1976. Briefly, he talked about that intellectual community disparaged and despised the people and lived unwelcomingly to their national languages, values, customs and traditions, so, consequently they retrogressed and degenerated (Öznur, 1999b:165). Because of these characteristics of intellectuals, the people turned its back on them, so the huge gaps occurred between the people and intellectuals which this was the sufficient reason of the people to become ignorant, according to Batman’s idea (op. cit., 166). Similarly, ‘intellectual’, in general meaning, symbolized a negative image to Nejdet Sançar in his article called “Intellectual in Turk’s Life” [Türk’in Hayatında Aydın] within Ötügen journal. According to him, intellectuals in Turkey have lack of national consciousness and naive characteristic of Turks let them fall into traps of these intellectuals (Sançar, 1973:8). Sançar stated that intellectuals felt inferiority complex about the West and later on, this complex turned into the western admiration and wannabe which that kind of conditions made intellectuals blind about the hostilities of aliens in Turkey against the state (ibid.). Therefore, a ‘true intellectual’ for Sançar is “the Turk who will be raised by consciousness and spirit of Turkishness” (op. cit.,9).
On the other hand, İlhan Darendelioğlu criticized the leftist intellectuals about their sympathy to the states which were described as either ‘socialist’ or ‘people’s republic’ in his article called “Intellectual Apathy and Equality Lie” [Aydın Gafleti ve Eşitlik Yalanı] within a Turkist journal called Toprak. According to him, communism was a system of oppression and fear which was enemy of freedoms and equality. He added, in the USSR for instance, that there was a huge social and economical gap between the people who were member of the communist party and the people who were not, and between the rulers and ordinary people as well (Darendelioğlu, 1977:1). As Darendelioğlu stated that the leftists and socialists in Turkey claimed there were much more freedom and equality in those kind of countries than Turkey and many of these leftist people are called ‘intellectuals’ (op. cit., 1-2). He described these intellectuals as ‘apathetic’ [gafil] and he added as long as Turkey is not saved from these kind of careless people who are called intellectuals, then development and progress of Turkey hold up because of these intellectuals (ibid.).

3.5 Overview

As a concept, ‘intellectual’, was always a touchy subject for Turkish nationalists especially since the Republic of Turkey was established in 1923. The main reason of this situation was the general understanding about intellectuals that they have a mission in society.

Nationalist thinkers perceived intellectuals as a group of people that must be well-educated and sophisticated because they would constitute the brain and ruling
staff of Turkey, as Türkeş, Arvasi and Hacıeminoğlu mentioned specifically in their writings. However, the most important characteristic of intellectuals before everything else was ‘having the idea of Turkish nationalism’, which this was the key criteria to become a ‘true intellectual’ or not to become a ‘pseudo-intellectual’, ‘colonial intellectual’, ‘semi intellectual’ etc. according to nationalist thinkers in Turkey. It is also needful to add that Turkish nationalism is used in the same context with ‘Turkish-Islamic synthesis’ by referring the perspectives of many nationalist thinkers on intellectual both before 1960 and onwards.

So, in this picture, it can be stated that nationalist perceptions on intellectual constitute mainly two different groups of intellectual staff as true intellectuals and pseudo-intellectuals. True intellectuals can be defined by referring to the ideas of nationalist thinkers as intellectuals who are reliant to Turkishness and Islamic belief, in other words, ‘Turkish-Islamic idealism’ in general, as Arvasi stated above. As a relatively secular nationalist thinker, Nihal Atsız also pointed that “intellectuals have to pay attention to individual, social, historical, traditional and psychological structure” of the nation (p. 40). In addition to that, it is expected from true intellectuals to question the world, the truth etc. and using their knowledges in favour of Turkey and Turkish nation.

On the other hand, there are many negative perceptions about intellectuals among nationalist thinker as well. These perceptions are expressed generally through Turkishness, Islam, the West, different ideologies and personal characteristics. First of all, main negative perceptions were about intellectuals who were seen as socialist and communist, and who were close to the Western thought. These kind of
intellectuals were named by nationalist thinkers as pseudo-intellectuals, semi-intellectuals and colonial intellectuals. Other negative perceptions about intellectuals were about Turkishness, Islam and their characteristics. For example, according to several nationalist thinkers like M. Zeki Sofuoğlu, Nejdet Sançar and A. Okçuoğlu, some intellectuals were careless about the national issues, have lack of national consciousness and enemy of religion and nation. Also, these kind of intellectuals were described by nationalist thinkers as two-faced, self-seeker, coward, selfish, unpatriotic, apathetic etc.

