

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON YUSUF AKÇURA AND HIS ARTICLE “THREE WAYS OF POLICY”*

Nelli Minasyan

Abstract

In his article, “Three Ways of Policy”, Yusuf Akçura, one of the founders of the ideology of Pan-Turkism, summarizes the political discussions in Ottoman society in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In this article he analyzes the doctrines of Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism, and Pan-Turkism. The author argues that the doctrines of Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism have exhausted themselves and are failed policies for the Empire. Additionally, he expounds the effectiveness of the policy of Pan-Turkism and formulates its conceptual principles.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the main doctrines presented in Akçura's famous work. The main focus was on the ideology of Pan-Turkism and the author's observations connected with it. In this context, we have considered the idea of Turkic unity, which is still relevant today.

He presents two important circumstances: first, he talks about other Turkic peoples and brings the ideas of Turkic unity to the political agenda. Second, Akçura understands earlier that the multiethnic Ottoman Empire must become a nation-state, which the author connects with Pan-Turkism. Akçura's Pan-Turkism ideas continue to be viable because even today the ideas of Turkic unity have an important place in Turkey's domestic and foreign policy agendas.

Keywords: Yusuf Akçura, Ottoman Empire, Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism, Turkism, Pan-Turkism, nationalism, Turkic peoples, Turkic unity, Pan-Turanism.

Yusuf Akçura and the Ideology of Ottomanism

Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935) has a special place among Turkish intellectuals in the first decades of the 20th century. He was born in Russia, but later he studied, lived and worked in the Ottoman Empire [29: 9-13]. He joined a secret opposition organization against Sultan Abdul Hamid II (1876-1909) when he was studying in the Ottoman Military college (Harbiye Mektebi). But the organization was revealed by the government, and its members, including Akçura, were exiled to Libya, from where he managed to escape to Paris [28: 26]. In Paris, he met famous sociologists and philosophers of the time, such as Albert Sorel, Anri Bergson, Emile Durkheim, Gabriel Tarde, Lucien Levy-Bruhl, Charles Seignobos and others [29: 28; 6: 321]. These thinkers greatly influenced on the formation of Akçura's views, in particular Sorel with his nationalist and Durkheim with his sociological ideas [28: 56-57].

* The article was submitted on January 20, 2022. The article was reviewed on March 24, 2022.

The activity of Akçura can be divided into two periods. The first period began from 1903 when he returned from France to Russia. This is when he wrote his famous article “Three Ways of Policy” (Üç Tarz-i Siyaset)¹ [22]. It was published in the 24th, 26th and 27th issues of the “Türk” newspaper in Cairo in 1904, respectively on April 14th, 28th and May 5th [29: 30-31]. His activities were more ideological during this period. The second period of Akçura's activity began after the coup of the “Young Turks” in 1908, after which he was able to return to the Ottoman Empire. He was active in spreading, institutionalizing and implementing the ideas of Pan-Turkism² [13: 42-43; 1: 248-283; 3: 64-114]. After the fall of the Ottoman Empire, Akçura joined the Turkish nationalist movement [30: 31-35]. After the declaration of the Turkish Republic, he participated in the development of the ideology of Kemalism and some of his Pan-Turkic ideas were carried out in the context of the reforms implemented by Mustafa Kemal.

Yusuf Akçura became the founder of political Pan-Turkism through the influence of his article “Three Ways of Policy”. In fact, before Akçura, Pan-Turkism was mainly a cultural movement and was interpreted in terms of cultural developments. However, Akçura gave this movement political meaning and, according to F. Gergeon, the article “Three Ways of Policy” is the first example of this fact [27: 2]. In this article, the author presents his concept of Pan-Turkism and then draws parallels between three political doctrines: Ottomanism, Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turkism. This discussion is not accidental, as the Turkish intelligentsia of the time was discussing the doctrines and ways to preserve the Empire. Akçura was interested in this issue too, so he tried to find the most effective way to preserve the Empire.

At first, we will write about the doctrine of Ottomanism, because that is the first doctrine the author discusses in the article. At the roots of the ideology of Ottomanism were some members of the Turkish intelligentsia and the bureaucratic elite of the time, who created a secret group, called Patriotic Alliance (İttifak-ı Hamiyet), in 1865 [15: 20-21]. The newspapers “Description of ideas” (Tasvir-i Efkar)³ of Namık Kemal and “Monitor” (Muhbir) of Ali Suavi were the functional organs of the organization that criticized the policy of *Tanzimat*. Patriotic Alliance published its program in 1867 and by this came about the founding of the Young

¹ Akçura published this article in 1912 in Istanbul as a pamphlet. The article was republished in 1976. In the introductory part of the article and regarding the Pan-Turkism put forward by Akçura was a quote by the Turkish professor Enver Ziya Karal, and at the end were the analysis of Ali Kemal and Ahmet Ferit (Tek-First).

