The Concept of Citizenship in Afet Inan, Ataturk's Protégée and a Pioneering Woman Historian in the Early Kemalist Era

Aslı Daldal[*]

Abstract: Afet Inan is one of the first *engagée* historians of the early Republican Era who was particularly interested in providing historical bases to Kemalist concepts of history and governance. She was very close to Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and, in that sense, her thoughts and intellectual preferences reflected those of Mustafa Kemal. This essay is particularly interested in Inan's conception of citizenship. As citizenship, State, and history are inseparable, the article also tackles with Kemalist historiography, Kemalist feminism and Turkish thesis of history. The aim is to examine how Inan "reinvents" the Turkish citizen that would fulfil all the duties necessary to make the nation progress. As a pioneering woman historian of the early Republican era, Inan often emphasized the importance of "unity and order" within the society, and to reach this "internal cohesion" she saw the rights and duties of the citizens as outstandingly important. Although far from the progressivist attitudes some earlier feminists adopted in the Republic, Inan nevertheless provided a theoretical basis for the extension of suffrage to "women citizens" in the young Kemalist Republic.

Keywords: Kemalist feminism, Afet Inan, Kemalist historiography, Kemalist citizenship, Inan's conception of citizenship, Turkish thesis of history

INTRODUCTION

Afet Inan is one of the key figures in the Early Republican Era. She has always been very close to Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and in whatever she wrote she emphasized the Kemalist ideals. Afet Inan was mainly concerned with the progress of the new Republic. She wanted to help the bureaucratic elites and the intelligentsia in their efforts to create a new Turkish identity through a new Turkish history and statehood. As Hobsbawm (1992) says, in newly founded societies, the State had the obligation to furnish its citizens with a new cultural identity to build

[*] Aslı Daldal (✉)
Department of Political Science and International Relations, Yildiz Technical University, Turkey
e-mail: adaldal@yildiz.edu.tr

AGATHOS, Volume 13, Issue 1 (24): 129-143
© www.agathos-international-review.com CC BY NC 2022

the new regime, to assure the loyalty and cooperation of the citizens and to justify its legitimacy. Afet Inan devoted her life and career to "reinvent", in Hobsbawm's terminology, a new Turkish citizen that would fulfil all the duties necessary to make the nation progress. She emphasized the importance of "unity and order" within the society, and to reach this "internal cohesion" she saw the rights and duties of the citizens as vitally important. For this reason, Inan worked heavily on the concept of citizenship. According to Afet Inan, to enable the newly founded Republic to progress and to "take the place it deserves among the civilized nations" all Turkish males and females alike must adhere to the principles of the Republic and must, before all, be good citizens serving the highest interests of their nation. This essay will primarily deal with Inan's multilayered conception of "citizenship". As Inan was an eclectic thinker who worked on areas ranging from "Kemalist feminism to Kemalist historiography" other important philosophical aspects of her work will also be examined briefly.

KEY FRAGMENTS OF INAN'S LIFE AND WORK

Afet Inan was born in 1908 in one of Saloniki's villages called "Doyran" as a daughter of a state officer. When the Balkan Wars broke, her family moved to Adapazarı. Afet Inan's childhood vas deeply marked by endless wars and travels. In an interview Inan said that the history of her generation could be summarized as follows: A strong fear of being invaded by enemies, three successive wars, the Lausanne Treaty and the formation of the Republic (Inan 1960). She travelled almost all-around Turkey because of her father's profession and she often reported that the historical villages she saw, especially around the western and southern coasts of Turkey like Biga, Söke, and Alanya, aroused in her an interest in history and ancient civilizations. She also felt from time to time a profound sentiment of "rootlessness" creating in her a wish "to belong to somewhere" (Inan 1981). This restless childhood and "the wish to belong to somewhere" are mainly responsible for her strong nationalist inclinations. The fact that she had a family from Rumeli[1] is also a reinforcing factor in her nationalist ambitions as Falih Rıfkı Atay, an intellectual and a novelist of the era, points out: "The Turks of Rumeli had never lost their faith in turning one day to their homelands after defeating the enemy … All their

[1] Rumeli is the popular name given to the Ottoman regions (vilayet) in the Balkans.

songs and stories were telling the beauty of their homelands and the strength of their sons who would bring them back" (Atay 1955, 8).