Moreover, subjects like education and intellectuals’ relations with the people were important for nationalist thinkers as well. Most of them mentioned about the importance of education, in other words ‘national education’, on raising true intellectual generations. Alparslan Türkeş had mentioned that national education must teach people about their national history, culture and values. He also criticized education system of Turkey by saying it was ruled planless and occupied by foreign cultures, which that situation caused to an unhealthy relationship between intellectual and the people. In addition to that, Tahsin Ünal and Necmettin Hacieminoğlu criticized education system of Turkey by stating that nationalist style of education started to disappear by Atatürk’s death and the Western oriented ideas and approaches were gradually taught to students in Turkey. On the other hand, corruption of national education with adaptations of the Western ideas caused a dichotomy between intellectuals and ordinary people according to nationalist thinkers. AlparslanTürkeş thought that Turkish education system was occupied by foreign originated ideas. According to him, ordinary people who were not trained by that kind of educational process were alienated to intellectuals who were raised by
this education system. In addition, Necmettin Hacıeminoğlu and Erol Güngör had stated that intellectuals despised the people about their cultures, religious beliefs, traditions and because of that, intellectuals perceived them as premodern, ignorant, narrow-minded, superstitious etc. According to Hacıeminoğlu, these intellectuals pushed the people to become modernized and westernized by leaving their cultures, religious beliefs and so on, however, the people looked askance at these kind of efforts and insisted to preserve their traditional codes.

Mehmet Kaplan had commented earlier about definition of intellectual by indicating that intellectual is a person who produces thoughts and questions everything he/she faces. Also, according to him, intellectual is a person who “approaches the ideas not from the aspect of benefit, propaganda, position or prestige but from the truth” (p. 42). However, general nationalist perspectives about intellectual show almost the opposite picture. First of all, intellectual was positioned either in positive or in negative meaning by nationalist thinkers. So, Turkish nationalism—as a superset of Turkish-Islamic synthesis—was the invariable aspect of this positioning. Intellectuals were called as ‘true intellectual’ or were not, to the extent that they were associated with Turkish nationalism.

Secondly, understanding of the truth of nationalists is not formed by reasoning or questioning the phenomenons. Instead of that, there is a ‘regime of truth’ that was adopted through feelings by nationalist thinkers called Turkish nationalism which determines ‘true intellectuals’ and ‘pseudo-intellectuals’ after all.
Thirdly, intellectuals, in other words true intellectuals, were imagined and perceived as a brain stuff who would both lead the country and educate young generations by imbuing them with the idea of Turkish nationalism. Therefore, they were seen as the people who make sacrifices and devote themselves to national benefits of Turkey and the Turkish people.

Consequently, concepts of intellectual and intellectuality were not interpreted independently from Turkish nationalism by nationalist thinkers. Primary characteristics that expected from intellectuals were being tied to Turkish nationalism and Islam. These main characteristics determined intellectuals both in positive and negative meanings. Nationalist thinkers imagined to design ‘nationalist intellectual generations’ to raise ‘the generations of nationalist Turkish people’.
4. Chapter Four

4.1 Conclusion

In this thesis, the main objective was to analyze the general nationalist perceptions on intellectuals and intellectuality in Turkey between 1960 and 1980, based on the writings of nationalist intellectuals that were mentioned in this thesis. The point was to underline the differences of conception with the West. To that effect, the Western perceptions on intellectuals were discussed by mentioning important Western thinkers as Karl Mannheim, Julien Benda, Antonio Gramsci, Jean-Paul Sartre, Michel Foucault, Noam Chomsky and Edward Said. This approach was preferred because the ideational process of intellectuality discussions in the West throughout the twentieth century were different than the Turkish nationalist thinkers’.

If necessary to mention briefly, intellectuality, does not stand as a solid concept in the Western perceptions when different time periods and thinkers are considered. For instance, Karl Mannheim in the beginning of the twentieth century had met ‘new type of intellectuals’ positively because as he stated that ‘old kind of intellectual stratum’ was under the control of scholasticism of the church during the Middle Ages but with the modern times ecclesiastical and dogmatized interpretation of the world was broken and a free intelligentsia which interpreted the world from variety of ways had arisen. In the same time period, Julien Benda had criticized the modern intellectuals by stating that they were passionate about practical benefits and materialistic ends of their national and class interests. However, just as Mannheim, Julien Benda defended the concepts like mental activity, justice and truth against religious boundaries which imprisoned the people. On the other hand, Antonio Gramsci had defined intellectuals from their functions in society, because according
to his famous statement, all men are potentially intellectuals in the sense of having an intellect and using it, but not all are intellectuals by social function. He had distinguished intellectuals as traditional and organic, and claimed that every social class tried to create and operate its own organic intellectuals according to benefit of their class interests. Intellectual, as a concept had connotated the words like reason, giving direction and ruling the other people for Gramsci.