² He made a great contribution to the creation of Pan-Turkic organizations such as Turkish Association (Türk Derneği), Turkish Homeland Association (Türk Yurdu Cemiyeti), Turkish Hearths Association (Türk Ocaklar Cemiyeti).

³ The newspaper “Description” was founded by Ibrahim Şinasi in 1862, but from 1865 in the newspaper was edited by Namık Kemal.

Ottomans' [15: 22] organization⁴ [15: 45-48]. The Young Ottomans (Yeni Osmanlar or Genç Osmanlar) published newspapers as well as books and leaflets in an attempt to spread their ideas. However, these activities were limited, as many sections of the society were not literate, and the published materials (in Ottoman) were far from the spoken language which was Turkish.

It should be noted that the discussions on reforms were continued in various layers of Ottoman society during this period. According to the Tanzimat, the non-Muslim population would be given equal rights. The aim of the reforms was to strengthen the central government, to resolve internal conflicts, to ensure the security of all subjects of the Empire and to secure the property of subjects regardless of their religion. In the words of Turkish historian Kemal Karpat, the goal was to achieve "political, economic and social integration" [9: 85]. However, these reforms did not materialize, and they also created new administrative, economic and social problems [10: 262-264]. The Young Ottomans offered solutions: "political liberalization, limitation of bureaucratic dictatorship and confirmation of the parliamentary system" [19: 42]. In other words, one of their primary goals was to establish a constitutional monarchy.

One of the key foundations of the Ottoman doctrine was the concept of the Ottoman nation. It meant the unity of all the nations of the Empire without religious differences. Christians then became Ottoman subjects and not the members of a separate *Millet* [4: 43]. It is important to note that even the Turks did not unequivocally treat the view of the doctrine of Ottomanism. Part of the ruling elite was against the promises of equality. They took the progressive ideas of Europe, such as nation, citizenship, homeland, but since in Europe these ideas led to the creation of independent, politically united nation-states, and then they aimed to stifle the national liberation aspirations of the Christian peoples in the Ottoman Empire. According to scholar R. Safrastyan, the main goal of Ottomanization or "assimilation" programs was to assimilate non-Turkish peoples [4: 47]. On the other hand, Ottomanism was mainly an intellectual movement and it did not turn into a mass movement. In our opinion, Pan-Turkists made use of the situation when they tried to spread the ideas of Turkism and Pan-Turkism among the common people.

Y. Akçura mainly discusses the issue of creating an Ottoman nation within the framework of Ottoman doctrine. According to Y. Akçura, the real goal of the existence of the Ottoman nation should be the proclamation of political rights and equal responsibilities for Muslims and non-Muslims living in the Ottoman territories, in this way establishing perfect equality between them and giving them complete freedom of thought and religion. The goal of all this should be the creation of an "Ottoman nation" (Osmanlı milleti), which was a new nationality, united in a

⁴ The founders and active members of Young Ottomans were İbrahim Şinasi, Namık Kemal, Ali Suavi, Ziya Pasha, Mustafa Fazıl Pasha, Midhat Pasha and others. Monitor (Muhbir) was the main organ of the organization, but soon there were complaints connection with the newspaper and Namık Kemal began to publish the newspaper Freedom (Hürriyet).

common state, like the American nation, where there are religious and racial differences [22: 19]. In fact, Akçura's ideas were progressive for that period, but in the case of the Ottoman Empire they could not be implemented. First of all, we are dealing with a theocratic state, where religion continued to be the key principle and the second, the goal of the Ottoman leadership was to assimilate the subject nations, not to create conditions for common coexistence. On the other hand, Akçura concludes that the High Ottoman State must be preserved as a final result of these difficult processes with its unique form within the old borders [22: 19]. Thus, the main goal of the author is the preservation of the Ottoman Empire.