Afet Inan had a very studious and ambitious personality that pushed her to learn more and more. She explained that wherever she went, she was called "the daughter of the inspector" and although she was proud of her father, she had a powerful wish of achieving something on her own (Inan 1981, 12). Inan's life changed when she met Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. She was sent to Lausanne to learn French and her nationalist inclinations became sharper there, as she read books in French. Says Inan: "I was learning a lot, but in some of our textbooks there were some humiliating expressions for Turks and these were offending me. It was said that the Turks were from-a secondary and barbarian race. I never wanted to read those books" (Ibid, 9).

Inan often said that she never read the books that gave a negative image of the Turks. This can be one of the reasons for her obsessions on some concepts appearing in all of her works as 'leitmotives'. One of those leitmotives was the question, "what is the real place Turks have been occupying in the world history and civilization since the first ages?" (Ibid, 10). Inan was obsessed with this question and finding a satisfactory answer to it seemed the ultimate aim of her life. All her efforts as a historian, antropologue, and archaeologist later would be based on proving the idea that "the Turks were the real masters" of the Minor Asian and therefore the world civilization. During her doctorate in Geneva University, her nationalism approximated, from time to time, to an "ethnographic racism" with the impact of one of her professors called Eugene Pittard. Her doctoral thesis was based on an anthropometric study conducted on 64,000 Anatolian villagers. Her aim was, first, to show that Turks have a superior-shape of skull, and then to compare her findings with the craniums found at the archeological excavations in Turkey, for proving that the Anatolian ancient civilizations in fact belong to Turks.

Afet Inan has always been close to Mustafa Kemal and she often proudly said that "she always wrote what Mustafa Kemal said" (Inan 1969, 7). Most of the time Afet Inan did more than merely inspiring from Mustafa Kemal and also acted as his closest assistant, noting every word he said and later publishing them. Inan's most comprehensive work on civic rights namely the *Civic Instructions* (1969) is one of those publications. In that respect, Inan's obsessions and leitmotivs also reflect those of Mustafa Kemal, hence the Kemalist ideology.

Inan's (and thus Mustafa Kemal's) second obsession was "civic instructions": the rights and duties of citizens. The concepts of right and duty were inseparable for Inan. All rights should be accorded if there was a corresponding duty. Inan had a clear-cut conception of "organic citizenship" in a Platonic sense that is individuals being parts of a larger whole and living for the benefit of that whole. This larger whole was the Turkish State and its benefit lied in "taking the place it deserves among the civilized nations". All Turkish males and females alike must work very hard to this end. Thus, citizenship was related to civilization in two ways: First, to keep the society in unity and order the state needed citizens proud of their Turkish civilization. Second the ultimate aim of all citizens should be to see the Turkish State taking its place among the civilized nations. That was the reason why citizens should work very hard (Ibid). Thus, for Inan, the fact that citizens were feeling themselves as part of a higher civilization should hold them together, and the wish to see the Turkish State prospered should push them to work harder and harder.

Afet Inan herself as a citizen showed great consistency with her theories. All her life (except her "wandering childhood") has been cautiously planned to serve best to the interest of the Republic. She was deeply committed to the duties assigned to her as a mother, academician, and citizen. She was the "ideal citizen": a life dedicated to the Republic. Almost in a Hegelian sense, for Inan, the State was the meaning of life, a sublime end to be a part of. It was also closely related to her conception of "citizenship".