In the second half of the twentieth century, according to Jean-Paul Sartre, the classical intellectuals were the practical knowledge operators who both criticize the domestic and international system and also paid well by their high-standard jobs, so they remain as officials of the dominant class. Therefore, Sartre’s ideal type of intellectual must be a defender of all the people who are oppressed by dominant classes. Michel Foucault analyzed intellectuals about their associations with power relations and the concept of the truth in general. The universal or the traditional intellectuals for him reflected the general values of the Enlightenment such as the universal reason, knowledge of the truth and the like. On the contrary, he defended the role of the specific intellectual which its primary aim has to be breaking the cornerstones of the power in all areas where it produces disciplines, institutions, practices, technologies, knowledge and the like according to Foucault. Classical/traditional intellectuals seemed as the negative images for Chomsky as well. According to him, this type of intellectual had always made the people as passive, obedient, ignorant and guided for thousands of years. In one sentence, according to Chomsky, intellectuals are in a position to expose the lies of governments, to analyze actions according to their causes and motives and often hidden intentions and they must understand very clearly the nature of power and
oppression and terror and destruction in their own societies. According to Edward Said, some intellectuals use the discourse of dominant class and define some groups as a negative other by the influence of their national affiliations. Said’s core mentality about intellectuals are their representativeness about messages, views, attitudes etc. for the public and expressing common sufferings of all the people in the world.

However, this picture is quite different when we study Turkish nationalists’ views. Intellectuals, in general, were perceived in positive or negative meaning by nationalist thinkers in Turkey. When they define intellectual in positive meaning, they mostly draw a kind of an ‘ideal profile’ together with its total duties in the ‘national society’of their imaginations. The core element of this imagination is obviously ‘the idea of Turkish nationalism’. This was the thing that has to be available for the existence of true intellectual, like an instrument which acts as the heart inside the human body. It is also necessary to remind that the Turkish-Islamic synthesis constitute the general characteristic of Turkish nationalism. Turkish nationalism was almost the only criteria to perceive something as good or bad, positive or negative and friend or enemy for nationalist thinkers. ‘The truth’ which the Western thinkers tried to analyze its existence from many different points, was the only thing for nationalist thinkers in Turkey as ‘Turkish nationalism’. So, the most important matter of argument for the Western intellectuals which is the ‘truth’ is founded in the beginning of the way for nationalist intellectuals in Turkey and rest of the way would be taken in the guidance of this truth. Therefore, ‘Turkish nationalist intellectuals’ were perceived as the only group of people who ‘know’ everything beneficial for Turkishness and Turkish nationalism. Also, education was
seen by nationalist thinkers as a factory for production of nationalist intellectuals, therefore, education had to be organized according to values and essentials of Turkish nationalism to create nationalist intellectuals of the next generations. On the other hand, almost the only criteria to perceive intellectuals negatively was their connections with western ideas, in general. Anything which did not attach itself with Turkish nationalism at the first step was perceived for nationalist thinkers as the enemy of Turkish existence in the world. That kind of intellectuals were named in several ways like ‘semi-intellectuals’, ‘colonial intellectuals’, ‘quarter intellectuals’, ‘pseudo-intellectuals’ and ‘intellectual at the middle’ by nationalist thinkers in Turkey. In addition to that, intellectuals who also attached themselves to communism were named as servants of Moscow. Nationalist intellectuals perceived the leftist ideas and leftist intellectuals as a threat and danger for Turkish nationalism and Turkishness.

Nationalist intellectual can be described mainly as Turkish nationalist, dedicated to Islamic moral values, avoiding alien or foreign thought and value systems and life style, seeing itself nested with ordinary people and using its ‘intellect’ and skills for the sake of the ‘Turkish nation’. However, people do not come to the world by becoming a nationalist intellectual. So, in order to maintain the reproduction of this ‘collectivistic profile’ and ‘collectivistic mentality’, nationalist intellectuals also argued about the characteristics of education that would produce nationalist intellectuals. Turkish nationalism constituted all the structure and mentality of the national education of Turkey. Nationalist thinkers as well shared the idea that Turkish educational system has to have a national character. However, it can be inferreded from their thoughts about the characteristic of education that
common opinion showes nationalist thinkers was not pleased from the content and implementation of national education.