Y. Akçura was one of the intellectuals who spoke out about the problems of other Turkic peoples. In this regard, he notes that the policy of Ottomanism is a local internal matter, so Turks and the Muslims living outside of the Empire were not very interested in it [22: 19]. According to the author, this policy was preferable and practical for the Ottoman domains in the early and the late 19th centuries [22: 20]. However, the author makes other observations in connection with the last decades of the century. According to him, the ideas of nationalism were spread in Europe through the French Revolution and the French model of nationalism was taken as a basis encompassing its well-known principles, of the French Revolution, in particular freedom of conscience, not origin or ethnicity. These ideas found some responses in the Ottoman Empire. Thus, the policy of creation of the Ottoman nation was adopted by Mahmud II (1808-1839) and his successors, which was self-deception according to the author. They were trying to unite peoples of different ethnic and religious backgrounds around the idea of one united nation by the mottos of freedom, equality, security and brotherhood [22: 20] (it was only an expression and was far from reality - N. M.). Influenced by these ideas, Mahmud II said: "I want to see a religious difference between my subjects only when they enter their mosques, synagogues, churches ..." [14: 13-40]. Akçura refers to French emperor Napoleon III (1852-1870), who was pursuing an active policy trying to create nations according to French principles and to make reforms. Inspired by such ideas, the reforms were carried out by Abdul Aziz (1861-1876) in the region and their manifestation was the establishment of Galatasaray Lyceum. Of course, all these actions were of a cosmetic nature and substantive changes were not made.

The situation in Europe changed as a result of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870-1871, when Prussia won. Akçura presented this as a victory for the German interpretation of nationality, over the French interpretation. This symbolizes that nationality was based on ethnicity, which, in Akçura's words, "I believe is closer to reality". The author then states: "I believe that the illusion of the creation of the Ottoman nation is in the past, far from with the French Empire and like it never can be reborn" [22: 20].

Y. Akçura in his article "Three Ways of Policy" mentions five reasons why the policy of Ottomanism is no longer useful for the Empire and, consequently, has failed. First, the author observes the reality that the Muslims, especially the Ottoman Turks, do not want to mix or assimilate with the non-Muslims, because this

policy will put an end to their 600-year domination and sovereignty. In this case, they will be on an equal degree with their *rayahs* and as a result they will have to allow them into the government and army. The Ottoman monopoly in these spheres would be abolished. On the other hand, they would have to be engaged in trade and industry, which they didn't consider honorable. The second reason was the religious factor. Muslims did not want to be equated with non-Muslims, first and foremost from a legal point of view, and they thought that *dhimmi* (Zimmi) should always remain second-class citizens. Third, non-Muslims did not want to unite with Muslims, because they had a past, their own culture, and they had established states that had been destroyed by the Ottomans. Besides that, the self-consciousness of the subject peoples was quite high, so they were striving for independence, and they would never give up that struggle. The author concludes that in reality none of these peoples is eager to form a national union with their enemy and they would strive for independence in every possible way. Fourth, Akçura mentions the threat of Russia. According to him, the greatest enemy of the Ottomans was Russia, which had influence in the Balkans, as it wanted to have influence on the Straits (Bosporus and Dardanelles), Anatolia, Iraq, Istanbul, the entire Balkans and the Holy Lands. The author notes that by occupying Anatolia, Russia would completely control the rich and productive region and, spreading to Iraq, the Empire could complete its Asian conquest and end its old rivalry with Britain. As a result, Russia would acquire political and economic leverage by acquiring the straits and the main part of the Ottoman Empire. Russia would have then connected the vast territories of the Balkans, united the southern Slavs and put a cross at the top of St. Sophia. The author concludes that the achievement of these goals requires the weakening, decline and disintegration of the Ottoman state. According to Akçura, the fifth reason was European public opinion and the struggle between Christianity and Islam. They wanted to save Christians from Muslim domination, to rid Europe and Christian territories of unbelievers. Some of them were more humanistic and gave a scientific color to their demands, wanting to save the European nations from the barbaric Turks, who know nothing but war. They offered to return these Asians to the deserts of Central Asia, where they originated. In such conditions, according to the author, despite all the external difficulties, the individuals in charge of the Ottoman government tried to create an Ottoman nation, relying on the support of some European states (especially France, represented by Napoleon III). Akçura emphasizes that this task cannot be overcome, and their aspirations will end in failure. Besides, the number of unfavorable conditions was growing. Abdul Hamid's policy increased the hostility and divided between Muslims and non-Muslims and the latter doubled their aspirations for their independence. Under such conditions, the European public opinion intensified against the Turks. France, which supported the implementation of the idea of the Ottoman nation, lost its power and became the supporter of Russia. The author concludes that the conditions internally and externally had become more and more unfavorable, so the policy of Ottomanism was nothing more than a waste of time [22: 28-30].