INAN'S CONCEPTION OF STATE

In analyzing a concept such as "citizenship", it is necessary to take a closer look at the State - very much intermingled, especially in the early Republican Era. In her *Medeni Bilgiler* (*Civic Instructions*), Afet Inan says that, "The State is responsible to its citizens; but the very existence of the State also requires some obligations on the part of the citizens. The relation between the State and the citizens is one of mutual responsibilities" (Ibid, 15). The State has three components: a fatherland, a nation and the nation's independence. The nation is a political and social entity composed of citizens united by common nationality, language, culture and ends. The State represents the nation or in other words it is the nation's legal personality (Inan 1958, 41).

Apart from the "organic" understanding of State stemming from the Socratic-Platonic tradition and unfolding through the writings of

Rousseau and Hegel, the practical importance of the State stemming from the 17th century British thought seems also valid for Afet Inan. Like Thomas Hobbes, Afet Inan says that apart from being the nation's legal personality, the State is also responsible for the well-being and security of its citizens. Inan quotes Mustafa Kemal who says that: "Naturally, each man desires to have the best of everything and thus the powerful disregards the weak… As a consequence, it is impossible to live in peace and security… The state which has the coercive means, terminates this endless war and brings order and harmony to its citizens… The citizens live in a network of rights and duties, and these rights and duties are administered by the State" (Inan 1969, 8). Therefore, the existence of the State is the *conditio sine qua non* of a harmonious and peaceful life. This kind of pessimistic view of human nature and the impossibility of order and peace without a coercive power is analogous to Hobbes' "state of war" of all men against each other without the organizing power of a "Leviathan" (Hobbes 2014). This pessimism is also apparent in Inan's writings (often quoting Mustafa Kemal) with respect to state-to-state relations. As a "realist" politician Mustafa Kemal often says that, "In international politics, power and right are inseparable… The powerful is always right and in order to preserve its rights, a State must be powerful… Today power and right are the common principles of all civilized nations" (Inan & Karal 1946, 38-40). A third element in international politics is civilization. A State, apart from being powerful and right, should also be a civilized one. Here, what Inan means by right is "the right to be recognized and respected as an independent nation" (Ibid, 43). A State should be civilized in order to be recognized by other civilized States. Civilization here refers to the success of a society in social and material life as a result of its common efforts (Ibid, 44). Inan's leitmotif of "hardwork in unity to take the place we deserve among the civilized nations" is apparent here. Inan describes three types of State: monarchy, oligarchy, and democracy. She states that the Republic of Turkey is a democracy and she defines it as the rule of the majority of people. The sovereignty belongs to people and (unlike some western democracies) it is indivisible. The Grand National assembly represents the sovereignty on behalf of the people (Inan 1969, 28-34).

Interestingly, to explain the word "democracy", Inan puts in parenthesis the word "populism" (*halkçılık*), thus equating democracy with populism. In the Kemalist ideology, populism played a key role in determining the Republic's economic policy. Ziya Gökalp, the socio-

economic theorist of the Turkish revolution who inspired from Durkheim's functionalist approach, was a key figure in determining the framework of this new "populist-democracy". Developed through Gökalp's *corporatism solidaire*, populism was one of RPP's six arrows and meant that in Turkey there were no contradictory classes whose opposing interests are constantly at war. In Turkey there were no conflicting class interests but solidarity based on mutual help: No classes but cooperation (Par1a 1992, 42). For example, as Karpat explains, in this period, the regulations such as the Labor Law dated 1929 demanded the peaceful settlement of disputes between workers and employers, preventing them from organizing strikes or any similar political activities (Karpat 2017, 160). Takrir-i Sükun Law (Law on Establishment of Order) which was proclaimed in 1925 or the Code of Obligations dated 1926 were also regulations that emphasized the "absolute obligations of citizens" towards the State. Thus, in the initial years of Kemalism, "populism" was mainly an anti-liberal principle and Afet Inan was equating it with democracy. Populism was also in line with the "etatism" of 1930's which aimed at realizing a fast economic recovery through making the state an active agent in economic matters (Inan 1970, 50). Though "etatism" was not necessarily against "private initiative", it certainly was not a liberal principle. Obviously Inan's conception of democracy was a unique one, representing the ideological inclinations of the early Republican Era.