As it was mentioned earlier, there are crucial differences among the Western and nationalist perspectives on intellectuality and intellectuals. It is obvious from the thoughts of nationalist intellectuals in Turkey that any idea or action that carry a western impression was denied harshly by them. Perhaps the first thing must be said that the Western thought perceived intellectuals as secular beings and attached intellectuality with secularism against the authority of religion. As it was mentioned earlier that according to Mannheim a free intelligentsia has arisen after the religious or superstitious thoughts and bodies were broken in the history. Also, Benda had stated that religious affiliations imprisoned the people in the world and according to Said, the true intellectual should be a secular being because that prevents them seeing things in extremes. However, it is observed that this understanding is the opposite of the thoughts of nationalist intellectuals in Turkey. Almost all of them thought that a true intellectual must dedicate himself/herself to the Islamic beliefs, values and life styles, in other words, to Turk-Islam idealism, as Ahmet Arvasi stated above.

Secondly, it is observed from nationalist intellectuals that they draw a more collectivistic profile and mentality when they define function of intellectuals. For example, Nihal Atsız’s statements that were mentioned earlier as ‘intellectuals have to pay attention to individual, social, historical, traditional and psychological structure of the Turkish nation’ give the general summary of this argument. Also, it can be observed from the writings of other nationalist thinkers that a true intellectual must work for the benefit of his/her country and nation, in general. However, the
subject of function of intellectuals meant by the Western thinkers quite differently. It meant for Benda as telling people the disturbing truths and constitute solidarity between the people based on justice and truth. For Gramsci, it meant organizing, educating or leading the people. For Chomsky, it meant to speak the truth and expose lies and for Said it meant making various thoughts visible against the dominance of the state and society, in general.

There are crucial differences on the subject of education as well. According to general nationalist perception in Turkey, intellectuals should be raised within an ideal nationalist education and later on they should serve to the state and also the people by enlighten them with nationalist ideas. If it is necessary to give specific examples, the main aim of education according to Türkeş is teaching the people national history, culture and values, because, these educated people will constitute intellectual staff of Turkey. In addition to that, non-national characteristics in Turkish educational system were criticized by many nationalist thinkers like Alparslan Türkeş, Tahsin Ünal and Necmettin Hacımınoğlu. In the Western perspective, Mannheim perceived education as a unifying sociological instrument between all groups of intellectuals. Gramsci and Sartre, on the other hand, considered education as an ideological tool of dominant class to produce its own intellectuals.

Moreover, there is an extreme contrast between the Western perspectives and nationalists in Turkey on the subject of nationalism. Julien Benda can be pointed as the most important side of this discussion in this thesis. As he had claimed above that the modern intellectuals run after their political passions and their national, racial and class interests. So, according to him, this situation produced a feeling of hatred for
others in them. Edward Said, on the other hand, accepted that all people are raised with their national ties and identities, however, according to him, if intellectuals are entrapped within dominant discourse of nationalism then they might perceive different national, racial or religious groups as the negative other.

In addition to that, Mannheim stated that intellectuals do not focus on just one direction of thoughts or any class or group interests, because according to him, intellectuals are relatively uncommitted stratum. He thought that intellectuals do not act for the benefit of one group in society but all groups from different political parties or social classes. However, according to all nationalist intellectuals in Turkey, Turkishness, as a national identity, cannot be broken off from the characteristic of an intellectual. As Necmettin Hacieminoğlu stated that intellectuals of Turkey must be nationalist both theoretically and practically.

In general explanation, all of the nationalist intellectuals perceived the West and its ideas, irrespective of socialism, capitalism, communism, liberalism, humanism etc. as the enemy of the Turkish nation. Therefore, there is no common point between the Western and nationalist intellectuals in any aspect of intellectuality discussions such as on characteristics, perceptions, functions and the like. It can be said for the last difference between them as there can be observed evolutional changes in the Western perception on intellectual, from Benda to Said, however, we cannot talk about the same situation on the nationalist perceptions that were analyzed in this thesis.
In consequence, all perceptions and understandings of nationalist intellectuals about intellectuality and intellectuals were developed within the idea of Turkish nationalism, in other words Turkish-Islamic synthesis. Although many of them stated that different ideas and thoughts should be discussed freely, however, in the statements above, generally it was stressed that all discussions had to be done within the limits of Turkish nationalism and all other ideas that were perceived as western, foreign, dangerous etc. by nationalist thinkers and writers were seemed like cursed by them.
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