Yusuf Akçura's observations on Pan-Islamism

Akçura also discusses another doctrine known at the time, namely Pan-Islamism. Pan-Islamism was raised to the state level during the reign of Abdul Hamid. The policy of Islamism (İslamcılık) first of all meant a return to the basic principles and traditional systems of Islam such as education and public morals [12: 22]. The adoption of the policy of Pan-Islamism was the turning point in the Russo-Turkish war in 1877-1878, and the summits and agreements of San Stefano and Berlin. As a result of the Berlin agreement: Serbia, Montenegro and Romania gained independence, Bulgaria was granted broad autonomy until full independence in 1908, Kars, Ardahan and Batumi passed to Russia, Cyprus was given to England for the organization of the Berlin Summit, and Austria occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina [11: 148]. The Ottoman leadership understood that the fall of the Empire and the loss of her territories was an ongoing process, so there was a need for a new ideology and actions. Under the circumstances, Abdul Hamid adopted the policy of Pan-Islamism, which consisted of two parts. The first part was the so-called internal Pan-Islamism, which aimed to prevent national liberation aspirations among the Christian population. The policy, according to K. Karpat, "allowed the ruling elite to emphasize loyalty to the Arabs in an effort to preserve the Islamic nature of the state" [9: 107]. The second part was to unite all the Muslims of the world. Ethnic differences would not be considered here, but religion and its advantages would be taken as a general basis. Abdul Hamid emphasized Islam and the title of Caliph [8: 20-21]. The main goal of the Sultan's policy of Pan-Islamism was to claim that he was the Caliph of all Muslims, so he could unite them under his rule [12: 36]. Hamid attached great importance to Muslim clerics. Thus, he personally appointed many *Qadies*, teachers and *Ulems* that he sent to Egypt, Crimea, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Bulgaria [17: 260]. In addition, he hosted influential Muslim leaders in Istanbul and his goal was to spread the influence and speech of the Sultan-Caliph through them. Abdul Hamid's goal was to establish an Islamic caliphate, unify Muslims and strengthen institutions of the Caliphate and the Sultanate [25: 96].

Akçura notes that the ideas of Pan-Islamism were initially mere thoughts mainly presented in the press but later they gradually acquired practical significance. Already in the last years of the rule of Sultan Abdul Aziz the word Pan-Islamism was often heard in diplomatic dialogues and steps were being taken to establish diplomatic relations with some Muslim leaders in Asia [22: 22]. According to Akçura, with this policy the Ottoman Empire again acquired the character of a theocratic state (in our opinion, it never changed - N. M.), which they tried to change with the Tanzimat [22: 23]. It should be noted that even during these reforms, the Ottoman Empire continued to remain a theocratic state.

Akçura, discussing the pros and cons of Pan-Islamism, asks this question: how useful is it for the Empire? The author first mentions that this form of politics will deepen the already existing competition and enmity between the peoples of the Empire and this will lead to the weakening of the state [22: 31]. Akçura notes that

in the face of such unfavorable conditions, the policy of Pan-Islamism nevertheless has an advantage and that is to unite all Muslims, including Turkic peoples, to create an Islamic state or union [22: 31]. In fact, Akçura remains committed to the idea of uniting the Turks in his article and this shows that Islam was considered a unifying factor for the Turkic peoples. According to Akçura, it is important to prepare the necessary grounds for the creation of such a union for establishing various organizations and structures based on religion and to strengthen spiritual ties. All this is necessary first for the survival among the powerful states. Then, over time, these processes will be strengthened, and it will be possible to create a stable spiritual union, which will stretch to a part of Asia and half of Africa and will be able to resist external and internal challenges [22: 31]. Islam is one of the religions that underpins the political and social systems of the state. In fact, when the Arabs began their achievements under the banner of Islam, the process of Islamization began in parallel. Many peoples who converted to Islam lost their ethnic and national features, traditions, social structures and language. According to Akçura, Islam is a powerful assimilation pot, where people of different ethnic groups and different beliefs were united around common systems [22: 32]. The author thinks that the rise of Islam was inside a well-organized political organization: the Constitution was the Quran, the official language was Arabic, and it had an elected leadership and sacred place [22: 32]. But over time this system started to weaken, when Islam splitted in two, the conflicts arise between Persians and Arabs and the influence of non-Arab elements intensified (he does not mention the conflicts between Arabs and Turks - N. M.). On the other hand, Christian states were getting stronger and gradually taking control of Muslim territories. Moreover, under the influence of the West, ethnic and national ideas begin to develop which had previously been oppressed by Islam [22: 32]. Then Akçura concludes that the religious belief was still quite strong among Muslims, the ideas of atheism was not yet widespread and the followers of Islam were still ready to make any sacrifices for the sake of their religion [22: 32].