Inan gives a good example of this "peculiar" conception of democracy that characterized the Turkish State, when she describes some contemporary movements "opposed" to democracy. She says that revolutionary political trade unions which try to dictate some policy implementations to the government threaten the democracy as they engage in mass strikes. She says that although these trade unions have been successful in Britain, France and Germany, they will never have such an impact in Turkey. The Turkish Government will never take any decision because of the pressures from below (Inan 1969, 41). Inan concludes by saying that the government formed by the Grand National Assembly knows best how to preserve people's security and prosperity and the citizens of all professions should be contented to do their best for the general welfare of the State. The denial of opposing classes and the conception of the State as the center of all is contradictory to the development of citizenship and democracy in western countries. T. H. Marshall sees the class inequalities and the

endless struggle of the working class, as the major motor forces of democracy. He says: "Political rights, the access to the decision-making process through participation in the choice of parliament by universal manhood suffrage, emerged in the nineteenth century and reflect in part the demands of the working classes for citizenship" (Marshall 1964, ix). According to the English sociologist, citizenship arose with capitalism which is a system of class inequality as a necessity of competitive market economy. As societies evolved and class distinctions became sharper, citizenship served as a buffer against further confrontations. Political citizenship was followed by "industrial citizenship" (the representation of workers within factories by trade-unions). Marshall argues that "as citizenship and the capitalist class system have been at war… the former has imposed modifications on the latter… A great deal of democratic politics involves the efforts of the lower strata to equalize the condition of existence and opportunity" (Ibid, 84-94). Marshall obviously sees what Afet Inan calls "a movement against democracy" as the major cornerstone in the progress of democracy and citizenship. Besides, far from equating democracy with the lack of opposing class interests within the State, Marshall sees the class inequalities inherent in the capitalist system as historically and dialectically necessary for the development of citizenship. Although Afet Inan explicitly puts the State at a superior level with respect to the individual and subordinates the latter to the former, she thinks that while performing their civic duties such as paying taxes, citizens should not feel the State as a separate entity. Inan states that, "the citizens today should give as much importance to the needs of the State as their own personal needs… Those who live in today's civilization should see the 'common being' (State) as part of their own selves. For the civilized citizens, the State is as natural as the air they breathe, and the water they drink" (Inan 1969, 107). Obviously Afet Inan's conception of State also reflects some of the pragmatic considerations of the Kemalist ideology. She chooses and combines some aspects of political theory according to the "needs" of the Republic. Hence, we have a Hobbesian conception of State together with some aspects of the social contract theory and a democracy based on majority rule together with a Jacobin attitude towards mass movements. As emphasized above, all of these efforts were for a common ideal: "To enable the Turkish nation to take the place it deserves within the 'civilized' world."

INAN'S CONCEPTION OF CITIZENSHIP

Individuals or Citizens?

To understand Inan's conception of citizenship, it is worth making a distinction between "an individual" and "a citizen". By using the term "individual" we aim to refer to a human being accepted as an "end in itself" and who is given the opportunity to develop fully and freely his critical faculties and learn the universal knowledge and values (Parla 1992, 78). Then what is the difference of a citizen from an individual? Are all citizens also individuals? To answer these questions, it is necessary to consider some of the key concepts of Inan's *Civic Instructions*.

One of those concepts is "liberty". Inan (1969, 50) defines liberty "as the ability of man to realize fully what he thinks and wishes". But she goes on to say that it is the broadest definition of liberty and man can never be so free. Inan defines two types of liberty: the first is what she calls "natural freedom". This refers to a natural right given to all men to develop freely his natural abilities (lbid, 51). In that respect natural freedom is closer to the above definition of individual. An individual then has a "natural freedom". The second type of liberty Inan defines is the "civilized freedom". This is a liberty limited by the State for the common benefit of all nations and the State. To limit the individual freedom by rules and laws is the essential role of the State. And the people, as they are responsible and free citizens, voluntarily leave some of their natural liberty to the Republic for the common benefit of all (Ibid, 53, 54). Inan sees this "civilized liberty" more supreme than the "natural liberty". Hence Inan differentiates a citizen from an individual first by her conception of liberty. While the latter has a natural freedom, the former has a civilized freedom which makes him/her responsible to leave some of this freedom to the State for the benefit of the nation. The important point here is that the citizens do not complain of leaving some of their freedom to the State. They are not afraid of the coercive power of the State but do it because they have internalized the rights and duties assigned to them by the State. Here we clearly see the traces of Rousseau's conception of citizenship. In *The Social Contract*, Rousseau states that human beings must be made citizens before they can be made men, but in order to do that the government must give liberty under the law, must create a system of public education by which children are "accustomed to regard their individuality only in its relation to the body of the State" (Sabine and Thorson 1973, 538). The production of the "general will" is an

ongoing process which is not only a political but also a "moral" matter. This is what the Kemalist intellectuals including Afet Inan aimed at realizing: "Liberty under voluntary subjection for the benefit of the State" and "a system of education that makes human beings citizens before they can be made men." The second concept to consider here is then "education". In making the children internalize this voluntary subjection and making them parts of this network of rights and duties, educational policies were crucial. Afet Inan points out that the course on "civic instructions" was made a compulsory one because it was necessary to follow the mentality of progress and make the members of the State good citizens for their fatherland (Inan 1958, 55). The essential points of Inan's course, made compulsory for the middle school children, were as follows: 1st year: Children's responsibilities to their school, family, neighborhood and locality; second year: Vital institutions of a society: The nation and the State; third year: Democracy: Rights and responsibilities, duties of citizenship. Afet Inan explains that this program would step by step teach the child that s/he is surrounded by rights and duties wherever s/he goes in the society. Hence the child would become a responsible citizen aware of his rights and duties and accept them as natural (Ibid, 56). In RPP's program of 1931 it is written that the aim of the national education is first of all to raise strongly republican, nationalist and secular citizens respectful to the Turkish nation and State (Par1a 1992, 71). The aim of the national education was set to raise citizens who have internalized the ideological and philosophical principles of the State.

A third concept that will be briefly dealt with is "solidarity". Inan points out that all citizens are tied to each other as they are all members of the same society. Reminiscent of Hegel's concept of "universal altruism", Inan points out that these ties are natural, social and economic. Solidarity replaces the philosophy of selfishness with altruism (Inan 1969, 71). In conjunction with solidarity Inan also brings the concept of "social debt". As all members of the society are not equally fortunate, those who have better living conditions are "in debt" to others. This "social debt" is paid to the State in the form of taxes (Ibid, 72). Inan also states that if a citizen does harm to another citizen, the whole society can suffer because of "those intimate ties that exist within the society" (Ibid, 73). Inan's "solidarity" is beyond the simple conception of "cooperation for enlightened self-interest". By introducing the concept of "social debt", Inan once again approaches Rousseau (and consequently Hegel) whose social theory is

based on the principle that "a community has a corporate person or *moi commun*, and that men make a society by spiritual bonds: the reciprocal sensibility and internal correspondence of all parts analogous to the vital principle of a living organism" (Sabine and Thorson 1973, 537). Inan also sees the society as a living organism whose *moi commun* is the State. Lastly according to Inan, solidarity brings order to the society necessary for the citizen's happiness (Inan 1958, 59). The questions raised at the beginning of this section have an answer now: In Afet Inan's conception (and for other Kemalist intellectuals as well) a citizen is different from an individual, as the former sees himself as part of a network of rights and duties and can only conceive his existence as part of a larger whole dedicated to the existence of the *moi commun*, the State.