Akçura mainly attests to Christian states for the failure of the policy of Pan-Islamism. They established their control over many Islamic countries and regions, and, according to the author, they can use any means to prevent the formation of a Pan-Islamic union [22: 33]. The author here refers to the fact that in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, all Asian states were in colonial or semi-colonial conditions. In fact, the author considers the implementation of the ideology of Pan-Islamism as unlikely, but he still leaves an important place for religion. Akçura suggested pursuing two policies of unity at the same time - Turkic and Muslim. Moreover, Muslim unity was to be led by the Turks. Thus, Akçura left open the question of the advantage of the policy of Islamism or Turkism for the Ottoman state [5].

The concept of Pan-Turkism of Yusuf Akçura

The third way of policy represented by Y. Akçura was Pan-Turkism. The author presents Turkism as a “still newborn child” [23: 173], therefore, in his opinion, it has the opportunity to develop and spread. Akçura begins this passage by talking about the benefits of the policy of Pan-Turkism. According to him, such a policy, when all Turks would live in the Ottoman Empire, is a perfect union in both ethnic and religious aspects. It is supposed to unite non-Turkic Muslim groups, who will have to be Turkified and assimilated with the Turks [22: 33]. This applied to the Christian population which lived in the Empire and hindered Turkic unity. In such conditions, they will be subject to systematic influence, and as a result they will lose their nationalities and eventually assimilated. According to the author, the main service of the policy of Pan-Turkism will be to unite all Turks, which are spread over most of Asia and in the eastern parts of Europe, belong to the same linguistic family, to the same ethnic group and essentially have the same religion (here he refers to the fact that the Turkic-speaking peoples are mainly followers of Sunni Islam and a small part follow Shia Islam - N. M.) [22: 33]. In fact, Akçura speaks about Turan or Pan-Turanism. As mentioned by H. Pulton “The idea of Turanism - a unification of all Turkic peoples from the Balkans to China in one country called “Turan” - can be seen initially in Akçura's ideas” [16: 82]. The Armenian scholar Zarevand considers Akçura the founder and theoretician of political Pan-Turanism [1: 17]. In fact, the author puts forward the idea that the unification of the Turkic peoples will create an opportunity for the preservation, development and territorial expansion of the Ottoman Empire. In this sense, he seems to be charting a new path for the Ottoman and then Turkish policy.

Akçura considers the abovementioned to be the advantages of the policy of Pan-Turkism and in parallel the author also mentions the negative factors. According to him, non-Turkic Muslim nations can be separated from the Ottoman Empire (most likely the author means the Arabs - N. M.) and can't be assimilated by the Turks, therefore, this policy will lead to division among Muslims and under such conditions, non-Turkic Muslim nations will refuse to have any serious relations with the Ottoman state [22: 34]. Additionally, according to Akçura, there are internal difficulties working against the policy of Pan-Turkism. First of all, the policy of Pan-Islamism creates unfavorable conditions. Due to the emphasis ethnic and nationalist ideas, it may not be possible to create a strong union among Muslims on the basis of Islam. According to Akçura, external factors also hinder the unification of Turkic peoples, notably Christian states, among which Russia is actively working against this policy. During this period the Turkic peoples were mainly located in Tsarist Russia, so the author considers Russia as the main obstacle. On the other hand, Akçura thinks that international situation favored Turkey, so he expresses the idea that Christian rulers could even sponsor this policy that will be directed against Russia [22: 35].

Y. Akçura tries to find ways and put forward universal principles around which it will be possible to organize the unification of the Turkic peoples. Thus, he

notes that the majority of Turks are Muslims, so could be an important factor in the establishment of a Turkic union [22: 34]. Therefore, in his article, Akçura considers the social role of Islam as an important component in Turkish society and in the process of forming national self-consciousness. At the same time, he acknowledges that religion alone cannot be the binding force for a Turkic union. According to Akçura, Islam is losing its power, as it was transforming into an individual rather than a social phenomenon [20: 59]. Thus, he did not reject the factor of religion, but mentioned that it can be useful in the processes of Turkish nation-building. That is, Islam continues to serve the people and thus maintained its political and social viability.