Women's Rights and Citizenship

Afet Inan is no doubt one of the key figures in the broadening of suffrage to women in the early Republican period. In most of her books, she cites an anecdote: "As a young instructor of civic rights at the School for Music Teachers (Musiki Muallim Mektebi), she decides one day to practice an election in the class among her pupils. A female student is elected. One of Afet Inan's male students rejects by saying that in Turkey women have no rights to be elected… Afet Inan feels very offended and starts working on that subject" (Inan 1970, 115).

Afet Inan has a peculiar understanding of feminism. At the core of Inan's feminism lies the principle of "equal rights and equal duties". She says that for her, feminism meant equality with men before the law in duties and rights (Inan 1958, 39). In that sense it would be appropriate to emphasize that she represented what Deniz Kandiyoti (1987, 317-318) calls "State Feminism" through which she claims women were "emancipated but unliberated". It is a well-known fact that there were more radical feminist activists during the early Republican era such as the well-known novelist Halide Edip, or Nezihe Muhiddin whose efforts to create a Women's Party (Kadınlar Fırkası) was not well received by the Kemalist cadres (Zihnioğlu 2016). For Inan, women must be given the civic rights to perform the corresponding civic duties. For her, women's rights meant "giving women the honor of becoming citizens". Thus, women could work equally as their husbands and sons for the welfare of the State. In the defense of women's rights, Inan often quotes Mustafa Kemal who said that "a nation cannot advance without the progress of women" (Inan

1970, 52). So "granting rights and duties to women" would again be for the benefit of the State. Inan saw absolutely no gender distinction in those civic rights and duties. She kept saying in the mid 1930's that women should also have military obligations. Reminiscent of the ancient Greek ideals articulated in the Spartan city, she writes in 1935 that wherever she goes, women of all ages kept asking her when they would be granted the "right" to become soldiers. Afet Inan says that she was proud of such questions (Inan 1958, 36-37).

The concept of political right is closely related to the type of State. Inan states that in a democracy, members of a society cannot be discriminated upon gender. It was pointed out earlier that Inan was equating democracy with populism, that is, class cooperation. It is not surprising that this cooperation goes beyond classes and also comprises genders. Thus, in a democracy there can be no class or gender biases which can go against the unity and order of the society: "The essential principle of democracy is its representation of the whole nation, men and women alike" (Inan 1970, 52, 53). Mustafa Kemal also states that the nation should advance in unity and order with all its males and females to reach the common goal (Ibid, 54). Inan describes the ideal Turkish woman as hard working, productive in economic life, and aware of her civic and personal duties. The personal duty of a woman concerns her responsibilities as a mother. So, the Turkish woman is responsible of raising good citizens to the Republic. The Turkish nation needs, as it progresses in the path of civilization, healthy and responsible citizens. The Turkish mother should first of all aim at raising such healthy and responsible citizens (Inan 1958, 71). Obviously, for Afet Inan the patriarchal power relations within the family did not matter too much. In a corporatist-nationalist spirit (which was also shared even by the "activists" such as Nezihe Muhiddin) Inan reduced women's rights only to the rights and duties of citizenship within the public sphere.

Citizenship and Civilization

T. H. Marshall (1964, 92) says that, "citizenship requires a bond of a different kind, a direct sense of community membership based on loyalty to a civilization which is a common possession". To create a society in unity and order, to mobilize people to sacrifice their physical and mental energy for the State, the possession of a common civilization is crucial. In the first section of this essay, it was specified that "civilization" was one of Inan's obsessions. She was very much

offended by the humiliating expressions used against Turks in some of the history books. It was underlined that civilization was related to citizenship in two ways: first, to keep the society in unity and order and to mobilize the citizens to voluntarily assume the duties imposed upon them, the State needed citizens proud of their civilization; and second, citizens were taught that their ultimate aim should be to see the Turkish State taking its place among the civilized nations. The nature of this civilization was very crucial for the State. When the Kemalist cadres mentioned the "Turkish civilization", they referred to some disciplines of social sciences such as history, archaeology, anthropology and linguistics. "Official historiography" was especially important in reinterpreting the history of Turkish civilization. In RPP's 1931 Program it was said that: "It is outstandingly important for our party that all Turkish citizens know well their history. This knowledge will increase the citizens' self-confidence and prevent them from engaging in destructive activities" (Parla 1992, 72).