When introducing the concept of Pan-Turkism, Akçura presents some basic principles. Thus, we must put at first the principle of ethnicity. Akçura considered ethnicity and language as one of the important features for the description of a nation. According to J. Landau: "This primacy of the interests of "the race of the Turks" and "the world of the Turks" obviously constituted Akçura's own conception of Pan-Turkism and Pan-Turk policy, as elaborated in his books, articles and lectures [13: 44]. His vision of Pan-Turkism considered the world of the Turks as one indivisible entity, with evident signs of both cultural ties (language, history, customs) and material bonds (blood, race)" [13: 44; 23: 23-26]. In this context, Akçura has given the description of the "Turk": "when we say Turks which is represented in science by the words Turk-Tatar, and sometimes Turk-Tatar-Mongol, we mean all tribes and peoples which originated from a common race, with the same traditions, very close to each other in their languages and mixed by historical life. In this regard various Iranian and European and some Ottoman writers called to Tatars as Kazan peoples, Azeris... etc, with them the Kyrgyz and Yakuts are also included in explanation of the Turk" [23: 33-34; 24: 1]. As we see, Akçura is trying to realize the idea of a Turkic world or a united Turkic people which should strive for cultural and then political unity.

Akçura paid a lot of attention to language. For him, it was necessary to simplify the Turkish language, to clear it of Arabic and Persian words. That is, the language must be simple, closer to the vernacular through which would make it possible to write in a language understandable to the people and to spread it among the people. In essence he was a supporter of linguistic Turkism. In addition to language, he pays attention to history⁵ [11: 390]. According to Akçura, Turkic national history should not be limited to the Ottoman Empire, but should also include the history of the early Turkic states, and especially the history of its heroes such as Oghuz, Genghis, Timur, Ulugh Bey and others [22: 35].

⁵ Akçura participated in the development of a "new historical concept". He was the "founder" and president of the Turkish Historical Research Society (Türk Tarihi Tetkik Cemiyeti-TTTC) in 1931. The next year, Akçura organized the first meeting of the TTTC, where he mentioned the goals and new directions of studying Turkish history.

Akçura stands at the foundation of Turkish nationalism (*Milliyetçilik*) and many of his ideas about Turkism later became its definition. He has provided significant space to the presentation of the description and formation of the nation. Akçura's national ideas began to take shape during his years of study in France [26: 99]. Akçura was the first intellectual to coordinate Turkish nationalism as a political project and more effectively explained nationalist terminology than Namık Kemal [21: 198]. Akçura's Turkism had deep effects on the ideology of the Republic [7: 203]. He defined nationalism as a human collectivity with common ethnic and linguistic roots and a common social conscience [20: 60]. In fact, the author uses the basic ideas of Pan-Turkism, when describing Turkish nationalism. But Akçura found Pan-Turkism as fraught with difficulties as the other two policies and there was yet no national consciousness among the Turks [6: 322]. He concluded his article with a question: was it not likely to appeal to the Turkish people when the other two policies collapsed?

In essence, Akçura was not driven by emotions, but considered the possible political benefits and harms. With this article, he tried to persuade the Ottoman political elite to choose a new policy, that is, Pan-Turkism, the goal of which was to unite the Turkic countries and peoples, and Turkism, aimed to turn the Ottoman Empire into a Turkish nation state. In fact, before Akçura, the ideas of Pan-Turkism were considered mainly within cultural boundaries and Akçura's most important contribution was to give a political definition to the Pan-Turkist movement.

Conclusion

Thus, in the article “Three Ways of Policy” Yusuf Akçura presents new ideas for the Ottoman domestic and foreign policy. The policies of Ottomanism and Pan-Islamism could not solve the internal and external problems of Ottoman society and Akçura was one of the first to notice this. On the other hand, in the context of the search for the preservation of the Empire, Akçura presents the doctrine of Pan-Turkism and considers it the only real political program.

We see that Akçura emphasizes two important circumstances. First, he was the first to start talking about other Turkic peoples and offered a vision to unite them. In this way, he in fact brings the ideas of Turkic unity to the political agenda and at the same time giving a political interpretation of Pan-Turanism. The role of Akçura should also be considered in this context when from the idea of the Islamic unity of Abdul Hamid there was a transition to the idea of Turkic unity. Second, Akçura understood early on that the multiethnic Ottoman Empire must become a nation state. In his article, he argues that in this case, the policy of Pan-Turkism is critical to this process.

On the other hand, Akçura along with other famous Pan-Turkist intellectuals (İsmail Gaspiralı, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, Ali Huseynzade, Ziya Gökalp and others) of the time began the process of institutionalizing the ideas of Pan-Turkism, discussing issues of Turkic identity, culture, history, literature and language. Additionally, the conceptual principles put forward by Akçura, such as ethnicity, Turkified Islam, his