The Turkish Thesis of History (Türk Tarih Tezi) was initiated by Mustafa Kemal who was seeing it as a continuation of the war of independence: "Those works have been done to get rid of the foreign views of history developed within and outside of Turkey against our national history" (Inan & Karal 1946, 55). At the core of the Turkish Thesis of History lied the argument that Turks were from the Aryan race (like the Europeans) and not Mongolians. At that period Mongolians were seen by the Europeans as a secondary race deprived of civilization, and in most of the European history books, Turks were shown as Mongolians and barbarians. Such a humiliating view would be incompatible with the ideals of the new Turkish State and its citizens (Ibid, 57). The essential questions were raised and efforts were spent to find a satisfactory answer to them. The most important of these questions was: What is the real place, Turks have been occupying in the world history and civilization since the first ages? To find the "right" answer, Turkish intellectuals made heavy use of archaeology and anthropology.

Afet Inan was among the first in engaging in eugenics as she went on working with Eugene Pittard in Geneva University. Eugenics, as heavily discussed in the interwar period especially within authoritarian regimes, was the promotion of the reproduction of people who were healthy and "useful" for the nation. In its negative meaning it expressed discrimination against the ill or the "unfit". As Ayşe Alemdaroğlu (2005) emphasized, the Turkish eugenists were more on

the side of the "positive eugenics" drawn to improve the nation rather than isolating its lower valued members. As discussed before, Afet Inan's doctoral thesis was based on anthropometric research upon 64,000 Anatolian villagers. Inan's first aim was to prove that most of the Turkish people were "brachycephalic", thus from the Aryan race. Her findings aimed at revealing that the Turkish people were actually from the "white race". Secondly, Inan aimed at comparing the craniums found at the excavations in Anatolia (mostly from Hittites and Seljukian civilizations) with the measurements she took in the villages of today's Anatolia. Inan (1947) maintained that Anatolia has been inhabited by the same people since the Copper Age even if their political names changed. She was very much supported by her thesis supervisor Eugene Pittard in her anthropometric studies. Pittard himself advocated the view that the European civilization was developed by Minor Asians who firstly tamed wild animals (Inan 1981, 49). As Soner Çağaptay (2004, 88) summarizes:

> Afet Inan detailed this further: the Turks were a brachycephalic people, whose roots went back to Central Asia, where they had lived thousands of years ago. In Central Asia, they had created a bright civilization around an inner sea. When this inner sea dried up due to climatic changes, they left their original home and moved in all directions to civilize the rest of the world. They went to China in the east; to India in the south; to Egypt, Mesopotamia, Persia, Anatolia, and Greece, and Italy in the west.

The wish to offer to the Turkish citizens a civilization that they could be proud of, led the intellectuals of the Republican Era to engage in various researches. The Turkish Thesis of History was not totally accepted at the end of the First Turkish History Congress convened in 1932. Important intellectuals such as Fuad Köprülü, Zaki Velidi Togan and Avram Galanti asserted that the existing documents should be closely reexamined (Daldal 2002). It nevertheless reflected the general view, very much supported by Mustafa Kemal's *protégée* and brightest historian Afet Inan, that "unity around a common ideal" was the main mission of Kemalist intellectuals and the main ideology framing their concept of "citizenship".