definitions of nation and nationality became important components of Turkish nationalism. The viability of Akçura's idea of Pan-Turkism is evidenced by the fact that they are still the basis of Turkish nationalism and are widespread in present Pan-Turkic circles in Turkey and other Turkic states. The ideas of Turkic unity presented by Akçura are topical and they are the basis of Turkey's policy towards other Turkic countries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ջարևանդ, Միացյալ, անկախ Թուրանիա, Երևան, 1993 (Zarevant, United and Independent Turan, Yerevan, 1963):
2. Մինասյան Ն., Համաթյուրքական բնույթի առաջին կազմակերպությունների գաղափարները և նպատակները, Մերձավոր և Միջին Արևելքի երկրներ և ժողովուրդներ, XXXII (2), 2019, Երևան, էջ 248-283 (Minasyan N., The ideas and purposes of the first Panturkic organizations, The countries and peoples of the Near and Middle East, Yerevan, XXXII (2), 2019):
3. Гасанова Э., Идеология буржуазного национализма в Турции в период младотурок (1908-1914гг.), Баку, 1966.
4. Сафрастян Р., Доктрина османизма в политической жизни Османской империи (50-70гг. XIX в.), Ереван, 1985.
5. Юсуф Акчур (1876-1935) и теория стадияльного развития, 2020; <http://www.idmedina.ru/ramazan/?7119/?7119> (25.03.2022).
6. Berkes N., The Development of Secularism in Turkey, London, 1998.
7. Gündüz M., Socio-cultural origins of Turkish educational reforms and ideological origins of late Ottoman intellectuals (1908-1930), History of Education, Vol. 38, No. 2, 2009, pp. 191-216.
8. Kayalı H., Arabs and Young Turks: Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1918, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1977.
9. Karpát H. K., An Inquiry into the social Foundations of Nationalism in the Ottoman State: from social estates to classes, from millets to nations, Princeton, New York, 1973.
10. Karpát H. K., The Transformation of the Ottoman State, 1789-1908, International Journal of Middle East Studies, vol. 3, No. 3, 1972, pp. 243-281.
11. Karpát H. K., The Politization of Islam: Reconstructing Identity, State, Faith and Community in the Late Ottoman State, Oxford-New York, 2001.
12. Landau M. J., Pan-Islam: History and Politics, London and New York, Routledge, 1990.
13. Landau M. J., Pan-Turkism in Turkey: A Study of Irredentism, London, 1981.
14. Levy A., The Ottoman Ulema and the Military Reforms of Sultan Mahmud II, Asia and Africa Studies, Vol. 7, 1971, p. 13-40.
15. Mardin Ş., The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought, A Study in the Modernization of Turkish Political Ideas, 2000.
16. Poulton H., Top Hat, Grey Wolf and Crescent: Turkish nationalism and the Turkish Republic, New York, 1997.

17. Show J. S., Show E. K., History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, Volume 2: Reform, Revolution and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey 1808-1975, New York, 2002.
18. Smith A., Nationalism in the Twentieth Century, Canberra, 1979.
19. Taşpınar Ö., Kurdish Nationalism and Political Islam in Turkey: Kemalist Identity in Transition, New York, 2004.
20. Uzer U., An Intellectual History of Turkish Nationalism Between Turkish Ethnicity and Islamic Identity, Salt Lake City, 2016.
21. Yavuz M. H., Nationalism and Islam: Yusuf Akçura and Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset, Journal of Islamic Studies vol. 4, No 2, 1993, pp. 175-207.
22. Akçura Y., Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset, Ankara, 1976.
23. Akçura Y., Türkçülük: Türkçülüğün Tarihi Gelişimi, İstanbul, 1978.
24. Akçura Y., Yeni Türk Devleti'nin Öncüleri, Ankara, 1981.
25. Akçuraoğlu Y., Türkçülük ve Dış Türkler, İstanbul, 1990.
26. Duran M., Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Manifesto Yazarı: Yusuf Akçura, 21. Yüzyıl, Sayı 36, 2011, s. 97-104.
27. Georgeon F., Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri, Ankara, 1986.
28. Uçar F., Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset, Türkçülüğün Manifestosu: Osmanlıcılık-Türkçülük-İslamcılık, Ankara, 2008.
29. Temir A., Yusuf Akçura, Ankara, 1987.
30. Şenoğlu K., Yusuf Akçura Kemalizmin İdeoloğu, İstanbul, 2009.