CONCLUSION

It was emphasized throughout this essay that Afet Inan was one of the key figures of the Republican Era and she was very close to Mustafa

Kemal. In that respect, Afet Inan is more than a simple historian. Her work reveals some of the key points framing the Kemalist ideology in the early Republican period where "unity around a common goal" is the most crucial aspect of historiography. This article aimed at focusing on a specific subject: Inan's conception of citizenship which is in close connection with the main philosophical and historical perspectives of the Kemalist cadres. This study indicated that in the Turkish case, citizenship was closely related, among others, to Jean-Jacques Rousseau's understanding of the State where the State is perceived as a "living organism" whose benefit lies in the harmonious work of each cell. The progress of the society represented by the "persona" of the State depends on the unity and order of the citizens. This unity and order can only be achieved if the citizens perfectly perform the duties assigned upon them. Although the State is formed for the well-being of its citizens, the citizens should, in no way, try to interfere with the decisions of the State that knows best how to protect its citizens' rights. Also this essay aimed at highlighting the extreme emphasis put on the Turkish civilization by Inan. To prove that the Turkish civilization is "nobler" than what the westerners think, it was the ultimate goal of the Turkish State and its citizens. The belief that Turks belong to a higher civilization is also a unifying factor in the society. The Kemalist ideology of the Republican Era valued citizenship more than individuality. The important thing was to make a citizen aware of his/her rights and duties to the State, and conceive that the only happiness was related to be a part of a greater whole: the Kemalist State.

REFERENCES:

Alemdaroğlu, Ayça. 2005. "Politics of the Body and Eugenic Discourse in Early Republican Turkey." *Body Society*, 11(3): 61-76.

Atay, Falih Rifki. 1955. *Babamız Mustafa Kemal* (*Our Father Mustafa Kemal*). Istanbul: Dogan Kardes Publications.

Çağaptay, Soner. 2004. "Race, Assimilation and Kemalism: Turkish Nationalism and the Minorities in the 1930s." *Middle Eastern Studies*, 3(40): 86–101.

Daldal, Aslı. 2002. "Afet Inan, Fuat Köprülü ve Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi'nde Tartışmalar" ("A Debate between Inan and Köprülü in the First Congress of History"). *Toplum ve Bilim*, 92: 234-248.

Hobbes, Thomas. 2014. *Leviathan*. Oxford University Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1992. "Introduction: Inventing Traditions". In Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-14.

Inan, Afet. 1947. *Türkiye Halkının Antropolojik Karakteri ve Türkiye Tarihi (Anthropological Characteristics of the Turkish People and the History of Turkey*). Ankara: Türk.Tarih Kurumu Basimevi.

Inan, Afet. 1958. *Herkesin Bir Dünyası Var (Everyone has a World*). Ankara: Türk.Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

Inan, Afet. 1960. *Tarih üzerine Inceleme ve Makaleler* (*On History*). Ankara: Akın Printing House.

Inan, Afet. 1969. *Medeni Bilgiler ve Mustafa Kemal'in El Yazıları* (*Civic Instructions and Mustafa Kemal's Manuscripts*). Ankara: Türk.Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

Inan, Afet. 1970. *Tarihten Bugüne (From History until Now)*. Ankara: Iş Bankası Yayınları.

Inan, Afet. 1981. *Mustafa Kemal'den Mektuplar (Letters from Mustafa Kemal*). Ankara: Türk.Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

Inan, Afet, and Enver Ziya Karal. 1946. *Mustafa Kemal Hakkında Konferanslar (Conferences on Mustafa Kemal*). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. 1987. "Emancipated but Unliberated? Reflections on the Turkish Case." *Feminist Studies*, 13(2): 317-338.

Karpat, Kemal. 2017. *Türk Demokrasi Tarihi.* Istanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

Marshall, T.H. 1964. *Class, Citizenship, and Social Development*. New-York: Doubleday Inc.

Parla, Taha. 1992. *Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları* (*The Official Sources of Political Culture in Turkey*). Istanbul: Iletişim.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 2019. *'The Social Contract' and Other Later Political Witings*. Edited and translated by Victor Gourevitch. Cambridge University Press.

Sabine, George H., and Thomas L. Thorson. 1973. *A History of Political Theory*. New York: Daison Press.

Zihnioğlu, Yaprak. 2016. *Kadınsız İnkılap: Nezihe Muhiddin, Kadınlar Halk Fırkası, Kadın Birliği (The Revolution without Women: Nezihe Muhiddin, Women's Party, The Union of Women*). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.