Nelli Minasyan

Armenian State Pedagogical University
minasyan.nelli@yahoo.com

ORCID ID 0000-0002-1372-111X

ՈՐՈՇ ԴԻՏԱՐԿՈՒՄՆԵՐ ՅՈՒՍՈՒՖ ԱՔՉՈՒՐԱՅԻ «ՔԱՂԱՔԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԵՐԵՔ ԶԵՎ» ՀՈԴՎԱԾԻ ՎԵՐԱԲԵՐՅԱԼ

Նելլի Մինասյան

Քանալի բառեր՝ Յուսուֆ Աքչուրա, Օսմանյան կայսրություն, օսմանիզմ, պանիսլամիզմ, պանթյուրքիզմ, ազգայնականություն, թյուրքական ժողովուրդներ, թյուրքական միասնություն, պանթուրանիզմ:

Յուսուֆ Աքչուրան իր «Քաղաքականության երեք ձև» հոդվածով, որը լույս էր տեսել Կահիրեում հրատարակվող «Թյուրք» (Türk) թերթի 24-րդ, 26-րդ և 27-րդ համարներում, ամփոփում է 19-րդ դարի վերջին և 20-րդ դարի սկզբին օսմանյան հասարակության մեջ առկա քաղաքական քննարկումները և ըստ այդմ հանդիսանում է պանթյուրքիզմի գաղափարախոսության հիմնադիրներից: Այս հոդվածում նա վերլուծում է օսմանիզմի, պանիսլամիզմի ու պանթյուրքիզմի վարդապետությունները: Հեղինակը հիմնավոր փաստարկներով գտնում է, որ

օսմանիզմի ու պանիսլամիզմի վարդապետությունները սպառել են իրենց և ըստ էության դրանք կայսրության համար ձախողված քաղաքականություններ են: Մյուս կողմից հիմնավորում է պանթուրքիզմի քաղաքականության արդյունավետությունը և ձևակերպում է նրա հայեցակարգային սկզբունքները:

Աքչուրայի մոտ մենք տեսնում ենք երկու կարևոր հանգամանք՝ նախ նա առաջինն էր, ով սկսեց խոսել թյուրքական մյուս ժողովուրդների մասին՝ առաջարկելով նրանց միավորելու տեսլականը: Այդպիսով նա փաստացի քաղաքական օրակարգ է բերում թյուրքական միասնության գաղափարները, միաժամանակ տալով պանթուրանիզմի (թյուրքական բոլոր ժողովուրդների միավորումը Բալկաններից մինչև Չինաստան «Թուրանի» սահմաններում) քաղաքական մեկնաբանությունը:

Այս ենթատեքստում պետք է դիտարկել նաև Աքչուրայի խաղացած դերը, երբ արդուփամիդյան իսլամական միասնության գաղափարից անցում է կատարվում դեպի թյուրքական միասնության գաղափարը: Երկրորդ՝ Աքչուրան ավելի վաղ է հասկանում, որ բազմաէթնիկ Օսմանյան կայսրությունը պետք է վերածվի ազգային պետության և այդ գործընթացը անհնար է կազմակերպել օսմանիզմի և պանիսլամիզմի քաղաքականությունների միջոցով: Նա իր հողվածում փաստարկում է, որ տվյալ դեպքում կարևոր և գործնականում կիրառելի է պանթուրքիզմի քաղաքականությունը:

Մյուս կողմից Աքչուրան, ժամանակի հայտնի պանթուրքիստ մտավորականների (Իսմայիլ Գասպըրալը, Ահմեդ Աղաօղլու, Ալի Հյուսեփնզադե, Ջիյա Գյոքալփի և այլք) հետ միասին սկսեց պանթուրքիզմի գաղափարների ինստիտուցիոնալացման գործընթացը՝ քննարկելով թյուրքական ինքնության, մշակույթի, պատմության, գրականության ու լեզվի հարցերը, որոնք ներկայումս ևս քարոզվում են թյուրքական պետությունների հետ միասնականացման քաղաքականության համայնապատկերում: Բացի այդ, Աքչուրայի առաջ քաշած հայեցակարգային սկզբունքները, ինչպիսիք են էթնիկ պատկանելությունը, թյուրքականացված իսլամը, ազգի ու ազգայինի նրա բնորոշումները, դարձան թյուրքական ազգայնականության կարևոր բաղադրիչները: Աքչուրայի ներկայացրած գաղափարների կենսունակության մասին է վկայում այն, որ դրանք այսօր էլ դրված են թյուրքական ազգայնականության հիմքում, ինչպես նաև նրա գաղափարները ներկայումս քարոզվում ու ներկայացվում են ներկայումս պանթուրքական շրջանակների կողմից: Հարկ է նշել, որ Աքչուրայի գաղափարները շարունակում են մնալ արդիական նաև մեր օրերում, խոսքը հատկապես վերաբերում է թյուրքական միասնության գաղափարներին, որոնք դրված են թյուրքախոս երկրների նկատմամբ իրականացվող Թուրքիայի քաղաքականության հիմքում: